The meeting was called to order by President Collier at 3:05 pm.

The minutes of the November meeting were corrected under Other Reports, the comments of Susann Dorman were changed to read "1992 Syracuse University report." Senator Luzzi moved to approve the minutes as corrected; Senator Kinney seconded the motion, which was approved.

Visitors introduced were Student Senate president Stephen Moret, Susann Dorman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Laura Lindsey, Amy Lowry of the Reveille, Sandy Hubbert of LSU Today, Committee on Committees chair Pat Lipscomb, and Interim Vice Chancellor William Jenkins.

President's Report

President Collier reported on efforts to secure faculty representation on the Louisiana Accountability in Public Higher Education Advisory Committee. LSU System Vice Chancellor Bill Silvia eventually secured one position on the Subcommittee on Teaching, Research and Service from the three Louisiana systems. After consulting with the president of the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates (ALFS), President Collier submitted three LSU faculty names to Silvia, who selected George Strain. President Collier attended the second organizational meeting of ALFS in Alexandria (11/20/93). Officers include: David Buehl (SLU), president, Gary Allen (UNO), vice-president, Lacy Marcot (Nicholls State), secretary, and Bill Collier, member at large. Discussed items: 1) McNeese faculty have met with local legislators and have convinced Rep. Randy Roach to draft a bill to be presented to the Legislature for faculty raises; it will be sent to other state Senators to obtain co-sponsors; 2) they are working on a position paper on the economic impact of higher education on the state; 3) they passed a resolution that the Board of Regents consider institutional and regional impacts when considering low-completer degree programs and have faculty consultation in considerations; 4) they discussed faculty representation on governing boards of higher education - Atty. Gen. iyoub's brother (Vice President for Student Services at McNeese) will check out legal status; 5) they are studying means to establish within the Legislature a higher education legislative caucus within the state - will sound out local legislators; 6) they also would like in the future to seek a meeting with the governor, before which a position paper will be prepared by the Executive Board of ALFS stating our concerns on faculty salaries, stable of funding of higher education, faculty representation on governing boards, economic impact of higher education in the state, and the political support of the Association.

Vice Chancellor Jenkins held his kick-off for the Programmatic Planning Process; he appears to be committed to a substantive involvement of faculty in the process and will meet with units periodically to monitor progress. Programs will be evaluated and prioritized by the Policy Committees, Deans, and Department Heads within the units. Similar planning is being initiated by the offices of the Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Research and Economic Development. FSEC met today with VC Eaton, who outlined his plans.
Questions from last meeting re: Dead Week Policy - Academic Affairs is considering the impact of the new phone-in registration on the need for 3 days for registration, as well as the uneven distribution of final exams this semester. The Commission on General Education will be formally charged 12/9/93. An LSU Creed feasibility study has been initiated by Dean of Students Tom Riech to address academic integrity, respect for others, etc.; faculty appointees are Alan Rieker (Mass Comm), Chris Soules (For Lengi), and Suzanne Lang (Hort). The evaluation of deans is behind schedule, but VC Jenkins still plans to pursue this. Jenkins has set up a feasibility study for a Multimedia Center, a service center for faculty; Education has received an $800 grant to establish such a center; he has also appointed a group to look at telecommunications and distance learning. The Junior Division/General College restructuring has been delayed but VC Jenkins hopes to have a recommendation within 6 months.

A draft statement on faculty workload was distributed. It was prepared by the FSEC from numerous sources, including the Personnel Policies Committee, the Faculty Handbook, last year’s Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload, and Policy Statements. Input from Senators is solicited; the table at the end will be updated with relevant research-university data. This will eventually be distributed to the LSU Board of Supervisors sub-committee examining the issue and to the Accountability Committee.

Old Business

Faculty Resolution 93-02 (Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching). A substitute resolution passed unanimously by the A & S Faculty Senate was moved by Senator Batinski and seconded by Senator Kinney; a copy was distributed with the mailing of the agenda. Differences between the two resolutions were discussed, which consisted primarily of 1) the absence of a recommendation in the substitute of tenure for excellence in teaching alone (2a. in 93-02) and 2) no recommendations for a Center for Faculty Development (3. in 93-02). Senator Van Fleet moved a friendly amendment to delete the word “intervention” from 1.c.; Senator Kinney seconded; the amendment passed. Senator Waters has extensive rebuttal to both resolution versions, which he had provided in writing for distribution. After much discussion, Senator Daly moved (and seconded) a new substitute resolution to refer both resolutions to the Improvement of Instruction Committee for consideration by a sub-committee including ad hoc members appointed by the FSEC to represent Basic Science, Engineering and Music. Objections asked for representation from Design and a student representative. The substitute resolution was, by friendly amendment, finally expressed as:

An ad hoc committee, appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and approved by the Senate, will examine the recommendations in the text of both versions of Faculty Senate Resolution 93-02 and make recommendations based on the issues raised back to the Senate.

Ad hoc committees, by Senate By-Laws, are appointed by the Executive Committee. The resolution passed (37-1), becoming the final version of Resolution 93-02.

New Business

None.

Senator Kinney moved for adjournment; Senator Luizzo seconded.

George Strain
Secretary
A Response to the Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation

William F. Waters, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Psychology

November 10, 1993

RE: COMMITTEE FINDINGS

1. consensus on characteristics of effective teaching -- If effectiveness of teaching is defined as what students learn, then instructor characteristics account for very little of the variance, most all of which is accounted for by two student characteristics: intelligence and diligence.

2. more than 60% of faculty feel that teaching effectiveness, not publication, should be the primary criterion for promotion (92% at two year colleges, 21% at research universities) -- Which is LSU? What are the data when analyzed by tenure track vs non-tenure track faculty at LSU? Could the responses from non-tenure track faculty be biased by a desire for tenure? By the way, a 50% return rate is poor and furthermore may not reflect the proportions of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty...does it?

3. myth that SETs are merely popularity measures -- Correct, in a sense: they are not merely popularity measures, they are mostly popularity measures. SETs are as good at assessing what other people think of someone's teaching as anything else, but at root they reflect primarily what students think about a teacher's style and the content of his/her course. That is a very poor criterion for teacher efficacy if you believe that efficacy is defined by how much (and how well) students have learned about a subject. Do any teacher ratings correlate sufficiently well with that?

4. students are not qualified to evaluate important variables such as whether an instructor is current in the field -- Correct. In addition, if the assessment of currency is based on teaching, few on campus can properly evaluate it unless they are expert in the subject matter being taught. Most undergraduate courses will include some of the latest information the professor has gleaned from his or her efforts in scholarship, but there will not be enough to permit an evaluation of how current a professor is except, perhaps in the most advanced undergraduate seminars and in graduate courses. There are two facts of interest here: (1) Most scholars are specialized and thus have limited ability to make informal judgements about how current other specialized scholars might be, especially from the very limited sample to be found in a few undergraduate lectures an evaluator might attend; and (2) The assessment of currency in one's field is basically what is accomplished by the annual review of a professor's scholarly productivity by his or her chairperson, and periodically, in promotion and tenure meetings. SETs do not and cannot address that issue, nor can any teaching evaluation.

   This is a good place to note that the purpose of scholarship (research articles, literary or other artistic works) is not solely to bring funds and prestige to the University (though they do indeed), but to generate new knowledge for a discipline and, concurrently, inform the teaching enterprise. Graduate students are the first to benefit from this, and benefit the most, but it clearly improves the level of information provided the undergraduate by both professor and graduate teaching assistant. It is scholarship that is the primary variable in how informative a professor might be to his or her students. In sum, scholarship/currency should be considered a major part of professorial ratings, but it cannot and should not be a part of teacher ratings. Apart from scholarly content, the rest of teacher efficacy is mostly communication skills and style, which the Committee Report addresses and erroneously implies is more important than content.
9. calls for a commitment of resources to support for faculty development, a
teaching assistance center -- This is a nice option to have available to all
teachers who are not getting adequate ratings from their undergraduate
students (on their communications skills and teaching styles); however, this
Report proposes nothing so benign. What it recommends is a large scale,
highly funded (most surely bureaucratic) faculty development center that
corrects the errors of imperfect teachers who are thus required to attend
would the consequence of not doing so be denial of promotion or tenure ?). If
such a center were anything other than a voluntary resource available to
those who are convinced that their teaching efficacy could benefit
sufficiently from it, it would amount to academic totalitarianism.

By the way, where would the funds come from ? What criteria would
determine who would need it ? What follow-up would there be and what are the
consequences of not meeting the (unspecified) standards ? For how long must
one have improved teacher ratings (by whomever) before one's probation is
lifted ? Do the faculty really want this ?

10. the teaching portfolio concept is an effective means of documenting multiple
sources of teacher evaluation data and acts as a stimulant to self-
improvement -- What good is the effective documentation of marginally
important information ? Has improvement in teaching efficacy been reliably,
scientifically established as attributable to the TP method ? If so, what
is the nature of this improvement ? What benefits to student learning
have been reliably, scientifically established as attributable to the TP method ?
Faculty spend a significant amount of time documenting their academic efforts
in quarterly, semi-annual and annual (calendar, academic and
fiscal year) reports to Chairpersons, Deans, State agencies, federal agencies
and others. It would not be considered good news to add the proposed TP to
that list. Lest anyone think that TP documentation would take little or no
time and effort (it was minimized in the Committee Report), please see the
attached information from the LSU Center for Faculty Development regarding
the contents of TPs. There is a strong resemblance to what primary and
secondary school teachers are required to do to document their teaching
efforts, and it is well known that they attribute a substantial proportion of
their vocational distress to exactly such requirements. I doubt that
university professors, who must also be productive scholars, would respond
better.

There is another issue. How bad are university professors as teachers
that they need a mandatory plan for the evaluation and amelioration of their
teaching ? Right now, at LSU, how many professors are doing such a bad job
that they require detailed evaluation, feedback and remediation of the kind
proposed in the Committee Report ? How much of the observed problem with
university level teaching is accounted for by teaching assistants who have
not yet perfected their teaching/communication skills or mastered their
subject matter ? How much of the problem is accounted for by professors who
could benefit from the services currently offered by the LSU Center for
Faculty Development ? Does the magnitude of the problem really require
mandatory corrections on a such large scale that present methods of
evaluation and remediation cannot be employed on a voluntary basis ?

11. 55 % of the faculty agreed that it is appropriate to tenure persons who are
exclusively teachers -- What was the breakdown of that figure in terms of
tenure track versus non-tenure track respondents ? What was the breakdown of
the 45 % who disagreed ?

12. teaching and research should be of equal value -- I believe most professors
readily acknowledge the importance of transferring knowledge to both
undergraduate and graduate students, though the pleasure each may get from
doing it varies. I also believe that most all professors have the integrity
to do as well as they can in the classroom regardless of how much they may or
may not enjoy teaching that course or teaching at that level. However, in
reality, teaching and scholarship are equal in importance are not.
actually equal in terms of their demands; there is a real difference between
the two enterprises in the amount of time required to do them at a level of
excellence. Scholarly productions typically require more time and effort to
do well than does the actual teaching of a course (Note: It is understood
that creating a new course may well be as great an endeavor as a given
scholarly work, but it occurs much less frequently for most). I know this to
be true in the sciences, with which I am more familiar, and I believe it to
be equally true in applied science disciplines and in the arts as well.

Despite the assertions of the Committee Report, the adequacy of teaching
does play an important role in promotion and tenure decisions, though it
seems to be a dichotomous one: If a professor teaches adequately or better,
there is no problem, and promotion or tenure is determined on other bases;
but if a professor is known to be a poor teacher, he or she is vulnerable to
denial of promotion or tenure unless scholarly productivity and quality makes
him or her irreplaceable.

16. Improvement in current teaching evaluation procedures is needed and the TP
was ranked first most often (37%) -- Was any effort made to determine which
of these respondents had any real idea of what is involved in the TP method?
When I completed the questionnaire, I did not; given what I know how,
however, I would have responded quite differently. The additional "campus
support" for the TP method, enrollment in the course had to be closed for
lack of room space, is a bad inference: other interpretations of that datum
range from very small rooms to large numbers of professors curious about what
is going to happen to them if TP is adopted.

Some general comments:

The Committee Report contains no information or arguments contrary to the
conclusions expressed at the end. Because it is unlikely that contrary
information or argument does not exist, it thus appears that the Committee Report
is intended to convince its audience of the need for a greatly enhanced Center
for Faculty Development, the mandatory use of teaching portfolios plus peer/
chairperson evaluation of teaching, and the granting of tenure for teaching skill
in the absence of scholarship.

The Committee Report is filled with conclusive statements, from a few sources,
but is seriously lacking in substantive and scientific data upon which such
conclusions might be based. The materials provided by the Center for Faculty
Development on the teaching portfolio method (Seldin, P. The Teaching Portfolio,
Anker Press, Bolton, MA, 1991) are similarly loaded with conclusion and lacking
in hard data (only testimonial data are provided).

If we want better teaching at LSU, perhaps we might try the following before
burdening our faculty with the teacher evaluation system described and advocated
by the Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation:

1. Improved student-teacher ratio at the undergraduate level. Our department has
3000 and 4000 level classes with enrollments as large (100-300) as those in
many 1000 and 2000 level classes and we have far fewer faculty than the
average at comparable universities. I am sure that the same can be said for a
number of other Departments at LSU. Correction of this problem could enable
the return of such interesting pedagogical relics as seminars, class
discussions, oral and essay examinations, etc. A professor might actually get
to know something of his or her undergraduate students' capabilities.

2. Improved classrooms, wherein students in all locations in a classroom can hear
their professors, without the assistance of (often malfunctioning) voice
amplification systems. It might be equally advantageous to have classrooms
and class sizes where students and faculty can see and hear each other well
enough to benefit from voice inflections, facial expressions, gestures and
other subtle but useful aspects of human communication.

3. Adequate classroom audio-visual equipment and a real budget for video and
audio tapes, slides, etc.

4. Funding for graduate assistants, who would be paid to learn how to teach by giving lectures in courses under the direct supervision of accomplished professors, until they were good enough to go on their own.

5. Analyze SETs according to the grade a student has in the course at the time of rating, to control for motivational bias in the ratings. A mean SET across all students, a mean SET for A and B students, and a mean SET for D and F students would be informative.

RE: COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. require each academic department to design and implement a comprehensive teaching evaluation system -- The consideration of teaching efficacy, like scholarly quality and quantity, is already a mandated criterion for promotion and tenure. However, the methods and criteria for evaluation (which are inevitably linked) are not prescribed because of the multitude of differences that exist among academic disciplines as to what constitutes appropriate degrees of quality and quantity of scholarship and of teaching.

Although the Committee Report recommendation does permit differences in teaching evaluation systems for each department, it still mandates multiple measures of evaluation (self, peer, student) and proactive strategies (mandatory remediation) which intrudes on departmental autonomy in the promotion and tenure process. That is a bad precedent. Nothing in these recommendations should be required of anyone or any department, both because of the need for different departments to evaluate their professors in different ways and because of the weakness of the "findings" that underly the recommendations.

2. a. Provide appropriate compensation and tenure for outstanding teaching -- Tenure for teaching without attendant scholarship is contrary to the mission of a major university; the emphasis on research is what differentiates a flagship State University from regional State universities. Tenure for teaching only might be acceptable at the latter (though I doubt it), but it is surely not appropriate at the former; apparently, it is acceptable at Junior Colleges. I would maintain that teaching and scholarship are inseparable if teaching is to be done in the way an institution of higher education should do it. What one learns as a scholar is often unique or at least at the forefront of an academic discipline, and it is the constant accumulation and dissemination of such knowledge that does and should distinguish university teaching from secondary and primary school teaching. Teaching, especially advanced undergraduate seminars and graduate courses, is thus better served. In return, such teaching often stimulates the professor toward scholarly endeavors. Nothing does that as well as the interactions of professors with their masters thesis and doctoral dissertation students. The graduate education model demonstrates what professorial teaching is about, and the university should attempt to emulate that teaching model rather than the one provided by our (failing ?) secondary and primary education systems.

2. b. reiterate the positive relationship between teaching and research by including scholarly activities directly related to teaching and curriculum development as pertaining to research -- I think the relation of teaching to research should be reiterated as just stated above. The contribution of scholarly activity to teaching (and the reverse) is clearly not served by merely relabelling "teaching and curriculum development" as "pertaining to research" or scholarly production. That would not only be incorrect, it would be blatantly dishonest.

2. d. adjust promotion and tenure biographical data sheet to reflect target percentages for teaching, research and service consistent with each faculty member's current job assignment -- Another way of saying that promotion and
tenure should be granted for teaching without scholarship. If you teach 100% your tenure and promotion is 100% based on teaching. Nice try.

2. establish a system for merit raises for exceptional teaching -- There is a system for merit raises for exceptional teaching and research: When there is money available for merit raises (laugher is permitted here), the Chairperson (with or without input from a faculty advisory committee) recommends who gets how much, based on the relevant criteria (typically the same ones used for promotion and tenure), and the Dean makes his or her decision. Alternatives?

3. dedicate financial resources to develop and expand the Center for Faculty Development -- Given all of the above, there is no reason to spend scarce monetary resources in this way. Even if monetary resources were sufficient, it would still be wasteful because neither the scientific justification nor the demand for it exists.

4. a system of voluntary publication of SETs -- This is feasible and has its benefits for students (assisting them in selecting which sections of a course to take, or which course to take), but it has some unfortunate, unintended consequences. In much the same way that students do not like the idea of having their grades posted next to their names (or even their social security numbers) if they are below average, faculty would not like to have their SETs publicized if they were not above average. The problems that might emerge are: (1) invidious comparisons among faculty (what the students must dislike most about the posting of their grades), and (2) the self-fulfilling prophecy in which people tend to dislike that which they expect to dislike. For example, students who are unhappy that they cannot avoid a course taught by a professor with lower SETs are likely to be negatively predisposed to said professor, and the professor, knowing this, will expect student disapproval and respond emotionally to it; such negative biases tend to direct attention to negative events and characteristics that might otherwise go unnoticed and which thus reinforce the bias and negatively influence the development of future events, in this case, the quality of the course. Such biases are difficult to overcome.

CONCLUSION: There should be a brief Faculty Senate resolution supporting the importance of teaching as an essential aspect of professorial functioning, emphasizing the contribution towards effective teaching of the scholarly activities that inform teaching, and the inherent reciprocal interaction of teaching and scholarly activity in fulfilling the objectives of higher education. The Committee Report findings and recommendations should be rejected by the full Faculty Senate for the multitude of reasons stated above.
Products of Good Teaching

The Products of Good Teaching:
- Student scores on pre- and post-course examinations.
- Student essays, field-work reports, laboratory workbooks or logs.
- Examples of graded student essays showing excellent, average, and poor work.
- A record of students who succeed in advanced study in the field.
- Student publications or conference presentations on course-related work.
- Testimonials from employers or students about the professor's influence on career choice.

Material From Oneself

Material from Oneself:
- A reflective statement of the professor's contribution to the teaching mission of the department or institution.
- Representative course syllabi which detail course content and objectives, teaching methods, readings, homework assignments and a reflective statement as to why the class was so constructed.
- The pursuit of research contributing directly to teaching one's discipline.
- A personal statement by the professor describing teaching goals for the next five years.
- Descriptions of steps taken to improve teaching including changes resulting from self-evaluation, time spent reading journals on improving teaching, participating in seminars and workshops on sharpening instructional skill.
- Summary of steps taken to identify students with special problems and to design teaching and assessment procedures which facilitate their learning.

Material From Others

Material from Others:
- Student course and teaching evaluation data which suggest improvements or produce an overall rating of effectiveness or satisfaction.
- Statements from colleagues who have systematically reviewed the professor's classroom materials, the course syllabi, assignments, testing and grading practices, and reading lists.
- Invitations to teach from outside agencies, present a paper at a conference on teaching one's discipline or on teaching in general.
- Statements from colleagues who have observed the professor in the classroom as members of a teaching team or independent observers.
- Documentation of teaching/development activity through the campus center for teaching and learning.
- Statements from colleagues at other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
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Getting Started on Your Teaching Portfolio

Your teaching portfolio is your own. It represents you, and you determine what is in it. There is no "recipe" for constructing a teaching portfolio. The following categories and questions are provided as a catalyst for your thinking and to assist you in getting started on your teaching portfolio.

WHY DO I TEACH THE WAY I DO?

What do I believe about teaching and learning?
What do I want my students to gain from my classroom?
Why do I choose the teaching strategies/methods that I use?
Why do I select particular assignments/experiences for my students?
Teaching is to learning as ___________ is to ___________.
What synonyms for "Teacher" would accurately describe what you believe yourself to be, or what you would like to be, for your students?

WHAT DO I TEACH?

What courses do I want to be the focus of my portfolio?
What are the major objectives of the courses I teach?
What level(s) are the students? (Under grad/grad; freshmen/upper level)
How many students?
Required/Elective?
Majors/Nonmajors?

HOW DO I TEACH?

What do I do in the classroom?
What do I ask students to do in the classroom?
What do I ask students to do outside the classroom?
What guidance do I give my students?
What kind of feedback do I give my students?
How do I assess my students’ learning?
What do I ask my students to read? What do I ask my students to do with what they read?
What kind(s) of exams do I give?