

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

10-26-1965

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, October 26, 1965

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, October 26, 1965" (1965).
Faculty Senate. 493.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/493

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

Discussed the write-up for the Scholarship Requirements.

RECOMMENDATION: That the wording for Scholarship Requirements be approved as shown above. Seconded and carried.

Dr. Bartholomew reported on the NCA Workshop which he attended last summer. The report is below.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty Senate, Tuesday, October 26, 1965, at 4:30 p.m. in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

Members present: Mrs. Cobb, Mr. Dalton, Dr. Edwards, Mr. Evans, Miss Felten, Dr. Fleharty, Mrs. Hoffman, Dr. Hollister, Mr. Osborne, Dr. Proctor, Dr. Rice, Mr. Schmidt, and Dr. Garwood, Chairman.

Member absent: Dr. Coder.

Also present: Dr. Bartholomew, Mr. Blickenstaff.

The Chairman, Dr. Garwood, said that the write-up for the Scholarship Requirements was the first item of business. Copies of a write-up were sent to the members previously. This was discussed. The final copy is as follows:

SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENTS

Every student is expected to demonstrate his ability to progress toward a degree by achieving at least a minimum quality of work each semester or summer session. Since a "C" average is required on total hours for graduation, a student's record should reflect progress toward that level of achievement.

A. Academic Probation. A student places himself on academic probation when his accumulated hours and grade points show that he is deficient from a "C" average, six (6) or more grade points on hours attempted but less than eighteen (18) grade points on hours attempted. This academic warning is designed to alert the student that he may encounter difficulty in meeting graduation requirements and that he should take steps immediately to improve his academic status.

B. Academic Suspension. A student whose accumulated hours and grade points show that he is deficient from a "C" average, eighteen (18) or more grade points on hours attempted will be suspended for poor scholarship. However, no student will be suspended at the close of a semester or summer session during which he achieved a "C" average or better. No freshman at the end of his first college enrollment will be suspended for academic reasons.

C. Reinstatement. A student suspended from College for poor scholarship will be provided a period of at least one semester during which he may reconsider and re-evaluate his plans. He may then file a completed Application for Reinstatement form in the office of the Dean of the Faculty. Each application will be considered on its own merits. Reinstatement is not automatic.

D. Appeal. Any person affected by these regulations who has shown marked improvement or who believes he has been affected unfairly may appeal to the Committee on Reinstatement. To make an appeal, the student should discuss his case with his adviser, then submit a written statement signed by him and his adviser to the Dean of the Faculty. He may ask to appear in person before the Committee.

This was discussed. The statement regarding the student discussing the case with his adviser was questioned. It was asked if this meant that the adviser should not sign the appeal if he thought the student should not be granted approval. It was asked what the adviser's signature indicated.

RECOMMENDATION: It was recommended that the wording for Scholarship Requirements be approved as given above. Seconded and carried.

Dr. Bartholomew's Report On NCA Workshop. Dr. Bartholomew attended the NCA Workshop in the summer of 1965. He said that he was grateful for the opportunity of representing the College at this Workshop. FHKSC was the only tax-supported institution in attendance. FHKSC has the largest enrollment of any of the colleges which were represented. Dr. Bartholomew said that the representatives chose a topic on which to work and he chose "Evaluation of College Teaching." The Workshop met for a formal meeting in the mornings and the afternoons were for individual work. There was considerable discussion about general education, problems attendant with large classes, evaluation of faculty instruction, and finding out what the other colleges are doing in various areas.

Dr. Bartholomew prepared a report, "The Evaluation of College Teaching," at the Workshop. He read the report to the Faculty Senate. The report is as follows:

THE EVALUATION OF COLLEGE
TEACHING

by

Leland Bartholomew
Fort Hays Kansas State College

Introduction

Evaluation is an inevitable operation of the human mind; thus, the history of the evaluation of college teaching is as long as that of college teaching itself. Until recently, evaluation of college teaching was almost entirely informal, or, if systematic, based on criteria representing only a part of the teaching process.¹ Vague, subjective evaluation by administrators, colleagues, students,

¹For a summary of traditional practice from an Old-World point of view, see Powell, J. P., "Experimentation and Teaching in Higher Education; Measuring Teaching Performance." Educational Research, Vol. VI, No. 3 (June, 1964), p. 188.

or, for that matter, anyone, was supplemented by rough, systematic evaluation based on easily measurable factors such as extent of formal training, publication of scholarly findings, and length of professional service. Such evidence, while convenient for administrative purposes, was patently superficial and naive; yet it formed the chief basis for evaluation of college teaching until recent years. The college teacher was expected to have mastered his subject discipline; his ability to teach it was taken for granted. His knowledge in his field gave him something of a Divine Right, which entitled him to rule with unquestioned authority in the classroom.

Following World War II, college enrollments began their momentous climb, necessitating the recruitment of unprecedented numbers of new faculty; moreover, the field of professional education, previously concerned chiefly with elementary and secondary education, now extended itself to embrace higher education as well. Coincident with these phenomena, and perhaps related to them, there arose a new concern for college teaching, a concern which resulted in the realization of the inadequacy of existing criteria for evaluation. Accordingly, attempts were undertaken to develop more satisfactory evaluative procedures. At present there is a sizeable body of literature on the evaluation of college teaching, most of it written since 1950.²

²Sister Nora Leutmer, O. S. B., Evaluative Studies Focused on the College Faculty (unpublished Univ. of Minnesota paper, 1965), contains extensive bibliography.

Purposes of Evaluation

Evaluation of college teaching is desirable for a college or university for several reasons. For administrative purposes it is useful in determining matters of faculty tenure, promotion and salary. For the individual faculty member it can suggest ways for self-improvement of instruction. For the student it is a means for the realization of responsibility in the teaching-learning situation.³

³Irvin J. Lehmann, "Evaluation of Instruction," Evaluation in Higher Education, ed. by Herold C. Hunt (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961), pp. 355-357.

Systematic Methods of Evaluation

As a framework for the description of the many methods which might be undertaken to evaluate college teaching, the classification developed by Ruth Eckert is highly satisfactory.⁴ Professor Eckert lists ten methods grouped in three

⁴Ruth E. Eckert, "Ways of Evaluating College Teaching," School and Society, LXXI (Jan.-June, 1950), 66-69.

divisions. The divisions of methods are based on the performance of the teacher outside of the classroom, on his performance in class, and on the impact of his teaching on his pupils. Her classification, presented here chiefly in her words, is as follows:

The Teacher Outside The Classroom

1. Inspection of materials which he has developed for his courses.
2. Observation of the faculty member's participation in college discussions and committee work focused on teaching problems.
3. Published materials bearing on teaching problems.
4. Participation in state, regional, and national associations, with special interest shown in section meetings and projects concerned with the improvement of teaching.

The Teacher in the Classroom

5. Ratings made by fellow instructors or administrative officers, based on regular and systematic class visitation.
6. Ratings of the teaching-learning process made by students themselves.

The Teacher's Impact On His Pupils

7. Comparison of the standings secured on departmental examinations by students in various sections, taught by different instructors.
8. Comparisons of students' performance on pre- and post-tests.
9. Studies of the activities in which the students engage while they are taking the course in question.
10. Investigation of the subsequent activities of students particularly in the first few years after they have taken a given course or sequence of courses.

Eckert's classification omits reference to publication in the teacher's subject field, although evaluation of his mastery of subject matter is implied (above, Nos. 1 and 5.)

Conclusion

Evaluation of college teaching is a sensitive matter. Fears masked as ethical traditions (above, p. 1) are well-rooted and cannot be overcome simply by administrative decree. Any criterion for evaluation is vulnerable to criticism of its propriety or validity. Thus, the introduction of systematic evaluation of college teaching must be preceded by extensive education in the purposes, possibilities, and limitations of the testing program. Students need to see that if the test becomes simply a means for the expression of idolatry or an instrument of revenge, its purpose is defeated. Faculty need to overcome their fears--fear of possible consequences for their self-images; fear of administrative punishment. In this regard, it might be well if evaluation were introduced in two stages. In the first stage, the evaluation would be carried out solely for purposes of the self-improvement of the faculty member, with no administrative participation. In the second stage, results could be used for administrative purposes as well.

For the administration, systematic evaluation of the teaching faculty presents rich opportunities and sobering dangers. The idea of a test instrument which would compare the performance of faculty on a numerical scale holds understandable appeal; yet only the most foolish administrator would try to implement such a notion. Valid systematic evaluation of teaching must be accompanied by satisfactory solution of certain basic problems; What is good teaching? Only the most tenuous kind of agreement by consensus is possible. Certainly, good teaching must produce progress toward the objectives of the pupil, the teacher, the department, the college, and the society. But what are these objectives? As with the earlier question, the variables are infinitely complex; the answers vague.⁵

⁵A pioneer effort in the identification and classification of objectives is a study under the general editorship of Benjamin Samuel Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives; Vol. I, Bloom and others (editors), Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Co., 1964); a third volume, on skills is in preparation.

Investigation into evaluation of college teaching has only begun. At present, the evaluative instruments are not nearly sufficiently sophisticated to provide adequate measurable data for rating a teacher's performance on a scale from Good to Bad, and any attempt to do so is likely to do more harm than good.⁶ In the

⁶Robert M. W. Travers, "Appraisal of the Teaching of College Faculty," Journal of Higher Education, XXI (1950), 41-42.

evaluation of faculty teaching, the administrator may use with profit any and all of the data available to him, but for the present, he must rely ultimately on that most refined and complex of all computers--his own personal judgment.

The report was discussed and questions were asked. The Senate commended Dr. Battholomew for his work.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

John D. Garwood, Chairman

Standlee V. Dalton, Secretary

Florence Boomer, Recorder