

Teaching Academy Executive Council Minutes
February 25, 2022

Members Present:

Courtney Meyers, Angela Lumpkin, Tara Stevens, Nancy Soonpaa, Karen Alexander, Lisa Garner Santa, Patrick Hughes, Susan Tomlinson, Bob McDonald, Kayleigh Millerick, Suzanne Tapp

Members Not Present:

Ali Duffy, Mitzi Ziegner, Dominick Casadonte

Approval of Minutes:

Angela moved to approve the minutes from, January 28, 2022; Nancy seconded. The council approved.

New Executive Council Members

Courtney introduced Bob McDonald and Kayleigh Millerick as the temporary representatives to serve in the place of Carla Lacerda and Feruzan Williams, who left the university this year. Bob and Kayleigh will serve until the end of the semester.

Hidden Gems Recognition

Courtney announced that twenty-six people were recognized as Hidden Gems. Each was sent a congratulatory email and a certificate. The stories shared on the nomination forms will be posted soon to the Teaching Academy website. Courtney is open to offering this recognition next year.

Teaching Evaluation Initiative at Texas Tech

The subcommittee chairs of the Teaching Evaluation Initiative met together this week to discuss the project and to set goals for the year. Angela gave an overview of the initiative's progress since 2021. Groups in this initiative met with various people across campus, including the Provost. They plan to meet with the President this semester. The aim is to be collaborative and gain support from upper administration. Angela gave updates about each subcommittee's work to identify questions to help shape values, identify goals, set a timeline, to get input from faculty, to get input from students, and to prepare for pushback.

Peer observation- This group is led by Mitzi Ziegner and Karen Alexander. They want to invite Shane from TeMPO to give insight. The concern is that it's not consistent across campus. They believe it needs to be connected with self-reflection questions. Louis Held could also help shape some of this work.

Self-reflection- This group is led by Lisa Garner Santa and Dominick Casadonte. They asked at what point in the academic year should this be done. They suggested it could be part of the annual faculty report or after each class. They plan to form focus groups to decide if there should be set questions or if it should be open ended. They want to make sure set questions won't be leading.

Defining teaching excellence- This group is led by Courtney Meyers and Lisa Low. They did a card sort activity last summer in an attempt to narrow down language for this definition. They

are working to sort through the data. They are also looking at definitions created by other institutions

Department teaching plan- This group is led by Angela Lumpkin and David Roach. Four departments have already committed to creating teaching plans. Kinesiology and Sport Management developed a teaching plan in the fall, and it included their definition of teaching quality and self-reflection questions for faculty to choose from. Their goal is to have six departments committed to developing plans this semester.

Student evaluations- This group is led by Suzanne Tapp and Michael Serra. This committee created surveys for chairs and faculty. They will present at Chair Academy in March and lead three other sessions for faculty and students this semester. There is also discussion to rename the instrument and that will go through the faculty senate.

All materials from this initiative can be saved in a OneDrive folder.

Tara mentioned using Q-Methodology to analyze data from the card sort and offered support. Courtney mentioned that they used cards for the sort and will get help from the committee who facilitated the card sorting activity.

Angela and David are offering to speak to departments about creating teaching plans and are willing to share materials.

Updates

Teaching Academy New Membership

The application is currently open, and they are due on March 22nd. The nomination/recommendation letters are due on April 1st. Courtney asked if Executive Council members were allowed to write letters for new applicants. The council discussed this and wasn't sure if this was in the bylaws. This discussion will continue at the next meeting.

Departmental Excellence in Teaching Award Selection Committee Report

Kirsten gave his report about the selection process. There were four complete applications and all made strong cases. All the committee members evaluated the applications before the selection meeting and there was a consensus on who should be selected.

Kirsten noted that the committee discussed what constituted a "comparable academic unit".

Some members wanted to have the ability to discuss whether or not certain applicants met this criterion since they weren't traditional departments. They thought that decision should be up to the committee instead of the chair. They suggested that future applicants submit an "intent to apply" document two weeks before the deadline so the selection committee could discuss that before the review and selection. Lisa mentioned the challenges for large departments who are broken down to sub units. Kirsten responded, saying that those units should still be encouraged to apply, but that the committee would ultimately decide if they met the criterion for a "comparable academic unit". This could help to avoid an unfair advantage for applicants that are fundamentally different from a department.

Kayleigh asked if all applicants would be required to submit an intent to apply document or only those who are not traditional departments. Kirsten said requiring it from all applicants would be fair. Kayleigh asked why there were more non-traditional applicants this year. Suzanne remembered that this inclusion began several years ago with small units in the Law School. Bob mentioned that the emphasis on use of award funds in 2010 led to broader applicants. Kayleigh

asked if more large, non-traditional units were applying due to their ability to be more involved in innovative teaching. Kirsten agreed that this is a factor and was the case with one of this year's applicants. He mentioned that he doesn't want to discourage anyone from applying but wants to give the committee members agency in the case of an unfair advantage. Susan noted that the council discussed this issue last year. Courtney asked if the award name needs to be changed to be more inclusive and avoid confusion about eligibility. Angela said that the council did discuss this and decided to not change the name.

Kirsten also suggested that the review scores and comments be made available to the applicants who did not receive the award. The committee wanted them to get feedback so they could apply again.

The last suggesting was that the committee meet once before the application deadline so that they could discuss the criteria to make sure each member was on the same page for the evaluation. Lisa asked if selection criteria was part of the application. Kirsten noted that the criteria are clearly stated for applicants, but that not everyone covers them clearly. Kirsten led two information systems about the application process and hopes that will help in the future. Angela suggested that the applicant and corresponding college or dean, rather than the committee, should be the one to show how they qualify as a comparable academic unit. This would give the unit an opportunity to show that they qualify. Kirsten agreed that this could be a good solution. Karen mentioned that if there were an official list, it would need to be updated regularly. She suggested that documentation from the dean should be part of the application. Nancy suggested creating a few criteria to help distinguish an acceptable unit. Kirsten said that there is a definition that's meant to be inclusive.

Courtney mentioned that this is a big application, and she doesn't want anyone to be discouraged.

Kirsten mentioned he will be on the committee next year, but Jeffrey Harper will serve as chair. Courtney asked if they could create a procedure manual for the committee and chairs in the future.

The committee suggestions will be discussed further in March.

Provost Council Meeting

February 21, 2022

- NCAA Academic Misconduct – Jennifer Brashear/Brian Shannon
 - Had a couple issues in the fall. Wanted to bring everyone up to date on the policies. They have a plan to deal with issues when they arise.
 - Brian Shannon answered some questions about NIL.
- Priorities Survey for Online Learners (PSOL) – Haylee Doss
 - Measures satisfaction of online learners in graduate and undergraduate programs.
 - Looks at university in general. Third time the university has done this. Last collected data in Fall 2021.
 - Shared highlights from the satisfaction instrument. Enrollment services and student services had lower scores than national average, but we were higher than national average in institutional perceptions. Some scores have improved from our previous

- survey in 2019 such as reputation and program contacts. Areas for improvement are for the bookstore and financial aid.
- They have data specific information for the college and program level. They will be sending that out in the next couple weeks.
 - Summer 2022 Above- Funding - Rob Stewart
 - Above base funded courses be prioritized based on what will meet the demand and not just what was offered last summer.
 - If they are not on the first priority, but are important for a sequence of courses, they will be prioritized. Will be sending a spreadsheet to use as a template.
 - Faculty and Staff Mental Wellness Committee – Rob Stewart
 - Submitted preliminary recommendations to President before the holiday. Sent out a survey to ask for feedback about mental wellness. This will help inform future directions. Asked to think about how funding could be used to help with student wellness and health – perhaps scholarships, access to other resources on campus.
 - Announcement – Rob Stewart
 - Announced he will be stepping down from his role in the Provost’s Office to return to a faculty role. This has been planned for more than a year. An official announcement will be coming out soon.
 - New Business
 - Working on a document to describe how institutional enhancement funding will be used. Will share the information in mid-March or so. [\$50 million total, \$5 million in funding to help support student mental health, \$7 million for graduate students (does not include health insurance), \$20 million for research.]
 - Provost Hendrick mentioned that debate regarding academic freedom regarding critical race theory continues at the state level. Emphasized we have strong support from our area’s legislators regarding the need to protect tenure and academic freedom.
 - Dr. Melanie Hart said eLearning was accepting grant applications for programs at regional sites.

Adjourn:

Susan motioned to adjourn the meeting; Nancy seconded. The meeting adjourned.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Molly Jacobs.