

CFC Meeting Agenda
Monday, November 15, 2021, 4 p.m.,
BTAC Forum Room & Zoom

Seid Adem
Allan Ayella
Carolyn Carlson
Amber
Dickenson
Karen Garrison
Kristen Grimmer
Lindsey Ibañez
Bruce Mactavish

Ashley Maxwell
Rebecca Meador
Michael McGuire
Justin Moss
Matt Nyquist
Michael O'Brien
Vince Rossi
Azyz Sharafy
Janet Sharp

Theodore Shonka
Bradley Siebert
Josh Smith
Cherry Steffen
Courtney
Sullivan
Nan Sun
Kai Xu

- I. Call to Order
- II. *Approval of CFC Minutes, Monday, October 18, 2021
- III. *Accept Division Reports
 - A. Humanities Division:
 - 1. April 12-2, 20211 online
 - 2. April 20, 2021 Zoom
 - 3. October 5-15, 2021 online
 - B. NSD: October 15, 2021
 - C. SSD: October 15, 2021
- IV. Committee Reports – None submitted
- V. *Old Business
 - A. Student Perception Survey
- VI. New Business
- VII. Discussion
- VIII. Information Items
- IX. Concerns
- X. *Announcements
- XI. Adjourn

CFC Meeting Minutes
Monday, October 18, 2021, 4 p.m.,
BTAC Forum Room & Zoom

Present:	Ashley Maxwell	Theodore Shonka
Seid Adem	Rebecca Meador	Bradley Siebert
Allan Ayella	Michael McGuire	Josh Smith
Carolyn Carlson	Justin Moss	Cherry Steffen
Amber	Matt Nyquist	Courtney
Dickinson	Michael O'Brien	Sullivan
Kristen Grimmer	Vince Rossi	Nan Sun
Lindsey Ibañez	Azyz Sharafy	Kai Xu
Bruce Mactavish	Janet Sharp	

I. Call to Order—4:01pm

II. *Approval of CFC Minutes, Monday, September 20, 2021--Approved

III. Accept Division Reports – None submitted

IV. Committee Reports – None submitted

V. Old Business

*None

VI. New Business

*None

VII. Discussion

A. *CAS student perception surveys

**Revised student perception surveys have been discussed with chairs and different divisions. Kelly Erby has also gone to CAS division meetings and will be meeting with the last division later this week.

**The proposed student perception forms offer more flexibility for departments to come up with their own questions.

**A comment was made that the proposed questions seem to be measuring multiple things at once. It was proposed that some of these things be divided up and answered separately.

**An important factor to consider in any decided evaluation format is to keep the length shorter so more students respond.

**A comment was made that the question about course materials is more of a student content interaction. Why is the question under “Course Organization and Planning”? The question headings will not be in Evaluation Kit, so students will not see the various section titles.

**A question about whether students would know what they are evaluating if the headings are not present was asked.

**The Math Department wants to know how questions map back to VPAA goals.

**The VPAA approved both versions of the questions.

**It was asked which question assesses the teacher’s preparation and what does a low score mean on the preparation question.

**It was commented that the former SIR-II categories were beneficial and there were some areas where help could be utilized.

**We have free use of the SIR-II materials.

**It was suggested to select some questions from the SIR-II to have consistency among evaluations.

**The second proposed survey shifts focus away from instructor behavior.

**It was asked what percentage the evaluations are weighted in terms of promotion and tenure. The response was that answer is specific to a department.

**Departments are encouraged to have different measurements of teaching effectiveness and not rely solely on student perception forms.

VIII. Information Items

A. Update on curricular approval processes

**There may be a few courses we need to get through this semester. The software will not be ready this semester.

B. Feedback on CAS tenure and promotion criteria needed

**Currently, feedback is being collected from the various divisions.

Some other information items below:

**Last candidate for VPAA Treasurer position is interviewing.

**Invitation for chairs to submit capital improvement and technology requests (reviewed by Resources Committee).

**The process for requesting faculty positions and the search process is currently under revision. There will be an evaluation of areas of growth and areas that may be less central to a smaller university that may be in the future.

**Changes to summer courses and faculty compensation for areas outside teaching in the summer is forthcoming.

IX. Concerns--None

X. *Announcements

**Faculty Colloquium: Truth

**Sisters Rising documentary

**Senior Student Art shows are underway.

XI. Adjourn

--4:50pm

**Humanities Division of Washburn University
College of the Arts and Sciences Minutes
April 12, 2021 through April 21, 2021 (online)**

Michael O'Brien, Chair of the Division, conducted a meeting via e-mail beginning April 12th, 2021.

New business included approving the following agenda items.

1. Approval of Minutes from the January 20-28 online meeting
2. Humanities Division Elections

Members were instructed to vote on the agenda items by reply to Michael O'Brien's e-mail no later than 5:00 p.m. on April 21, 2021. Michael O'Brien also instructed members to provide feedback on a proposal from the Natural Science Division to revise the College of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Document. After some e-mail exchange, Michael O'Brien scheduled a separate Zoom meeting for April 20th at 3:30 p.m. to allow for synchronous discussion of the CAS Tenure and Promotion Document. Separate minutes will be recorded for that meeting.

On April 21, 2021, Michael O'Brien announced via e-mail that all items on the agenda were approved with a quorum and provided the results of the election he would forward to the Dean's office.

- Carson Kay (Communication Studies) was elected to serve on the Faculty Instructional Technology Advisory Committee and on the Faculty Senate.
- Jim Schnobelen (Communication Studies) was elected to serve on the General Education Committee.
- Andy Farkas (English) was elected to serve on the Honors Advisory Board.
- Kai Xu (Communication Studies) was elected to serve on the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee.
- Louise Krug (English) was elected to serve on Undergraduate Probation and Reinstatement Committee.
- Corey Zwikstra (English) was elected to serve on the University Program Review Committee and on the Faculty Senate.

The meeting concluded on April 21, 2021.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dr. Danny Wade
Department of English
Secretary to the Humanities Division

Humanities meeting on April 20th, 2021
Discussion on Natural Sciences Division proposal for T&P document

Michael O'Brien presided the meeting. Carson Kay, Louise Krug, Tracy Routsong, Jim Schnoebelen, Corey Zwikstra, Kara Kendall-Morwick, Ian Smith, Andrew Farkas, Courtney Sullivan, Bradley Siebert, and Miguel González-Abellás attended (Miguel recorded the minutes).

Meeting was called to order at 3.33 p.m.

Comments on the T&P proposal:

- Some faculty members had problems with “the judgement of professional colleagues,” since that is not a scholarly activity per se. Discussion on that item followed.
- There was a discussion on some editorial changes to the bullet list, in terms of offering some uniformity or parallel structure to the bullet points. Besides, it was suggested that “Scholarly activities include” should change to either “Scholarly activities may include” or a similar more flexible formula.
- On section A.1, General Policy, it was suggested to use “**competent**” instead of “**able**” (line 4, first paragraph)
- On the next section, 2.b (Minimum Requirements for Consideration for Promotion and Tenure; Experience) there was discussion on the difference between tenure and promotion that the document indicates versus the administration suggestion that tenure and promotion to associate professor are one single or unified procedure. There seems to be a mixed message here that requires clarification. Some faculty members were concerned about the merging of both tenure and promotion, and wondered why they are being pushed as the same. Here's the section under consideration:

If the candidate is eligible for promotion during the year of the tenure decision, then one petition and one departmental committee may be used for both. Where a department employs different standards for tenure and for promotion, the relevant set of standards must be met for each. A candidate for Associate Professor whose petition for tenure is denied may not be promoted.

- Discussion on the teaching and service sections was smoother. The rest of the document was fine for the members present.

Request for nominations for Sue Taylor-Owens.

No further announcements.

Meeting was adjourned at 4.22 p.m.

**Humanities Division of Washburn University
College of the Arts and Sciences Minutes
October 5, 2021 through October 15, 2021 (online)**

Michael O'Brien, Chair of the Division, conducted a meeting via e-mail beginning October 5, 2021.

New business included approving the following agenda items.

1. Approval of Minutes from April 12-21, 2021 (Online/E-mail)
2. Approval of Minutes from April 20, 2021 (Zoom Meeting)
3. Informational Item: Proposed Change to Math Requirement

Members were instructed to vote on the agenda items by reply to Michael O'Brien's e-mail no later than 5:00 p.m. on October 15th.

On October 15, 2021, Michael O'Brien announced via e-mail that all items on the agenda were approved with a quorum.

The meeting concluded on October 15, 2021.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dr. Danny Wade
Department of English
Secretary to the Humanities Division

Natural Science Division (NSD) Minutes for Friday, October 15, 2021.

- I. Meeting called to order at 2:03 pm by Division Chair Seid Adem.
- II. Rick Barker was elected secretary of the Natural Science Division for the 2021-2022 year.
- III. Minutes of the previous NSD meetings (3/12/21) were approved as circulated.
- IV. Introduction of New Faculty – 2020 and 2021
 - Mathematics – Lori Gill, Gary Hu, Jillian Kimzey
 - Chemistry – Hoang Nguyen
- IV. Committee Reports – none.
- V. Old Business – none.
- VI. New Business –
 - A. The Dean of College of Arts and Sciences has asked for input from the division about the current College Promotion and Tenure Proposal. Kelly Erby lead a spirited discussion made several additions/modifications to the proposal were suggested.
 - B. Kelly Erby also lead a discussion of Revising CAS Student Perception Surveys for Fall 2021.
- VII. Discussion –
 - A. University Mathematics Requirement Proposed Change. Sarah Cook led an informational discussion on this topic.
- VIII. Announcements –

The meeting was adjourned at 3:09pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Rick Barker, Secretary

There was an informative and interesting presentation by Dr. Sarah Cook, about “Reimagining Developmental Courses.”

Social Science Division
Meeting minutes
October 15, 2021
Via Zoom

In attendance: Sarah Cook (guest, Math department), Kelly Erby, Kerry Wynn, Tom Prasch, Kim Morse, Rachel Gossen (History), Cindy Turk, Linzi Gibson (Psychology), Mary Sundal, Alexandra Klales, Ashley Maxwell, Lindsey Ibanez (SOAN), Linsey Modellmog (Political Science)

1. Sarah Cook, Chair of Mathematics and Statistics, discussed the proposed wording of the university math requirement. She emphasized that MA116 and all other math courses above 112 would still fulfill the university's math requirement, but the new wording would emphasize 112 as the preferred course for non-STEM and non-business majors. This is due to the higher success rates in 112 compared to 116. Under the changes, MA116 would satisfy the math requirement AND could be counted as an NSD gen ed. It was asked whether students might misinterpret this wording and inadvertently enroll in 112 when their major program requires 116. Cook said that advising would help prevent this, and it was more common for students to enroll in 116 when they should be in 112. It was asked whether Cook could circle back with us after discussing with the natural sciences division. There was also a question about concurrent enrollment. Cook also discussed pre-reqs and co-reqs.

2. The division discussed the proposed questions for the new student evaluation survey. Kelly Erby explained the rationale for the new questions, which emphasize student perceptions of their own learning rather than their perceptions of instructor characteristics and behavior, in light of research findings. She also explained that the CAS dean is setting the expectation that student perception forms not be the only tool to evaluate effectiveness of instructors. Concerns expressed by faculty included: questions measure online and classroom environments simultaneously; questions capture multiple instructor skill sets that should be parsed out; questions have not been tested for reliability and validity in the Washburn context, so it is difficult to compare to previous survey results. It was noted that instructors usually seek feedback from other avenues, but it was also pointed out that student evaluation survey results are part of faculty review and therefore consequential for career advancement.

3. Other business:

- A new division representative is sought for the HAB to replace Ibanez
- If anyone is interested in serving as division secretary, they should let Ibanez know
- AAADS and LACLS courses, and other D&I courses, are being offered for spring – some are upper division Gen Eds.
- Honors English 300 is being offered again.

Proposed Revised Questions—Revised

1. The learning goals for this course were clear to me.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

2. The course material and activities helped me learn.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

3. The course was clearly organized.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

4. I was encouraged to participate in this course.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

5. I regularly/frequently had the opportunity to ask questions about concepts and skills important to this course.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

6. I was treated with respect in this course.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

7. The classroom environment was inclusive of all students.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

9. I received timely feedback on my course work/assignments throughout the semester.

- 5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

10. I received feedback on my course work/assignments that helped me learn.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

11. This course expanded my knowledge and skills in this subject matter.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly disagree

12. Rate the quality of instruction as it contributed to your learning (try to set aside ideas about the course content)

- (5) Very Effective
- (4) Effective
- (3) Moderately Effective
- (2) Somewhat Ineffective
- (1) Ineffective

13. What is your class level?

- Freshman/1st year
- Sophomore/2nd year
- Junior/3rd year
- Senior/4th year
- Graduate

Auditor
Other

14. Please make additional comments about the course or instruction in the response box below.