

Teaching & Learning Committee Faculty Senate Report

2024/2025

Committee Chair: Diana Meiser

Committee Vice Chair: Alea Lee

Executive Committee Liaison: Ryan Cain

Administration: Julie Rich

Student Senators: Angelea Hansen, Krystal Orantes, and Ruby Vejar

Ex Officio: Nicola Corbin, CETL Director; Oliver Snow, WSU Online Director

Members: Brock Adams, Melina Alexander, Robert Ferguson, Sara Gailey, Mariangelica Groves, Joscha Klueppel, Andrea Lalumia, Taowen Le, Abigail Mack, and Gennie Parkman

Meeting and Committee Information

During the 2024/2025 academic year, the Teaching & Learning Committee worked on nine Faculty Senate Charges. The charges and progress information are listed in detail later in this document.

The larger Teaching & Learning committee met monthly, six times over the 24/25 academic year, with smaller sub-committee meetings taking place in between those monthly meetings. A subcommittee was formed for each of the nine charges. Meeting attendance was strong with only a few members needing to miss a meeting here and there due to scheduling conflicts.

The work of the committee was advanced through the excellent efforts of all TLC members, especially those who took on leadership roles for the sub-committee work: Robert Ferguson, Julie Rich, Melina Alexander, Oliver Snow, Alea Lee, Gennie Parkman, Abby Mack, and Joscha Klueppel.

Teaching & Learning Committee Charges

Charge 1: Review suggested syllabus language -

<https://www.weber.edu/cetl/syllabus-guidelines.html> - for Creating a Supportive Campus, Core Beliefs and Challenging Subject Matters, Academic Integrity, and Americans with Disabilities Act

Sub-Committee Members: Melina Alexander, Sara Gailey, & Taowen Le, Andrea LaLumia, Robert Ferguson

At the April 4, 2025 TLC meeting, the full committee approved the suggested language located on the CETL website.

Charge completed.

Charge 2: Explore options to increase Student Senate engagement with the Teaching & Learning Committee

Sub-Committee Members: Taowen Le & Julie Rich, Ruby Vejar

A meeting was set with the CSBS student senator, Ruby Vejar, and Julie Rich. Ruby agreed to join the TL committee and then invited her student senator colleagues to a second meeting to inform the potential student participants of the scope of the TL committee and the charges. All three agreed to join the TL committee and they attended two of the meetings held in spring semester.

Next steps: Need to work on better engagement of student senators in future meetings. Also need to establish a plan going forward to invite student senators to participate early in the year and then have them identify student senator replacements interested in serving the following year at the end of spring semester or early in the following fall semester.

Charge 3: Create a policy that addresses best practices for verification of identity and regular substantive interactions with students in online courses.

Sub-Committee Members: Oliver Snow, Joscha Klueppel, Nicola Corbin, & Diana Meiser, Andrea LaLumia

Oliver Snow provided this link to RSI document -

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1a6DKR0NkY8vAB604-5xDEaYeIlv-MKyRscHzoLfU1Bc/e/dit?tab=t.0>

Joscha looked at the document that Oliver created and created a Qualtrics survey for students to see what they would like. Joscha is working with Nicola to get the survey out. Our Accreditation review resulted in the creation of a webpage -

<https://www.weber.edu/online/RSI.html>

Next steps: Survey was distributed to students -

https://weber.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6zJ1uRGGgqkZV66. Gail Niklason will share the results of the survey.

Charge 4: Work with GEIAC to develop a 3-5 year metric specifically for adjunct instructors teaching GenEd courses, including on-boarding, procedural training and more specific professional development targeting GenEd students' retention and academic outcomes.

Sub-Committee Members: Alee Lee, Diana Meiser, & Melina Alexander

Note: We switched up this charge to start from what we actually want for students with the gen eds first and then using that to think more about what kinds of training and development we need for faculty who are teaching the GenEd courses so they are meeting the gen eds.

The proposed plan involves:

1. We want to work from a "portrait of a Weber State student who has completed our Gen Eds in order to design some sort of support/onboarding for adjuncts (and others who are teaching GenEds).
2. The new GenEd outcomes are being voted on in mid Dec 2024, so we will start making alignments in the new year (Jan)
3. [HERE](#) is the PDF for postsecondary portrait for USBE and [HERE](#) are the rubrics.
 - a. Mastery
 - b. Autonomy
 - c. Purpose

At the January meeting (Jan. 07, 2025), the following information was shared:

1. Excel File with the postsecondary portrait of a graduate (created by Melina)
 - a. Does this fit a Weber State Graduate? What needs to be added? What should be taken out or reframed?
 - i. Mastery
 1. Academic Mastery
 2. Wellness
 3. Civic, Financial, & Economic Literacy
 4. Digital Literacy
 - ii. Autonomy
 1. Communication
 2. Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
 3. Creativity and Innovation
 4. Collaboration & Teamwork
 - iii. Purpose
 1. Honesty, Integrity, & Responsibility
 2. Hard Work & Resilience
 3. Lifelong Learning
 4. Service
 5. Respect

Next steps: TLC decided to move this charge into next year as GEIAC is still working on coming up with the new general education outcomes.

Charge 5: Create a resource for peer review committees and folks going up for tenure as guidance for observations.

Sub-committee Members: Alee Lee, Taowen Le, Maria Groves, & Ryan Cain

The sub-committee worked on how to craft questions for analyzing teaching practice to provide actionable feedback:

- * How much thinking are the students doing in the class?
- * What sorts of connections are the faculty members making with the students?
- * What evidence is there that the instructor prepared for the lesson?
- What does practice and interaction look like?
- Webb's Depth of Knowledge [Linked Graphic](#), Blooms Taxonomy
- Remind those under review to ask for reviewers to attend to specific things they are looking for feedback on
- Are we asking reviewers to look at all of their interactions with students including Canvas, Lectures, messages?
- What sorts of evidence does the instructor provide in their teaching practice to their development of the teaching section in their tenure file?

Three ideas were developed:

- Letter to new hires, in Spring or even at the start of year 2
- Template for reviewers with open-ended questions
- Template for reviewer letters

When looking at the dimensions of teaching:

- Learning environment (classroom, Canvas, instructor's demeanor)
- Content accuracy
- Learning process

Should the person being reviewed ask their reviewers what sorts of things are you looking for?

- Candidates should state the lesson of the goal to the reviewers
- <https://truframework.org/> what if we provide the framework with 2 questions from each dimension, and ask candidates and reviewers to pick two to three dimensions to work on
 - <https://truframework.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/TRU-CG-domain-general-2018-version.pdf>
 - We might say to candidates, read pages 1-6 of the above document, then pick about five questions across two to three of the dimensions

Ryan created this ONE-PAGE [draft](#) using the TRU framework

Overarching organizational document that describes the 3 or 4 stages (Pre-observation, during observation, after observation)

- Pre-observation
 - Meet with the peer review committee folks to get on the same page about what will be observed for
- During observation (the notes form)
- After observation
 - Debrief
 - Writing the letter

Next Steps:

- Overview document that describes the three sections of the review
- One document for pre-observation (thinking this is like what Ryan has)
 - This document should provide a layout of the TRU framework and point out the resources they should read or interact with
- Observational tool - the table & probably describe what kinds of notes should be taken?
- After observation
 - Summary of instruction
 - How to write a letter for review

Charge 6: [Thrive Symposium](#) proposal committee & the CETL awards committee.

Sub-Committee Members: Gennie Parkman, Diana Meiser, Alea Lee, Nicola Corbin, & Ryan Cain, Andrea LaLumia

This group provided support for the Thrive Symposium on October 8-9, 2025 and helped select the award recipients for the Thrive Banquet on March 17, 2025.

Charge 7: Investigate potential support for faculty working with International students in conjunction with the Community of Practice assigned to this topic.

Sub-committee Members: Abby Mack, Joscha Klueppel, Alea Lee, & Diana Meiser

There was a Supporting International Students Workshop on Dec 12 from 1 PM to 3 PM in Lampros 201. A number of TLC committee members attended the workshop.

A food drive took place to support international student need at the WSU food pantry -

<https://www.weber.edu/pantry/>

Krystal mentioned that international students would really appreciate it if faculty would take a moment to go over the resources available on campus in more detail. Helping students navigate those internship issues.

Next steps: Diana Meiser is working with Kacy Peckenpaugh to redesign the UNIV 1106 course to provide additional support for international students.

Charge 8: Investigate supporting faculty in facilitating ethical AI use by students.

Sub-committee Members: Gennie Parkman, Abby Mack, Brock Adams, Oliver Snow, & Nicola Corbin

This sub-committee work was put on hold due to a larger campus committee working on AI.

Charge 9: Investigate ways to support adjunct faculty in the following areas: Professional development specific to adjunct faculty; Compensation for training; Keeping adjuncts informed about their benefits on campus.

Sub-committee Members: Brock Adams, Julie Rich, Melina Alexander, Sara Gailey, Diana Meiser, & Andrea LaLumia

Julie Rich initiated a discussion in Dean's Council meeting regarding adjunct faculty training compensation. There were many questions about the level of compensation, how much, who would be responsible (college or Provost). Some colleges had an endowment that might be used, while other colleges did not. Funding this training/support for adjuncts from the colleges did not get off the ground at this time.

An adjunct faculty support survey was created by Brock Adams, in conjunction with Deanna Froerer and Heather Chapman. Brock worked with Rachel Cox-Vineiz to distribute the survey to the adjunct faculty at WSU.

Survey Title: Adjunct Faculty Support Resources Survey

Introduction

Briefly explain the purpose of the survey and assure respondents of confidentiality.

Section 1: General Information

1. **Department/Discipline:**
- [Open-ended]
2. **Years of Experience as an Adjunct Faculty Member:**
- [Multiple Choice: 0-1, 2-5, 6-10, 11+]
3. **Current Teaching Load (number of courses):**
- [Multiple Choice: 1, 2, 3, 4+]

Section 2: Current Support Resources

4. **Which of the following resources do you currently utilize?** (Select all that apply)
 - Faculty development workshops
 - Mentorship programs
 - Access to teaching materials
 - Technology support
 - Library resources
 - Other (please specify): [Open-ended]
5. **How satisfied are you with the current support resources available to you?**

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neutral
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

Section 3: Identifying Needs

6. ****What types of support resources do you feel are lacking?**** (Select all that apply)

- Professional development opportunities
- Networking opportunities
- Access to teaching materials and resources
- Administrative support
- Health and wellness resources
- Other (please specify): [Open-ended]

7. ****What specific support would you like to see implemented?****

- [Open-ended]

8. ****How can the institution better support your professional growth?****

- [Open-ended]

Section 4: Additional Feedback

9. ****Do you attend departmental faculty meetings?****

- Yes
- No
- Comment on your answer [Open-ended]

9. ****Please share any additional comments or suggestions regarding adjunct faculty support resources.****

- [Open-ended]

Conclusion

Thank respondents for their time and emphasize the importance of their feedback in enhancing support for adjunct faculty.

Survey Results: 123 responses have come in on the survey. Survey was sent out on four separate occasions from Dec. 24-January 25.

Respondents' years served:

11+ years – 39%

2-5 years – 37%

6-10 years – 24%

Support

95% of respondents are satisfied with the current support resources that they receive through the institution.

52% have been invited to attend department faculty meetings, 48% have not.

Responses indicate that adjuncts would like to be included more in the department communication.

48% of the adjuncts who have been invited to attend department meetings, have attended in person.

CETL

48% have not visited the CETL site, or known about the amount of resources available to them through CETL. Many of the respondents are not aware of the CETL.

Additional information.

31% of the respondents requested higher compensation for their efforts.

A handful of respondents are very upset at their departments/colleges. No correlation between departmental dissatisfaction.

Future surveys could itemize college and departmental choice, which would allow for clearer interpretation of data.

Teaching & Learning Committee's Next Steps

Charge 2 will need to be an ongoing process to engage student activity within the Teaching & Learning committee. Charge 3 will require more work and guidance from the university as a whole. The TL committee can share the results of the student RSI survey with the greater WSU community. Charge 4 work will need to continue into next year due as GEIAC creates and disseminates the new GenEd learning outcomes. Charge 5 provided a number of excellent resources for peer review committees. Decisions will need to be made on how and which resources to advocate for on a broader university scale. Charge 7 will continue with the work Diana Meiser is involved with Kacy Peckenpaugh in. In addition, there is a larger university committee focused on international student success. Charge 8 is covered by a larger university AI committee. Charge 9 will need to continue into next year with the creation of additional adjunct faculty support hopefully being driven by the adjunct faculty survey results.