

## Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Meeting

November 4, 2016

### Minutes

*Voting members present:* Gary Delander, Theo Dreher, Eric Kirby, Janet Lee, Mei-Ching Lien, Deb Pence

*Guests present:* Raven Chakerian

#### **Review processes for Ecampus Instructors** – Raven Chakerian, Chair of Faculty Senate Online Education Committee (OEC)

- Chakerian discussed the necessity of establishing consistent and effective processes for review of Ecampus instruction. She also shared the Online Education Committee's [Annual Report](#). Included in the packet of materials provided were notes from the 2016 Quality Matters Conference and power point slides presented to the faculty forum for Ecampus about research done by the Committee concerning practices on other campuses. Raven spoke about the devaluation of online education in terms of standards and review at OSU occurring simultaneously with the encouragement for creation of online courses. She reported that SET questionnaires used for on-campus teaching do not adequately assess the experience and needs of online instruction. She also discussed the inconsistencies across campus whereby some units provide specific review beyond the standard SET scores and others do not. Chakerian explained that the Quality Matters certification for evaluation of online courses (a programme committed to excellence in online teaching) is recommended by Ecampus and by the OEC. Currently, there are 54 online courses at OSU where QM rubrics are being or have been used. The OEC made suggestions addressing some of these issues last January and were told that these recommendations would be passed on to the Provost. Apparently, no action has been taken.
- Chakerian also reported that the OEC is now working on an OSU survey to assess the extent and kinds of evaluation currently utilized by departments and units. The issue was raised that SET questionnaires could be adapted for online teaching given current knowledge about best practices. A focus might include the usefulness of the top two or three SET questions used in promotion and tenure dossiers for on-campus teaching.
- Another issue raised by data on online review practices concerned whether online curriculum development was a form of scholarship. Discussion focused on the ways the OSU Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Guidelines have designated this as teaching rather than research. However, also included in the packet of material was the "Policy on Promotion and Tenure Issues" proposed by the (formerly named) Faculty Senate Distance Education Committee that was accepted in April 2007 by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and its Promotion and Tenure Committee, and by Academic Affairs. Item 5 of this policy included the following: "Scholarship and creative activity, following OSU Promotion and Tenure criteria, include original curriculum development and novel course delivery media whose significance is validated and communicated beyond the university." One committee member described this statement as "inconsistent and troubling": a comment endorsed by other members. Discussion ensued concerning the ways curriculum development represented teaching rather than scholarly activity in terms of OSU P&T Guidelines. One committee member also made the observation that the way the statement was written could provide emphasis on the last clause about communication beyond the university. Two questions arose: did this get approved by the full Senate, and where is this policy now given that it was the committee's consensus that it has not been included in P&T guidelines? Delander will ask Gary Beach about this policy and report back. Finally, the issue of online curricula as intellectual property was raised and briefly discussed.

#### **Evaluation of Promotion and Tenure Procedures**

- This item, suggested for consideration by Janine Trempy, was discussed at the last meeting. It concerns a possible review of P&T guidelines and processes slated for 2018. No new information was presented. This item is still on hold, although Theo said he would talk to Janine and report back at the next meeting.

#### **Review Processes for Faculty Research Assistants**

- This is an ongoing item from last year. Kirby said he would check on notes and minutes

from past Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure meetings and will send out information. He sent an email after the meeting that included a document, "Simplified Review Processes for Faculty Research Assistants and Non-Tenure-Track Instructors (FS P and T working document 12-15-14)" and explained that this issue was last raised in June 2015, just before summer (although the document retains a date from December 2014 in the title, and a second date from February 2014 in the file name). In 2016, the document was split into two, whereby non-tenure track instructors were treated separately. It is not clear whether either of these documents were sent to the full Senate. Kirby has the most recent document pertaining to non-tenure-track instructors, but not the comparable one for faculty research assistants. It is not clear whether there was closure on this issue. Kirby suggested the usefulness of a conversation with Henri Jansen.

Next meeting: Friday, December 2, 2016  
10:30-11:30 AM  
321 Reed Lodge

*Minutes prepared by Janet Lee*