

CAS Chairs and Directors Meeting Minutes

December 11, 2018

3:30-5:00pm, Dolan 202/203

Medora Barnes, Matt Berg, Rich Clark, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Rebecca Drenovsky, Jeffrey Dyck, Gwen Compton-Engle, Margaret Farrar, Peggy Finucane, Nathan Gehlert, Gerald Guest, Rodney Hessinger, Anne Kugler, Kathy Lee, Mike Martin, Sheila McGinn, Phil Metres, Keiko Nakano, Mike Nichols, Tamba Nlandu, Mindy Peden, Dani Robbins, Catherine Rosemary, Debby Rosenthal, John Yost

I. Approval of minutes

R. Clark moved to approve, N. Gehlert seconded, none opposed.

II. PT faculty evaluations: documents, timeline, and communication

M. Farrar presented an overview of the current situation and noted that all part-time (PT) faculty will be evaluated in Spring 2019. She asked that department chairs start a schedule for classroom observation and let their PT faculty know that evaluations are going to happen.

- a. N. Gehlert asked if chairs can share this work with other faculty in the department. M. Farrar said yes, the language in the document could be changed so that is a clear expectation.
- b. S. McGinn requested that the format for the observation report be such that both the person who observes and person being observed can see the results.
- c. D. Robbins suggested building the topic into new faculty orientation.
- d. M. Berg asked if departments can generate different documents. M. Farrar replied yes, departments can do more than what was presented, but not less.

III. Tenure and promotion committee (Jeff Dyck)

M. Farrar noted that faculty council is proposing university-wide changes to tenure and promotion guidelines. Questions/concerns should be sent to Jeff Dyck. S. McGinn added that the committee is meeting this week and will come up with different models of how the process will work. J. Dyck commented that the committee is concerned with getting good faculty feedback; information is needed from departments.

- a. M. Barnes suggested talking to UFO, untenured faculty who have not been here very long.
- b. M. Peden noted that the committee should look at information from other schools in order to have a framework before doing an anonymous survey. D. Rosenthal agreed that comparator universities should be looked at.
- c. J. Dyck said some feedback is needed before creating models: should the committee do a survey? Visit departments? M. Peden suggested doing mini publics, a big gathering with a presentation and structured conversations. M. Farrar said structured conversations need to be by rank. R. Drenovsky commented that there should be

- various ways to let people participate (Canvas discussions, surveys, etc.). J. Dyck agreed that there should be multiple pathways. R. Hessinger suggested working up fully developed models so folks can see pros and cons. R. Drenovsky agreed that the committee should show options for ways it could be done in order to get objective feedback. M. Barnes said having more information up front will get people interested in making a change.
- d. M. Peden proposed inviting an expert in to start the discussion.
 - e. M. Berg added that chairs should stress what is needed for future hires along with the push in recent years to be deliberate about tenure and promotion guidelines.
 - f. R. Drenovsky commented that there is a lack of shared understanding of what it means to be a faculty member at JCU. Conversations across disciplines are helpful. M. Peden noted that the guidelines promote an articulation of core values. M. Farrar remarked that as tenure and promotion guidelines are revised, there is more commonality among departments.

IV. PT faculty usage

M. Farrar said that JCU is moving toward using fewer part-time faculty. This change is not just about class size, but balancing small classes with other course enrollments. It is a shift in thinking about what courses need to be taught vs. what faculty want to teach. Going forward, we will have better data about what departments need to offer, and information about where students are in the pipeline. R. Hessinger noted that Humanities and Social Science chairs looked at PT faculty usage, and ITS has created a new Argos report that shows how many students in each cohort have met Core requirements. Rodney will ask ITS to share the report with all chairs.

- a. M. Peden asked about factoring in signature programs and their needs, faculty who teach in multiple programs, and interdisciplinary programs.
- b. J. Yost asked about having an estimate of the number of students coming in with AP credits. Since this is trending up, we need reliable information.
- c. M. Barnes added that now that the Honors program is bigger there is more work administering it. There should be a discussion about how honors thesis, independent studies, and master's essays fit into this; things with no compensation. M. Farrar mentioned that we also need to look at why independent studies are being offered. There is too much uncompensated labor by faculty.
- d. R. Hessinger brought up the issue of hiding PT faculty courses on the course schedule. J. Yost suggested looking at it from the student's point of view – should we be worried about losing students who are having trouble scheduling when a PT faculty class would have fit their schedule? M. Peden noted that there is a psychological effect of having courses fill up, JCU is small enough that students should be able to take what they want when they need it.
- e. N. Gehlert pointed out that the counseling department sends out surveys about what students are interested in/what they need.
- f. M. Farrar said there will be some changes in how PT faculty are hired. The Deans will work with departments to discuss budgets and set targets for part time hires. It is an evolving process with some flexibility. For reference, JCU uses \$4,000 as a course salary estimate. Core support, interdisciplinary support, and signature program support will all

- be taken into consideration. Overall, the university will be using fewer PT faculty. The new core supports this change. This process will make it easier for the Dean to make the case for faculty hires. It is also better for students to be taught by full time faculty.
- g. M. Martin added that departments should be doing more planning and have a 1-2 year schedule in place. M. Farrar stated that the more transparent we are with students the better it will be for them, help them reduce variabilities. R. Drenovsky commented that students love it when course plans are clear.
 - h. G. Compton-Engle asked what is a reasonable percentage of courses to be taught by PT faculty? There will be a lot of variability among departments. R. Hessinger noted that one change will be putting full time faculty in first year student courses. PT faculty are not as available to students as full time faculty, so it will benefit students.

V. Program prioritization

M. Farrar emphasized that prioritization is about programs, not faculty. The CAS identity is not going to change; rather changes can amplify identity. It is a way of focusing energies: looking at what needs to end and realizing the limitations of a smaller faculty group. The goal is to not spread faculty too thin. The process will include sharing data, looking at enrollment, assessing program viability, looking at trends over time, majors, faculty retirements, and where programs are now. A rubric will be created for assessing programs.

- a. N. Gehlert suggested looking at employment rates as part of the data.
- b. M. Peden asked if other divisions are going through this process? M. Farrar replied that some divisions have already gone through this. It is important to know what happens with the budget on a macro level. However, prioritization is important even without budget concerns. Often it seems like courses are offered simply because they were offered in the past, so it will be helpful to look at recommendations.
- c. M. Peden suggested counting Core as a program in terms of understanding what counts as department or program.
- d. G. Compton-Engle suggested bringing minors into the picture.
- e. M. Nichols requested that departments be able to bring their own data into the picture, such as trends seen within department.

Adjourned: 5:05

Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 15, 2018 at 3:30pm

Minutes submitted by: Karen Connell

Guidelines for the comprehensive evaluation of part-time faculty

The comprehensive evaluation process for part-time faculty entails:

- A review of all student course evaluations (using electronic form)
- At least one classroom observation (using form)
- A review of the syllabus for the course(s) taught
- For on-line or hybrid courses a review of the materials provided to the students
- Assessment of professional conduct

The evaluation will be conducted by the Department Chair or Program Director, or an appropriate full-time faculty designee.

Procedure:

At the beginning of the semester the instructor will be notified of the evaluation process. At that time the Chair or Program Director will provide the faculty member with the name of the person who will conduct the class visitation.

1-Class Observation:

The class visitation will be scheduled by mutual agreement between the evaluator and the part-time faculty. The faculty being evaluated will be given the opportunity to visit the class of the evaluator or of a full-time faculty teaching similar courses.

The evaluator will review the syllabus before the class visitation to understand the learning goals, expectations and method of conducting the class.

All evaluators must complete the Classroom Observation Form. Departments should use this common form, but are welcome to add additional items that pertain to their disciplines and learning goals specifically. For special courses (on-line, performance, lab) the department can adjust the form to meet their needs.

During the observation the evaluator should arrive before the class begins and sit in a location that minimizes disruption to the students. The evaluator will avoid interference with class operation.

The observer will submit the completed form to the Chair within one week of the class visit. If the classroom visit raises concerns that require immediate attention the Chair should be notified at once. The faculty member should be given the opportunity to discuss the class visitation with his/her observer.

Every new instructor will be observed in their first semester of appointment, and annually for the first three years working at John Carroll. Part-time faculty who teach for us regularly will be observed every three years unless the evaluation surfaces issues that require correction. In that case the observation will be repeated the following semester.

2-Student Evaluations:

Student evaluations will be conducted for every course using the appropriate form and process. Evaluations will be conducted in class during the last week of classes; the form should be available for the students during all of that week.

The results of the evaluations will be made available to the instructor once final grades have been submitted.

3-Syllabus Review:

The Chair will review the syllabus of any new instructor to verify that it conforms to University's norms and expectations. For recurrent faculty the syllabus review will occur every three years. The review will occur before the syllabus is handed to students on the first day of class.

4-Professional Conduct:

The evaluator will assess whether:

- Class meets appropriately (any class cancellation cleared with the Chair, etc)
- Grades are turned in on time
- There are minimal grade changes
- There are reasonable grade distributions
- The level of difficulty is appropriate (test, assignments)
- The course expectations are communicated clearly and consistently
- The instructor responds in a timely way to departmental and student communications
- The instructor exhibits professionalism in communications with colleagues and students
- The instructor maintains currency in the discipline

5- After the Chair/Director reviews all the information she/he will inform the faculty member of the results of the evaluation. Ideally this will occur in an in-person or phone conversation. The evaluator will inform the faculty member of any concerns, and will assist the faculty member in the correction of any problems observed during the process.

Classroom Observation Form

Name of Evaluee: _____

Name of Evaluator: _____

Date of class visit: _____

Course Number and Section: _____

Course Format (lecture, workshop, seminar, etc): _____

I reviewed the syllabus before the class visit []

Evaluation Item	Observation	Notes
Organization and preparation		
Begins and ends class on time	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Appears well-prepared for class	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Uses class time effectively	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Uses technology appropriately	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not needed for this class	
Instruction		
Involves students in class activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Asks challenging questions to stimulate thought	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Presents ideas clearly	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Creates a respectful atmosphere conducive to learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Responds constructively to students' questions or concerns	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Communicates enthusiasm towards the content	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Shows mastery of the content	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes with qualification <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Overall Summary		
Strengths observed		
Aspects that require improvement and suggestions for improvement		

Course Evaluation for Classes Taught by Part-Time Faculty

Note: Departments will be free to merge these questions with questions of their own; they are also encouraged to consider their use for classes taught by Full Time faculty

Instructions to Student: We believe that meaningful input from students can help instructors improve courses. Please share your impressions of the course, and the role you played within it, in response to these questions:

Self-evaluation questions:

1. What was the average number of hours you spent outside of class each week preparing for this course? (Include the time you spent reading, writing, and consulting with tutors, among other things.) (Scale: 0 to 2 hours, 3 to 4 hours, 5 to 6 hours, 7 to 8 hours, 9 or more hours)
2. How often did you seek out assistance from the professor outside of class? (Scale: 0 times; 1-2 times; 3-4 time; 5+ times)
3. How satisfied were you with your effort in this course (or section)? (Scale: Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied)

Course Evaluation questions:

Please answer the below questions using the following scale:

1 – Strongly Disagree | 2 – Disagree | 3 – Neutral | 4 – Agree | 5 – Strongly Agree

1. Course expectations for students were clear.
2. The course material was well-organized.
3. The classroom environment was conducive to learning.
4. The instructor was responsive to students seeking help.
5. This course was academically rigorous.
6. I would recommend this instructor to others.

[Continued...]

Open-ended questions:

What are one to three specific things about the course or instructor that especially helped to support student learning?

What are one to three specific things about the course that could be improved to better support student learning?