

April 18, 2014

TO: Provost's Council

FROM: Judith M. Bowman  
Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Studies

SUBJ: Provost's Council Agenda for Tuesday, April 22, 2014

The Provost's Council will meet on Tuesday, April 22 from 8:30-10:00 a.m. in the Board Room in Koch Hall. The following agenda items will be discussed.

1. Approval of the March 25 minutes (see attachment, p. 1-3)
2. Approval of the April 8 minutes (see attachment, p. 4-5)
3. Faculty Senate Issue 2013-14/2, Access to All Student Opinion Survey Results for Faculty, and Faculty Senate Issue 2013/14-15, Evaluation of Teaching Comparison to Averages (see attachments, p. 6-8, p. 9-10, and p. 11-14)
4. Faculty Senate Issue 2013/14-18, Tenure (see attachments, p. 15-17)
5. Proposed Revision to the Policy on Faculty Records (see attachment, p. 18)
6. Proposed Procedures to Evaluate Credentials from Non-regionally Accredited Universities within the U.S. and from Institutions Outside the U.S. (see attachment, p. 19-21)
7. Faculty Attendance at Commencement
8. Announcements

PROVOST'S COUNCIL  
April 22, 2014  
Minutes

The Provost's Council met on Tuesday, April 22 from 8:30-10:00 a.m. in the Board Room in Koch Hall. Those present were Carol Simpson (Chair), Oktay Baysal, Jane Bray, Paul Champagne, Chandra de Silva, Heather Huling, Brenda Lewis, Shelley Mishoe, Ravi Mukkamala, Ginny O'Herron, Brian Payne, Charles Wilson, and Gil Yochum. The following agenda items were discussed.

1. The March 25 minutes were approved.
2. The April 8 minutes were approved.
3. Faculty Senate Issue 2013-14/2, Access to All Student Opinion Survey Results for Faculty, and Faculty Senate Issue 2013/14-15, Evaluation of Teaching Comparison to Averages

Council members discussed the recommendations from the Faculty Senate for several revisions to the University Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching. The first recommendation was to add the following language in section I.C.

Because the definition of quality teaching eludes precise definition, even in combination the available means of evaluation are able to distinguish only the clearly superior and clearly deficient instructors from among the majority of competent teachers.

The Deans felt that the addition was not necessary and recommended that items C and D be combined.

The second recommendation added language that comparison to departmental, college or university averages cannot be used in the evaluation process and also stated that references to student comments should reflect established trends only. The Deans recommended the language be changed to "should not" instead of "cannot" and revised the statement on student comments as follows:

References to isolated student comments should be avoided unless an established trend can be demonstrated.

The third recommendation was to delete results for student opinion surveys where five or fewer students are enrolled from the system and not make them available to faculty or administrators. The Dean felt it was important that they and their department chairs be able to see these results, but they agreed that faculty should be able to see them as well. They suggested the following revision.

Results for student opinion surveys where five or fewer students are enrolled in a class will be made available to faculty and administrators.

Provost Simpson asked Paul Champagne if the Senate would be willing to consider the revisions proposed by the Council. She also suggested that perhaps a small group made up of Faculty Senators, Deans and department chairs could be formed to review the entire evaluation process. A version of the policy showing the suggested revisions will be returned to the Senate for consideration.

4. Faculty Senate Issue 2013/14-18, Tenure

Council members discussed and approved, with a minor editorial revision, the recommendation from the Faculty Senate to revise the Tenure policy to require a summary of minority opinion from the department committee and the college committee when there is a split vote. A minority report is required from these committees when dealing with promotion to professor and is also required from the University committee in tenure cases. The recommended revision will be forwarded to President Broderick and, upon his approval, to the Board of Visitors.

5. Proposed Revision to the Policy on Faculty Records

Council members discussed and approved the proposed revisions to the policy on Faculty Records. The revision makes it clear that graduate teaching assistants who are faculty of record are required to ensure that department chairs receive copies of their academic transcripts directly from institutions issuing credentials. The revision also includes a provision for electronic transcripts. The revision will be sent to the Faculty Senate for information and will be included in the next update of the Faculty Handbook.

6. Proposed Procedures to Evaluate Credentials from Non-regionally Accredited Universities within the U.S. and from Institutions Outside the U.S.

Council members discussed the proposed procedures to evaluate credentials from non-regionally accredited universities within the U.S. and from institutions outside the U.S. The procedures are intended to operationalize what is in the policy on Academic and Professional Preparation Requirements for Faculty and will not be included in the Faculty Handbook. There are no changes to the policy. The proposed procedures were approved with two editorial revisions and will be sent to Deans and department chairs.

7. Faculty Attendance at Commencement

Carol Simpson reminded the Deans about the requirement for faculty to attend at least one Commencement ceremony per year. The Office of University

Events reviewed the attendance and found that it is very low in some colleges. Dr. Simpson will share the data with the Deans on an individual basis and asked them to work to increase attendance from their college.