

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 17, 2012 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.
GREAT HALL, MEMORIAL UNION**

Present: Agarwal, S.; Amidon, K.; Anderson, C.; Anderson, D.; Baldwin, C.; Beell, T.; Bhattacharya, J.; Blevins, J.; Butler, A.; Clough, M.; Cooper, E.; Cunnally, J.; Dark, V.; Dell, B.; Essner, J.; Fei, S.; Freeman, S.; Greenlee, H.; Hendrich, S.; Herrmann, P.; Hill, J.; Hochstetler, A.; Hoff, S.; Horwitz, J.; Jackman, J.; Janvrin, D.; Keren, N.; Koziel, J.; Kushkowsky, J.; Loy, D.; Loynachan, T.; Maitra, R.; Marquart, D.; Martin, M.; Martin, R.; Matzavinos, T.; Miller, A.; Minion, C.; Napolitano, R.; Nelson, S.; Olson, J.; Owen, M.; Prieto, L.; Sapp, T.; Schaefer, V.; Sherman, P.; Stevenson, G.; Strohbehn, C.; Sturm, J.; Thompson, L.; Torrie, M.; Townsend, T.; Tuckness, A.; Ware, W.; Zarecor, K.; Zhu, D.

Absent: Arndt, G.; Beattie, G.; Bowler, N.; Bruning, M.; Chaudhuri, S.; Dahlstrom, M.; Daniels, T.; Geske, J.; Harding, C.; Hostetter, J.; Jurenka, R.; Kuo, M.; Luecke, G.; Manu, A.; McQueeney, R.; Schalinske, K.; Smiley-Oyen, A.; Stalder, K.; Taylor, G.; Williams, C.; Windus, T.

Substitutes: M. Bailey for Byars, J.; A. Katz for Eisman, A.; D. Vleck for Pleasants, J.;

Guests: Hoffman, B. (Provost); Holger, D. (Associate Provost); Pounds, D. (University Relations); Porter, M. (Parliamentarian); Furfaro, H. (Ames Trib); Rippke, S. (President's Office); Kane, K. (P&S Council)

I. Call to Order

President Freeman called the meeting to order at 3:33 and seated the substitute senators.

II. Consent Agenda

- A. Minutes of Faculty Senate April 3, 2012 - [S11/M/8]**
- B. Agenda for April 17, 2012– [S11/A/9]**
- C. Calendar – [S11/C/9]**
- D. Drop Limit Policy Proposal – [S11-31]**
- E. Pass-Not Pass Policy Proposal - [S11-32]**
- F. Resolving Non-Reports Policy Proposal – [S11-33]**

Moved and second to approve the consent agenda. Motion passed without dissent.

III. Special Order: Tim Day, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

President Freeman introduced Professor Day, who began by noting that one of his duties is to participate in exit interview with Student-Athletes (SAs) who leave after completing their eligibility. The idea is to get SAs to talk openly in order to identify where ISU Athletics might improve. He had the chance to talk with four students yesterday. Basically they were all happy with their experience. Each stated that he/she had had concerns about coming to a school in such a small (and nondiverse) community, but each are said that he/she had a very good experience. Professor Day

recognized Scott Christopherson and Michelle Browning as the Letterwinner's All-Around Award Winners at last night's banquet to recognize SA scholarship.

The academic report continues to be strong. Professor Day presented slides showing that:

- with 450-650 SAs in each cohort, this is the 5th straight year that the SA GPA is numerically above, though not significantly, the GPA of the general student body.
- the 6-year graduation rate of 58% for SAs in Fall 2011 was just under the general student body rate; the graduation rate for students who exhausted their eligibility was above 92%
- we are admitting fewer special admits and they are more qualified
- all teams had an academic progress rate about 930, the current NCAA cutoff, and also above 935, which will be the new cutoff

Changes have been implemented by the NCAA to raise academic standards and to increase penalties for not meeting standards.

ISU was among the last institutions to undergo NCAA recertification in 2011. We were fully recertified. Recertification will be replaced by an Institutional Performance Program that is under development.

IV. Special Order: Ann Marie VanDerZanden, Director for the Center of Excellence in Learning and Teach – Class Climate Report

President Freeman introduced Professor VanDerZanden, noting that in January there were questions on the floor concerning online student evaluations. One concern was that the Class Climate Program just appeared on campus and faculty did not feel that they had been consulted or that the program had been fully vetted. There also was concern with what was perceived to be lower response rates.

Professor VanDerZanden presented the background on Class Climate, noting that:

- the program was initially proposed in 2009-10 and a small pilot was run in Fall 2010
- the small pilot phase results were discussed with the Undergraduate Programs Council, which includes representatives from all colleges, student affairs, and academic affairs
- in Spring 2011, a recommendation to implement the program on a broader scale was made to Senior Leadership

The Fall 2010 pilot included 4 colleges, 34 departments, 250 unique instructors/TAs, 468 unique courses, 8279 students. The results were:

- a 75% response rate at a cost of \$0.79 per student
- a survey of faculty users showed 37 yes, 3 no regarding moving forward with adopting Class Climate
- a survey of subunit administrators (38 staff) in August 2011 asked about time spent on evaluations showed that 57% said they spent 8 or more hours per

semester prior to Class Climate and 20% said that they spent 8 or more hours after Class Climate

In Fall 2011, 108 departments (68%) and several programs adopted Class Climate for their evaluations. The results showed:

- the response rate was 64%. (More detailed data were presented for spring 2011, summer 2011, and fall 2011).
- there were some server issues, that have been fixed
- there is also a concern about excessive email to students and when to release the evaluations and for how long.

There is a Class Climate User's Group consisting of subunit administrators, who implement the system for departments. CELT wants to develop training for them. There also is a need to make sure that students are clear, when they are in Class Climate, just what class/instructor they are rating.

Professor VanDerZanden thanked Laura Bestler-Wilcox, Class Climate User Support; Allan Schmidt, CELT; and Randy Dalhoff, ITS. She then took questions from the floor.

Senator Sturm noted that he supported getting student input and having a reduction in work load getting the input. He noted that students who attend class have a lot of information to share with faculty, but students who are nonattenders have little information to share. Only attenders complete paper evaluations. With all the Class Climate reminders, more nonattenders may complete the evaluations, but give low scores because they are irritated. He wondered if there was some way to examine the evaluations as a function of grade. He noted that student evaluations are very important to P&T.

- Professor VanDerZanden noted that we cannot examine evaluations as a function of grade now.
- President Freeman noted that student evaluations should not be overly important in P&T. He stated that the current evaluations also are flawed, but are better than nothing.

Senator Maitra commented that he thought students needed a password to complete the evaluation, so perhaps it could be passed out in class.

- Professor VanDerZanden noted that passwords can be used but are not mandatory.

Senator Maitra asked about the integrity of the system. He asked if there would be random checks to verify that what the students are inputting is being properly recorded.

- Professor VanDerZanden stated that the software is commercially available and we have to trust the vendor.

Senator Zarecor noted that the system was piloted during her tenure year. The students were extremely negative. The response rate was less than 50% and the mean values were much lower. Because of the clear difference in ratings and low response rate, she

was allowed to discount those ratings in her P&T materials. She disliked allowing two full weeks to complete the evaluations.

- Professor VanDerZanden noted that many factors influence ratings. She stated that comparisons in Horticulture showed higher online means for 30% of the classes.

Senator Butler noted that in the pilot, some students may not have been clear what course they were evaluating.

- Laura Bestler-Wilcox replied that they have changed the format to clarify for students which class is being evaluated. The course is at the top of the page.

Senator Butler asked about flexibility in timelines. Two weeks seems excessive.

- Professor VanDerZanden replied that the timing is a local decision. There is flexibility.

Senator Townsend responded to the earlier comments about the means going up in 23% of the classes and down in others. This indicates a reliability problem and there is no validity without reliability. He noted that with the online administration over a long period, there is a lack of control of the environment in which the data are being collected. For the sake of getting reliable data, there should be control. Perhaps we need kiosks where students must go to complete evaluations. The evaluation should be done in an academic setting. If there were a 100% response rate, this would be less worrisome. Perhaps we should require an evaluation to get the grade.

- Professor VanDerZanden stated that there is local control. It is possible to have a short window and to have the data collected in a lab. She noted that we do not currently have a 100% response rate.
- Senator Townsend noted that if evaluations are administered the day before the final, it is close to 100%.

President-elect Hendrich wondered if there should be an attitudinal survey to address these issues. She noted that we should look in the literature to see what people have done to understand the problems.

Senator Sturm noted that the discussion reveals that faculty want information that is useful to them. The purpose of evaluations is not to allow students to vent. Faculty want information that can help them teach better.

Senator Sherman noted an earlier statement that faculty were allowed to administer evaluations in paper form. He would like to see a systematic comparison between values obtained in in-class paper evaluations and online evaluations.

- Professor VanDerZanden could not say for sure if paper evaluation forms would be available in the future.

Professor VanDerZanden noted that many departments are having discussions on how to move forward from here. The Class Climate is a tool for evaluation. CELT's role is to provide training and implementation.

President Freeman noted the time and thanked Professor VanDerZanden for her presentation.

V. Announcements and Remarks

A. Faculty Senate President

President Freeman said that there will be 3 Provost candidates next week. He displayed the times and locations of the Open Forums. He urged senators to participate and to urge others to participate. The names of the finalists will be announced tomorrow.

Senator Zarecore observed that originally 5 times had been scheduled. She asked if they had asked 5 and only got 3. President Freeman said no. They planned for 5 in case that many were needed, but they only asked 3 to come to campus.

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect

President-elect Hendrich gave a brief report on conference. About 20 attendees stayed until the end. Their key recommendations were:

- Senior Leadership Should Promote Wellness
- Wellness Benefit Package
- Campus Wellness Coordinator
- Support “Blue Zone” Conscious living initiatives/Articulate a vision

President-elect Hendrich is working with the Representative Committee to figure out where to go from here. Among the next steps is to coordinate with the Benefits Committee and to coordinate with relevant FS committees. She noted that the Benefits Committee wants to move forward very quickly, so we need to figure out how the senate can have effective input. She hopes to have a report by the end of the semester.

C. Provost

Provost Hoffman noted that there continues to be no useful news on the budget. There is no public movement. Hopefully she will have useful information to report on May 1. There is a very full BOR meeting next week, including P&T actions. Provost Hoffman will make her P&T report in May.

VI. Old Business

A. Wind Energy Minor – [S11-27]

President Freeman noted that this item of business had been introduced at the last meeting. Since that time, no comments or questions have been raised. He asked if there were questions or concerns. There were none. He asked if there were any comments before the vote. There were none. He asked for a voice vote. The motion carried without dissent.

B. Master of Design in Sustainable Environments – [S11-28]

President Freeman noted that this item of business had been introduced at the last meeting. Since that time, no comments or questions have been raised. He asked if

there were questions, concerns, or comments. There were none. He asked for a voice vote. The motion carried without dissent.

C. Master of Urban Design – [S11-29]

President Freeman noted that this item of business had been introduced at the last meeting. Since that time, no comments or questions have been raised. He asked if there were questions, concerns, or comments. There were none. He asked for a voice vote. The motion carried without dissent.

D. Masters of Engineering in Engineering Management – [S11-30]

President Freeman noted that this item of business had been introduced at the last meeting. Since that time, no comments or questions have been raised. He asked if there were questions, concerns, or comments. There were none. He asked for a voice vote. The motion carried without dissent.

VII. New Business

President Freeman noted that we have no new business. Because he cut off discussion of Class Climate earlier and there is still time remaining, he gave senators the opportunity to continue discussion.

Senator Sherman stated that when he returned to his seat, he was told that paper evaluation forms were no longer forms no longer being processed on campus. He asked if that were true.

- President Freeman replied that some people are still using the paper forms, so testing can still process them. He was uncertain about whether there would be a change in the future.

President-elect Hendrich noted that Academic Affairs Council had conversations with students. The overall concern from GSB is that the evaluations are not being used. She noted that we, as a faculty, need to communicate to students that evaluations are important and are being used to make improvements.

Senator Maitra asked what happened to discussion of Items D, E, and F in the Consent Agenda.

- President Freeman replied that unless items are pulled off the consent agenda, they are not typically discussed. By approving the consent agenda, the items have been approved.
- Senator Maitra noted that F in particular (change of nonreport to an F) was serious for the student.
- President Freeman noted that the faculty member, chair, and dean get told before a grade is changed and that this is a very rare occurrence.
- Associate Provost Holger added that there is an appeal process for everything. If all else fails, the student can appeal.
- President Freeman noted that these are not policies under direct faculty control. They were put on the Consent Agenda for information purposes.

VIII. Good of the Order

Senator Minion asked whether there is a need to meet in May if there is no new business.

President Freeman said yes because there are a number of Special Orders, including the graduation list.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 pm.

NEXT MEETING, TUESDAY, May 1, 2012 3:30-5:00 P.M., GREAT HALL, MU

Respectfully submitted,
Veronica Dark
Senate Secretary, April 24, 2012