

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
April 9, 2001

The University Senate met at 3:30 p.m. in Room 338 of the Memorial Union with Dr. S. Jacobson presiding and the following members present: S. D. Anderson, Arnell, Burnett, Burton, V. Clark, T. Colville, Corry, DeHaan, Deissler, Elias, Garvey, Grafton, V. Hatlen, Horvik, B. L. Johnson, Kegode, A. Kostecki, Logue, Macintosh, Mahalingam, McCourt, D. Miller, Nawrot, Norris, Nuechterlein, R. O'Connor, N. A. Olson, C. D. Peterson, Pieri, Rathge, Riley, R. C. Schnell, J. Schwarz, Sehgal, Slobin, Soucek, Stammen, Vaidya, D. Wells, A. White, Yuvarajan.

Substitutes: L. Prunty for Hopkins, J. Venette for P. Jensen, D. Andersen for K. Kellogg, Brewer for Rider, and Lindley for Wiesenborn.

Previous Minutes

MOTION (Colville/O'Connor): to approve the minutes of March 19, 2001, as distributed. MOTION PASSED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

General Announcements

1. Status of Building Projects

- a. Vice President Schnell announced that bonding was approved by the legislature for a new residence hall and an addition to Minard Hall. Approval was also received to proceed with plans for a College of Business Administration building and for renovation of Sudro Hall.
- b. Vice President Schnell reported that plans related to the new Horse Park are in the final stages.
- c. Vice President Schnell announced that NDSU is exploring the possibility of a downtown campus location. Four potential sites have been identified for consideration.

2. Legislative Budget Update

- a. In response to a question, Vice President Schnell reported that, although the House amended SB 2003, removal of tuition from appropriated estimated income has been maintained for now.
- b. Salary percentage increases are currently at 3% for the first year of the biennium and 2% for the second year.

3. Call for Nominations

Presiding Officer Jacobson called for nominations to fill the following roles:

- a. Council of College Faculties representative (3-year term, non-administrative)
- b. Standing Committee on Faculty Rights (non-administrative, tenured faculty)
 - Two-year term to fill the remainder of a term
 - Five-year regular replacement term
- c. Presiding Officer Elect for 2001-2002 University Senate.
 - Nominees are to come from the elected membership of the Senate and have at least two years of Senate membership remaining at the regular May meeting of the Senate.
 - Duties include presiding in the absence of the presiding officer and representing the University Senate on the Policy Coordination Committee.

Committee Reports

1. Academic Affairs

MOTION (Garvey/D. Miller): to approve the curricular recommendations as shown in [Attachment 1](#). MOTION PASSED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

2. General Education

MOTION (DeHaan/Horvik): to approve the report of the five-year review of General Education courses as shown in [Attachment 2](#). MOTION PASSED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

3. University Assessment

Dr. Robert Harrold, committee chair, presented and reviewed documents related to assessment of student learning.

- a. "Guidelines for Reporting Assessment Activities 2001-2002 Academic Year," includes purposes, format, and suggestions for conducting and reporting assessment activities as shown in [Attachment 3](#).
- b. Two forms of "Assessment of Student Learning: Levels of Implementation" are shown in [Attachment 4](#). The first one includes three rating levels and is patterned after a North Central Association - Commission on Institutions of Higher Education publication. The second document with the same title is a modification of the first one and has five rating levels.

4. Peer Review of Teaching

Dr. Robert Harrold presented a committee report on peer review of teaching, shown in [Attachment 5](#), which was modified according to feedback received during two Open Forums held on March 27 and April 4. He pointed out that the focus was to encourage assessing learning rather than just student satisfaction. Presiding Officer Jacobson and Dr. Harrold reviewed the background underlying renewed interest in the benefits of peer review of teaching that led to the recommendations listed in the report. The Teaching and Professional Service committee was acknowledged for their collaborative efforts.

Additional handouts were provided including a classroom observation report form, materials on an evaluation rubric for peer review of teaching via peer classroom observation, peer interviewing of students as part of formative or summative faculty review, and a proposed context and a format for peer review of course syllabi.

The following issues and concerns were raised during general discussion:

- a. Are the "expected" reviews during years one, three, and five required for tenure-track faculty?
- b. Are 10 people sufficient to serve as mentors? (Calculations were presented to justify initiating the process with 10 mentors for number of courses to be reviewed each year.)
- c. How would this process apply to tenure-track faculty already here? (Answer was to include them in the process at whatever year was appropriate. New faculty members would begin the process during their first year at NDSU.)
- d. How many hours would be needed for all steps of a peer review? (Answer was 12 hours.) Comments indicated this may be an optimistic view of actual time to complete a peer review.

- e. What is the cost estimate for released time for mentors? (A per course range was cited.)
- f. How realistic is it to expect that the community has available and qualified replacements for mentors?
- g. What criteria will be used for selecting mentors? (The committee expected to identify mentors via nominations from deans and other faculty.)
- h. Have the politics of the campus been considered in the design of the process?
- i. What will the current "Classroom Observation Report Form" yield? Replacing the list with observable behaviors to increase rater reliability was suggested.
- j. The issue of moving a formative process into a summative assessment was raised regarding purpose and use of the results.
- k. Given that flexibility seems to be part of the plan, what legal implications are there if everyone is not reviewed equally?
- l. What is the motivation? Is it to improve teaching or to put something in a promotion, tenure, and evaluation file?
- m. Has there been any thought to gender and minority issues with this process?
- n. What research has been reported on the benefits? (Response was to refer to the footnotes on the Rubric Format for the references by Peter Seldin and by Pat Hutchings. Also, a Kansas State University web site [www.idea.KSU.edu] was identified as a source for references.)
- o. If the process of improving teaching is for the purpose of improving student learning, shouldn't there be a plan to determine if student learning is improved?
- p. Should recommendation number six in the peer review report be restated to comply with the NDSU policy statement in Section 332, which indicates peer review is an option?
- q. The policy in Section 332 specifies that at least one course be reviewed. What if a person wants more than one class reviewed? Would this create a resource problem?

Suggestions following the discussion:

1. Implement peer review on a voluntary basis, get experience with the process, and then consider making it a requirement.
2. Send the recommendations on peer review to departments for review.
3. Peer review implementation for this fall seems too early.

Conclusion:

The report of the ad hoc Committee on Peer Review will be sent back to the University Senate Executive Committee for discussion.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Alberta M. Dobry, Ph.D.
Secretary