

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Members Present	Jodi Lindseth, President Mary Dodson, Vice President Nathan Fryml, Secretary Donna Cleere Nichol Dolby Robert Gustin Robert Johnson Shawna Lopez Tara Meraz Sarah Milford Courtney Milleson Bill Netherton Sarah Uselding Karen White
Members Absent	Tammy Holmes Phyllis Pastwa [attending conference] DeeAnne Sisco
Guests	BRANT DAVIS, MORTUARY SCIENCE FRANK SOBEY, ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Topics	Discussion/Information	Actions/Decisions Recommendations/Timelines
Call to Order	President Jodi Lindseth called the meeting to order at 2:03 PM	
Approval of Minutes		

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Special Guest Report	<i>Frank Sobey gave presentations. Recorded below in "New Business" due to actions taken by Senate.</i>	
President's Report	<p>Board meeting report from Jodi. Board very concerned about faculty pay; is on mission to get it in mid-range for the state. 3% raise (and reinstatement of steps) was approved by the Board previously. Faculty pay was the biggest increase in the budget. Heartening to see their support. Issues of balance of contact hours and effect on budget. Big push for recruitment, especially for spring. Not a lot of room for mistakes with the current budget. Jodi encouraged faculty (Senators especially) to go to Board meetings, as they really seem to be wanting to work with faculty.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: Did they address benefits package?</p> <p>LINDSETH: Very briefly.</p> <p>Big issue of not great money AND not great benefits. We are in danger of losing faculty NOW, primarily because of insurance. Compare raise to changes in insurances costs, etc.</p>	
Secretary's Report	Demonstration of how to access Senate documents in google drive folder.	
Courtesy		
Elections		

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Legislative		
Mead Award		
Professor Emeritus Award		
Questions	<p>SENATE FUNCTION/OFFICIAL ROLES, AND HOW TO ADEQUATELY COMMUNICATE TO FACULTY? Suggestion that an email go out once per semester with current Senator list and website URL. Include reminders of critical information and procedures. Website updates are in process. Will look into options of presenting information in person to faculty (faculty meetings, etc.). Refer to previous Faculty Senate meeting minutes for called special meeting regarding past tenure issue and dismissals, which led to initiation of re-writing of rules regarding “separating of employment of tenured faculty” (still in process, believed to be with Mark White currently).</p> <p>ACCESS TO BUDGET/MERIT PAY FUNDING INFO? Merit Pay is not part of current budget for this year. Budget does not seem to have been formally released yet. Jodi will take these questions to Frank/Tamara.</p>	
Salary		
Technology		
Faculty Survey	Examination of Summary, and discussion of full report. Do we	

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>send out both in entirety to faculty? This is the one place faculty feel free to express true feelings. Foul language should be struck, as should overt slander, but names should remain stated.</p> <p>Not a lot of shift from previous years, with exception: VPAA got positive feedback. Also, many comments about food.</p> <p>Issue with reading/sorting current results: Comments separated from initial question.</p> <p>Should be distributed by Faculty Senate officers rather than committee chair.</p>	<p>MOTION [by Shawna Lopez]: Survey summary and full report should be released as they are. Seconded. All in favor: 14 Opposed: 0 PASSED</p>
Hospitality		
Faculty Development	To be discussed on Oct. 6	
Instructional Technology		
Pinning		
Faculty Committee Appointments		

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

New Business	<p>FRANK SOBEY presented a draft of Textbook/Course Materials Conflict of Interest Policy. Looking for Senate approval before official presentation to Cabinet.</p> <p>Gave background on connection between board policy manual and textbook guidelines (not dealt with specifically in the past). Dr. Lowery-Hart started looking into this, Deborah Vess continued efforts to draft policy, and now Frank Sobey is attempting to bring this to fulfillment with help of Mark White.</p> <p>[Senate read through the document together. Document attached.]</p> <p>Question about pre-existing texts. SOBEY: Would be retroactively subjected to this policy.</p> <p>When put into effect? SOBEY: Senate blesses, Cabinet considers, President implements. Spring of 2018 is the goal.</p> <p>DISCUSSION of timeline.</p> <p>Question of department policies [e.g. only changing textbooks every 3 years] seeming to conflict with this proposed college-wide policy. SOBEY: In cases of quality literature, this new policy actually supports ongoing use. AC certainly wants to support its instructors' pursuit of publication.</p>	
---------------------	--	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>Senators expressed concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Too much power in VPAA's hands- "Reasonably priced" (how is that determined)- "Peer reviewed" (by whom?) <p>SOBEY: Would be based on market value and standard evaluative procedures.</p> <p>Academic freedom?</p> <p>SOBEY: More about the profit side. Academic freedom is still there, but tempered by these other important considerations.</p> <p>Opportunity to appeal?</p> <p>How many schools?</p> <p>SOBEY: The proposed are criteria, not "standards" <i>per se</i>. Spirit is to support excellent texts, not in any way to restrict opportunities to make a profit. Goal is to protect against re-packaging material and taking advantage of students in the process.</p> <p>What if we implemented for one year, then determined if there needed to be tweaking or institution of appeals process. Would cabinet consider "probational" use of this policy?</p> <p>SOBEY: Fact that it is not part of the board policy manual means it is easier to revisit. Concern seems to be, what if the text is vetted at several levels and then dies at VPAA office? So – does there</p>	
--	---	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>need to be an appeals process?</p> <p>Appeals process through Faculty Senate, presumably? In order to have something on record.</p> <p>What does “promotes student success” mean, exactly? Too ambiguous.</p> <p>Should this policy not address the action taken against instructors who refuse to comply? What do supervisors have to hold to in the fact of “academic freedom”?</p> <p>SOBEY: Would probably have to come from VPAA office as “violation of existing policy.”</p> <p>Policy must be enforceable, and punishment must be consistent.</p> <p>Great policy! Must be taken a step further in order practically implement.</p> <p>SOBEY: So it sounds like spring 2018 implementation is unreasonable. Interim policy will create more issues. Needs to be ready to go. Will take these concerns/ideas back to Cabinet, and ask Mark White to revisit if necessary, returning updates to Senate for approval. Will try to get something back to Senate by next week or week following.</p>	
--	--	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>FRANK SOBEY continued with discussion of "Class Climate." 2/3 of the way through term, all students receive course/instructor survey. Previous (current) model is not good, and very few students respond. Cornerstone (merit pay model) requires that student feedback be factored in. Led to a careful look at student survey model and how it might be improved, either by additions or replacement. Has passed through various levels of vetting (deans, etc.).</p> <p>Showed the platform. Went through questions.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>A lot of problems, especially in terms of verbiage using absolutes, or potentially leading questions. Feeling words such as "enthusiastic" would be better replaced by "kept you engaged." Or phrasing technology-related questions in terms of "appropriate use."</p>	<p>MOTION [by Jodi Lindseth]: Vote by email ballot once it comes back from Cabinet? Seconded. All in favor? 14 All opposed? 0 MOTION PASSED</p>
--	--	---

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>The committee tried to keep language and elements that were connected to faculty pay.</p> <p>Question of how “mandatory” this is for students.</p> <p>SOBEY: One of the more common practices is to prevent students from seeing final grade until survey is filled out. According to Mark White, no legal issue with that. In classes incorporating online elements, parts of the course can potentially be locked until survey is completed.</p> <p>SOBEY: For the sake of argument, let’s say Senate doesn’t approve of the proposed platform. The students will then be required to use the old platform, which will still be affecting faculty pay.</p> <p>SOBEY: Two separate problems: Designing an instrument with which faculty are reasonably satisfied, and then implementing in a way that accurately reflects what the students are actually experiencing.</p> <p>End goal was originally to protect faculty.</p> <p>Feelings are a major part of this. Individual and groups of students need to be gauged somehow.</p> <p>Concerns that there are so few questions about actual learning.</p> <p>It is important that we know how the students perceive their own</p>	
--	---	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>learning and faculty effectiveness.</p> <p>The comments are the most valuable. Need to tweak the questions to get more ACTUAL feedback.</p> <p>SOBEY: If we don't act on this, will revert to old survey starting with this 8-wk term. No different from last year, except now pay is affected. Major difference with this proposed survey is that it is tailored to the merit pay model/content. If we rework questions, will not make the September deadline.</p> <p>Were previous questions passed through Senate?</p> <p>SOBEY: No.</p> <p>Survey content is directly tied to Cornerstone content (as applies to teaching component, which has subcomponents).</p> <p>Faculty formed the questions, so there was some input that way.</p> <p>SOBEY: Issues at hand is, how to make Merit Pay work for faculty, regardless of current feelings towards it. Spirit was how to make the student survey work BETTER than before.</p> <p>Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Wording of a few questions- Administration of the survey to students (and potentially	
--	---	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>throwing off results)</p> <p>SOBEY: Can include it as an “assignment” in course, as an example. Will get with Nancy Forrest and Merit Pay task force. Personal opinion: would be inclined to let it run and get it right.</p> <p>Now, how to implement in such a way that more students participate. Commentary on varying discussions of the past and Merit Pay task force, considering current results and how other schools handle. Open for suggestions!</p> <p>Great concerns about blocking grade or tying to grade.</p> <p>Could recommend blocking access to final grade until survey completed, but NOT blocking progression in course.</p> <p>Discussion. Is it legal? If so, is it ethical?</p> <p>Better to work into module checklist.</p>	<p>MOTION [by Nathan Fryml]: Pass it through in current form with allowance for amendments. Seconded [by Bill Netherton]. All in favor: 13 All opposed: 1 [Mary Dodson] PASSED</p>
--	--	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>Best we can do is encourage students to provide feedback, possibly by working into the printed expectations for the course.</p> <p>So we are encouraging rather than coercing? We seem to want them to provide the feedback, but aren't quite willing to do what they seem to need in terms of "motivation."</p> <p>Discussion of whether final or external grade can actually be hidden on Blackboard. Turns out you CAN.</p> <p>Examined Senate Committee Assignments.</p> <p>Discussion of Piper nominations email sent out by Mary Dodson. No nominations thus far. Get word out to faculty, please!</p>	<p>MOTION [Nathan Fryml]: Do not force student participation, at least in these early stages of implementation. Seconded. All those in favor? 14 All opposed? 0 PASSED</p>
--	---	--

Faculty Senate Minutes

Date, 2017

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>Professor Emeritus (discussion led by Mary Dodson). Can we draft formal criteria, for use in nomination form, followed by secret ballot?</p> <p>YES, start work on this.</p>	
Unfinished Business		
Updates and Announcements	Reminder of how Minutes approval works.	

Recorder: Nathaniel Fryml, Instructor, Senator for Liberal Arts