

Northwestern Oklahoma State University - FEAD

Dr. Mary Riegel (Chair)
Tammy Brown
Lindsey Cherry
Dr. Roxie James
Shannon Leaper

Dr. Steve Maier
Dr. Steven Palmer
Dr. Eric Schmaltz
Dr. Shelly Wells
Mark Zadorozny

Those present in bold.

Minutes for meeting on August 17, 2022 at 3 p.m. via Zoom

- Update on meeting with Dr. Bell regarding Administration's goals for FEAD this year, requirements as set out by RUSO, and limitations of the ALCA system.
 - Dr. Riegel started by summarizing a meeting with Dr. Bell. Owing to limitations of the ALCA system, the ideas of (1) multiple rubrics for 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year portfolios and (2) a points-based rubric will not be practical to implement, especially in a timely manner. The administration would therefore like us to attempt to modify the existing rubric to reflect an annual expectation for faculty to meet. Those faculty members submitting a multi-year portfolio will then need to demonstrate meeting those expectations for each year of the rubric. Next Dr. Bell asked that we consider more closely the issue of the evaluation of non-tenured faculty especially as regards to the portfolio. Finally, he asked that we consider three questions (see below) and how to communicate to all faculty our decisions regarding those questions.

Items for discussion and ongoing work:

- Timing of portfolio submissions for Non-Tenure-Track faculty
 - According to the RUSO Policy Manual:

"3.12 Non-Tenured Faculty. Non-tenured faculty shall be afforded the same rights of academic freedom as tenured faculty.
Annual Evaluation. Unless the faculty member will not be reappointed the performance of non-tenured faculty members shall be evaluated on or before March 1, each year, and the results of the evaluation shall be placed in the personnel file of the non-tenured faculty member. The non-tenured faculty member shall be given a copy of the evaluation."
 - At NWOSU, this has been interpreted as requiring a NTT faculty member to submit a portfolio each year. Dr. Bell and Dr. Riegel would like to propose an alternative wherein a NTT faculty member submits a portfolio on a 2 or 3-year rotation and during non-portfolio years be evaluated in combination by the student evaluations and by his/her chair (or the dean in the case the faculty member is a chair) using a less formal method. Dr. Riegel asked for input from the committee about this idea.
 - Mrs. Leaper indicated that the Library faculty do not receive annual student evaluations and so some other mechanism would need to be available for their evaluation. Dr. Maier suggested that we might work along with FDAB to

generate a rubric. Dr. James indicated that a rubric would be helpful for the chair in doing the evaluation but also for the faculty members in terms of growth and improvement. Mrs. Leaper also reminded the committee that there is a rubric for annual staff evaluations to use as a template for creating an evaluation rubric. The committee agreed to create a rubric -the committee will work to have one ready for next fall.

- Next, we discussed the timing of the portfolio submissions. After discussion, the committee agreed that a 3-year cycle seemed the best option. It is in keeping with the tenure review schedule and yet still provides a break to faculty and chairs for the non-portfolio years. The question was raised as to whether a portfolio submission was necessary at all and Dr. Riegel indicated that while we are working on the alternative rubric and evaluation process that we would like to keep the portfolio in use as a back-up. Also for faculty who transition from NTT to TT, the experience of creating a portfolio will be helpful.
- We next discussed how a change in portfolio schedule would work for non-tenured but tenure-track faculty. We agreed that TT faculty should still have the experience of doing the portfolio a couple of times before they submit the tenure application portfolio. Dr. Schmaltz initially suggest they submit portfolios in alternate years. This would mean that faculty would submit portfolios in years 2 and 4 of their employment before turning in the big portfolio in year five. After discussion, and realizing that this would only remove the year 3 portfolio (but not the need to document), we agreed that making a change did not seem worth the effort/confusion. Furthermore having completed a portfolio in years 2 through 4 makes the big portfolio easier to complete in year 5.
- The committee therefore recommends that evaluation of NTT faculty move to a schedule wherein a faculty member will submit a one-year portfolio every third year of employment to be used for that year's annual evaluation. During the other 2 years the faculty member will be evaluated by his/her chair (or dean) using an alternative rubric. Said rubric shall be developed during this academic year and (pending approval) be provided to chairs to use starting Fall 2023. Dr. Riegel will also begin drafting any revisions to the faculty handbook such a change will require for the committee to review at our next meeting.

- The Rubric –

- As Dr. Riegel had mentioned, the administration would like to see the FEAD committee work on refining the language of the rubric to reflect annual expectation of the faculty. This seems like the more practical (and in fact possible) of all of the options that had been considered in recent years and the one most likely to be able to be completed within the year. Dr. Riegel asked the committee to, before our next meeting, spend some time reviewing the rubric looking for places the expectation needs clarification or revision in order to reflect an annual expectation. Dr. Maier asked how that would work for a multi-year portfolio. Dr. Riegel expressed that her understanding was that to achieve an “excellent” mark in a section a faculty member would need to demonstrate that they had achieved that level for each year covered by the portfolio. She also indicated that this would require clarity of language and clear communication to the faculty regarding expectations. She said it might be that this results in faculty receiving more 2's (professional level) than they may be used to, but that this may be a shift across the university wherein the expectation is of professional level scores with the occasional excellent rating in the sections that a faculty member really emphasizes. She

indicated that there is uncertainty regarding whether this change will bring about the changes we are hoping for, but also that we need to try something as the current system does not seem to be working to everyone's satisfaction. She also remarked that the act of refining the rubric to an annual expectation will help us to create the alternative rubric for chairs to use with NTT faculty. Revising the rubric will be a big project and is likely to require regular meetings of the committee this year.

- The final charge the Dr. Bell gave for FEAD is to address three questions regarding evaluation of portfolios:
 - Who is the audience for the comments in the evaluation process?
 - Are we meant to evaluate the faculty member or the portfolio?
 - Can we create a more consistent experience for all faculty?
 - There was a consensus that we as faculty are uncertain about the process of evaluating portfolios, and in particular how to use the comments section. There were suggestions of a place to give more procedural comments intended for the chair or dean separate from the comments to the portfolio author. Again, it was commented that the act of refining the rubric will help us to answer the posed questions.
- Dr. Riegel asked for any other issues, questions or ideas for FEAD.
 - Dr. Maier asked if there are other duties, such as ALCA training, of which FEAD needs to be aware. Dr. Riegel indicated that she had not heard back about ALCA training this fall, but that she had reached out. She will let the committee know when/if she does have a schedule and we will have members on hand to answer questions.
 - Dr. James asked about trainings about building and organizing the portfolio, separate from the ALCA software training; there had been a panel last spring that she found helpful. Mrs. Brown indicated that would be something FDAB and FEAD could do again, and once we have made progress on modifying the rubric we will look to schedule something next spring.
- Dr. Riegel thanked everyone for attending and indicated the next meeting will be mid-September.