

Faculty Senate
January 17, 2013
Collins Center

Present: Laurel Burks, Sean D'Evelyn, Elizabeth Drummond, Richard Fox, Michele Hammers, Paul Harris, George Hess, Karen Huchting, Diane Meyer, Katherine Noon, Patricia Oliver, Judy Park, John Parrish, Jennifer Pate, Ralph Quinones, Robert Rovetti, Gregory Ruzzin, Marta Sanchez, Sue Scheibler, Tim Shanahan, Carl Urbinati, Thomas White and Amy Woodson-Boulton.

Excused: Hawley Almstedt, Omar Es-Said, Jamie Hazlitt, and Mladen Milicevic

Moment of Silence

Welcome to the new senators, Sean D'Evelyn from Economics, Karen Huchting from Educational Leadership and Judy Park from English

Motion 1: Move to approve the December 6, 2012 minutes
12 for, 0 against, 4 abstentions

Teacher Scholar Model Statement

Discussion

- The teacher–scholar document includes recommendations on reforming the merit system, addressing workload issues and hiring for the teacher-scholar model. The floor was opened for recommendations on how to best proceed.
- This is a great opportunity to address multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary work. We could assemble those on campus who are already doing this type of work to get a sense of how to incorporate it.
- Reforming the merit system was already on the yearlong agenda and may be a good starting point. A proposal on a new system could potentially be created this semester.
- Merit system reforms could utilize the current strategic planning process and use the Workload and Merit Task Force report as a starting point.
- Reallocating the current merit increase is where faculty have the most leverage. In some colleges, top merit is only awarded for publication with few exceptions. This makes teaching and service a minimal part of the merit decision.

- A university wide merit proposal could potentially be developed. I believe it is a challenge to separate out and quantify teaching.
- Determining the quality of teaching is not easy, but it can be done with more effective instruments.
- Examining the number of new course preparations may be one way to further evaluate teaching, but I believe we are currently only looking at quantity not quality.
- The current incentive is to publish short term projects and we need to be making more qualitative evaluations that advance the intellectual culture of the university.
- Some departments have discussed using the small pool of money for professional development opportunities to impact a greater number of faculty members. The types of development that could be offered would be based on faculty feedback.
- There are some departments who rank service opportunities in order to make transparent an individual's level of service. I'm hesitant to create a new system that would involve more decision making based on qualifying publications. I do believe there is a broad consensus to move to a multiyear system for tenured professors.
- Shared governance is leading to more service and a larger time commitment from faculty. There are other institutions where faculty are engaged in reading and assessing the work of their colleagues.
- Merit evaluation involves expending a lot of time considering a comparatively small amount of money. The option of having the AMI split evenly inviting, but ultimately is not a fair process. The current process offers two categories where approximately 60% of faculty are given top merit and 40% are not.
- We could look at a 10 point system with a 0-2 scale for teaching, scholarship and service. The teaching and scholarship score could be doubled and service would have a 0-2 range. Having even one additional level of merit category could potentially assist with morale issues.
- At other institutions personnel committees are established and voted upon by faculty. The committee reviews faculty FSRs and makes a recommendation on merit. This is a manageable process and may create a better system.
- More support for department chairs may be needed as they are currently overburdened.
- We are now in need of actual proposals and clarity on exactly what needs to be improved.

- We are now in a transition from one type institution to another and we need to proceed carefully understanding how this impacts current and new faculty members. I believe that department level merit decisions can become politicized.
- Many LMU junior faculty are now coming in to focus only on scholarly activity. There are teaching and service responsibilities in our contracts that are not being valued and measured.
- There are four broad areas to consider; more differentiated categories; more sensitivity to all three areas of performance; a multiyear review for tenured faculty; and clarity on who decides and make the recommendations and how quality assessment fits into it.

Motion 2: Move to form a committee to come up with merit review proposals.

19 for, 1 opposed, 1 abstention

Invitation List for Full-Faculty Events

- I support including all categories of full time faculty. We could potentially suggest a less expensive wine and cheese event in order to be more inclusive.
- I do believe we are sending the wrong message by not including these individuals and we should make every effort to incorporate them in these events.
- Changing the nature of the BBQ or Faculty Social events may require more substantial discussions and planning
- I feel we should invite clinical and other full time faculty to the BBQ this year and keep the event attendance expanding.
- We should consider whether continuing the Faculty Social, which relatively few faculty attend, is an effective use of resources.

NSSE Data Update

Guest: *Laura Massa, Ph.D., Director of Assessment*

- Laura Massa will be presenting NSSE reports to a variety of campus stakeholders throughout the Spring 2013 semester. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is given to freshman and seniors and LMU participated in 2007, 2010 and 2012. The last NSSE cycle was done in Spring 2012 and aligns to the undergraduate learning outcomes. This is the 3rd cycle of NSSE data since the approval of the undergraduate learning outcomes. The 2012 response rate was

29% for freshman 32% for seniors. It would be beneficial to engage additional faculty to determine how best utilize these findings.

- The topic of academic challenge is one area that is interesting and beneficial to faculty. The NSSE asks students how often the student has worked harder than expected to meet an instructor's expectations, the extent that examinations challenged students to do their best work, the frequency which the student came to class without completing readings or assignments and how many hours are spent a week preparing for class.
- Examining the freshman and senior mean scores against other Jesuit intuitions, masters' universities and the NSSE total provides a picture of how LMU compares to its competitors. The report also depicts LMU NSSE responses over time.

Discussion

- It may be useful to disaggregate the Jesuit school responses by those who have 3 unit or 4 unit curriculums. This may help guide our conversation on the potential shift to 4 unit courses.
- The data can also explore time spent on extracurricular activities and hours spent working on and off campus. This provides a more complete picture of how the student spends their time outside of the classroom.
- I feel that creative mechanisms such as posing specific questions for faculty to consider in response to these subjects would help with faculty engagement. Hosting discussion groups in a less formal setting may also work for LMU faculty.
- The Office of Assessment will soon begin working on oral communication and critical thinking components. Faculty will be asked to work on scoring the rubrics.

New Business

- A new policy on part time faculty and health benefits will have an impact of the cost of health insurance.
- The pros and cons of spousal hires and a spousal hiring policy will be brought to a future meeting.

Adjourned at 5:00pm

Submitted by: Jennifer Pate

Prepared by: Robert Houghtaling