

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Members Present	Jodi Lindseth, President Mary Dodson, Vice President Nathan Fryml, Secretary Donna Cleere Nichol Dolby Robert Gustin Tammy Holmes Robert Johnson Shawna Lopez Tara Meraz Sarah Milford Courtney Milleson Bill Netherton Sarah Uselding Karen White
Members Absent	DeeAnne Sisco Phyllis Pastwa
Guests	FRANK SOBEY

Topics	Discussion/Information	Actions/Decisions Recommendations/Timelines
Call to Order	President Jodi Lindseth called the meeting to order at 2:06 PM	
Approval of Minutes		MOTION to approve: Karen White SECOND: Robert Johnson

Faculty Senate Minutes
February 2, 2018
Ware Student Commons, Room 207

		YEA: all NAY: none
Special Guest Report	<p>FRANK SOBEY</p> <p>QUESTION 1: Why is it students must complete an assignment in an online class before they are considered “active” but merely showing up in an on-campus class once in two weeks is sufficient? Can faculty members have the option to mark students as “non-attending” when they have shown up to an on-campus class, but have not completed any of the assignments that have come due?</p> <p>ANSWER 1: As it currently stands, you count a student as “present” on the census roster based on MEANINGFUL participation. This is mandated by the Department of Education. We support this because it gives us a better shot at retaining those students and preventing “Pell-jumping.”</p> <p>But it IS deeply concerning that physically attending one class in the traditional model is the minimum requirement for marking a student “present” on the census record.</p> <p>The attendance model really is constructed around physical presence. That’s what we have to go with for now. It was the only model before Pell-jumping became the focal point of the DOE.</p>	

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Changing the policy for online classes simply reflects the greater concern in that area.

Is it possible to officially note students who seem to be in danger of “gaming the system”? Yes, clear personal records, which can be factored into faculty performance review. It is possible to work this information into Cornerstone narrative (use attachments).

QUESTION 2: I notice the new “online rubric” is a “modified” version of something originally produced by the State University of New York, through the Open SUNY® Center for Online Teaching Excellence. I have three questions: 1. Was there any faculty involvement in this major change to our online courses, and if so where was it? 2. Was any consideration given to academic freedom? This rubric takes a cookie-cutter approach to instruction across disciplines and courses. 3. What are the future implications? If online courses can be forced into a rubric and monitored, why not traditional classes? Do teachers at AC receive any trust in how they teach anymore?

ANSWER 2: Last year, members of the “Quality Matters Task Force” (task force assembled by Dr. Vess, bringing together faculty from all disciplines) presented a rubric directly modeled after the program. So yes, there was considerable faculty involvement.

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Goal was to certify several faculty members, allowing them to examine all courses in catalogue and give the “Quality Matters” stamp of approval. This idea was revisited by Frank this year, but the scale of it seems unrealistic. Need for SOME sort of standardization for accessibility. Decided to create own rubric based on the Quality Matters program. “Quality Matters Task Force” went back to work, streamlining (geared towards AC needs specifically) and focusing on MASTER COURSE DESIGN, as a way then to assess the various online courses in the context of faculty evaluation. Intention was to make less burdensome for faculty.

- Faculty involvement? Yes, from the start.
- Academic freedom? Really, it’s more about accessibility than about the content specifically. It’s more of a “best practice” issues regarding delivery, with quality of design as the focus (meeting minimal expectations of what an online course should have). Just an assessment, to be used with common sense. It ASSUMES that we have quality faculty here, but NOT that every traditional idea translates well or automatically to online format. All about COMMUNICATION. “Standardization” is the conversation / issue. What is in the best interest of the MOST students.
- Cookie-cutter approach? Perhaps in a way, but with

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>intention. Dealing with MINIMUM requirements to be met. Much flexibility beyond that. Especially helpful for adjuncts teaching master courses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Why not traditional courses as well? This is a TOOL for faculty to use, largely on their own and in the context of faculty evaluation. Gives the faculty member material for self-evaluation and defense of teaching practices. No plans to force traditional classes into such a rubric, but there is already oversight of classes, teaching techniques, etc (by chair, coordinator, etc.). Not at all unreasonable. The “online assessment” for online courses is similar in nature.- Do faculty receive any trust in how they teach anymore? Question seems to presuppose mistrust. But this is about quality maintenance, not lack of trust. This can and will be very helpful for many faculty members (especially our many adjuncts). <p>Rubric currently provides standards for layout, but not necessarily a “standard approach.” Certain content is prescribed (such as link to syllabus), but how you meet these standards is largely in the purview of the faculty member. We are being held to the standard of “uncluttered layout.”</p>	
--	---	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

COULD “lack of trust” become an issue? At what point would faculty perceive lack of trust from the administration? Perhaps if courses were required to maintain the same pace, or modules / content were mandated. But currently, very discipline-specific. And even in environments that are highly controlled (developmental math, etc.), there is still room for instructor personality. Some other courses / disciplines are more naturally subjective in terms of content and interpretation, but there are still necessary LEARNING OUTCOMES that must be followed, as well as departmental requirements.

(Discussion ensued regarding content vs. delivery.)

It is CONSTANT supervision / questioning that would be construed as lack of trust. Sometimes there is a time / place for canning courses, depending on the necessary exit skills / content mastery required in a particular situation. In a sense, trust and faculty instructional experience is built over time. So this rubric is, again, intended to be used as a TOOL for coordinators and faculty.

General info/guidelines provided by Becky Easton by email, pertaining to the above question:

1. The committee that chose the rubric consisted of [Becky

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Easton], Heather Voran, Courtney Milleson, Sarah Uselding, Tony Tackitt, Larry Adams, Sam Swarzlose, Jill Gibson, and Pam Ortega.

2. This rubric did not go through Curriculum Committee because it does not involve “curriculum change, student learning outcomes, general education core curriculum, admission requirements, degree requirements, units of credit, attendance policy, late and irregular registration, [or] grades and grading policy.” It is just a tool.

3. The rubric has three purposes, one of which relates to new courses and two that apply to existing courses.

a. New courses created with a Master Course Stipend through CTL will be evaluated with this rubric.

b. Faculty can voluntarily use the rubric to evaluate their own existing courses with an eye toward improving their own course’s design. In other words, if faculty are wondering whether the design of their own online courses are up to snuff, they can self-assess their course using this rubric.

c. If a faculty member consistently has lower success rates online than in the classroom, the immediate supervisor can go over

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>the existing online course with the faculty member to ascertain whether the low success rates are due to a poorly designed course. If students fail because they don't read instructions, because they miss due dates, or because the material is challenging, that's one thing—or technically, three things. The rubric is meant to measure something else entirely: how the course is designed. If students fail because they are not meeting the standards, the failure is on them. If they are failing because of a poorly designed course, the faculty member can use the rubric as tool to remedy the situation.</p> <p>4. There is no deadline, nor is there a mandate to redesign all online courses.</p>	
President's Report		
Secretary's Report		
Courtesy		
Elections		
Legislative		
Mead Award	Notebook in hand now. Getting started now.	
Professor Emeritus Award	Much effort to get the list correct over the past few months. Final	

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>nominations still came back as Ken Pirtle (same as the single nomination received a few months ago). Standing question of whether a deceased faculty member can be nominated. Criteria include Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and continuation of support for AC.</p> <p>Is there justification for continuing the Professor Emeritus award? Who should be making this decision? Input from all faculty should be factored in.</p> <p>What do we do about the list moving forward? Needs to be at the forefront of everyone's minds now (EOD, etc.). The records must somehow be pulled back together and tracked ongoing.</p> <p>Passed Senate presidents have said that deceased should come off the list. General consensus now is that this should be the policy. This "weeding" process would need to be an early part of the Prof. Em. Committee responsibilities.</p> <p>Nomination is really limited to who the (increasingly younger) faculty know/remember personally.</p>	<p>Motion to nominate Ken Pirtle: Nichol Dolby Seconded: Bill Netherton In favor: ALL Opposed: NONE</p> <p>Proposal: Include question of continuation on faculty survey. Seconded: Mary Dodson In favor: ALL Opposed: NONE</p>
Questions	<p>NEW QUESTIONS (Answered or Pending)</p> <p>1) QUESTION: Is AC paying for TCCTA convention anymore, or no?</p>	

Faculty Senate Minutes
February 2, 2018
Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>If not, why not?</p> <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <p>Question for EOD? Becky Burton? Used to be paid for by Perkins. Will be revisited before next month (deadline is first weekend in March).</p> <p>DISCUSSION OF QUESTIONS COMMITTEE BYLAWS</p> <p>Main questions is how questions are to be answered / addressed, and whether questions may be altered at all, especially for questions involving conflict. Bylaws state that all questions are to be presented to the Senate FIRST before answers are pursued.</p> <p>Proposed amendments (see attached) discussed. Final version will be approved in process of approval of minutes. Then presented to faculty for vote.</p> <p>2/3 of the faculty who vote must be in favor in order for bylaws to be changed.</p> <p>[Senators cast vote by email in favor of distributing revised bylaws</p>	
--	---	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	to faculty for approval.]	Motion to submit revised bylaws for faculty vote: Nathan Fryml Seconded: Tara Meraz In favor: ALL who voted Opposed: NONE who voted
Technology		
Faculty Survey		
Hospitality		
Faculty Development	Funding (especially recent sources) must be used in order for it not to disappear. Encouragement is for faculty to apply for as much as they can effectively use, to keep those needs present in administrative and budgetary discussions.	
Instructional Technology		
Pinning	Committee met on 1/14 with Lyndy Forrester. Committee recommended moving ceremony from 2-4 to 11:45-1:15.	
Faculty Committee Appointments	Sarah Uselding moved to this committee.	
New Business	<p>It has been suggested that Faculty Senate should get involved with accommodation of students with physical disabilities (in addition to support structures already in place for learning disabilities), as well as student/faculty safety (especially at night) and accessibility of campus facilities to student/staff.</p> <p>Jim Baca and Police need to be brought into discussion. Lack of police presence is a real concern.</p>	

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 2, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>Liability issues behind campus security cameras, shelters, etc.</p> <p>Another new item for discussion: ADVISING is asking that students in danger of failing a pre-req course, or having just failed, be reported <i>by the instructor</i> to the student's advisor so advisor can make better class assignments (biggest issue is between first and second 8-week courses). Students who are unable to repeat a course (due to full class, etc.) owe back money for failing the course. Advisors don't get any notification that the student has failed a class (student is already enrolled in the next level) unless faculty member informs Advising. By the time it's caught, it's too late. Question is, would faculty be willing to do this? How are the faculty supposed to know TO WHOM to send these alerts? How about a dual-wave of retention alerts? Students without specific advisors are a complication. This definitely warrants further discussion, addressing classes with large numbers, etc.</p>	
Unfinished Business		
Updates and Announcements		
Meeting Adjournment	President Jodi Lindseth adjourned meeting at 4:22 PM	

Recorder: Nathaniel Fryml, Instructor, Senator for Liberal Arts