

10-6-2010

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 10/06/10

Janet Shields

Central Washington University, senate@cwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

---

### Recommended Citation

Shields, Janet, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 10/06/10" (2010). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 52.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/52>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU.

**REGULAR MEETING**  
**Wednesday, October 6, 2010, 3:10 p.m.**  
**BARGE 412**  
**Minutes**

**Senators: All senators or their alternates were present except:** Tom Cottrell, Rodrigo Murataya, Don Nixon, Steve Wagner, Michael Whelan, Kathy Whitcomb, Matthew Wilson and Dale Wright.

**Visitors:** Sheryl Grunden

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Approved**

**MOTION NO. 10-01(Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES** of June 2, 2010

**INTRODUCTIONS –** Introductions of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee were made. Senators and guests were asked to introduce themselves and their department. Chair Bransdorfer gave a brief orientation on how Senate meetings would be conducted, asked that senators come prepared for meetings, read through material prior to the meeting and communicate with their representative departments.

**COMMUNICATIONS - None**

**FACULTY ISSUES:** Senator Bartlett requested that the Faculty Senate look into the class attendance policy. Each quarter he has at least one student who will show up for one of the first three days of classes and this attendance behavior seems to be a trend for the rest of the quarter. Would like to see the policy changed to if they attend less than two days during the first three days they may be removed from the class.

**PRESIDENT:** President Gaudino reported that the Governor has reduced the budget by 6.32% across all state agencies as receipts are falling well below state projections. The Governor does not have the authority to change budget allocations, but does have the authority to reduce funds across all state agencies equally. President Gaudino indicated that when the Legislature returns in January they will more than likely address budgets as well and they do have the authority to change budget allocations. Central created their base budget for this fiscal year on 9500 student FTE expecting that we would enroll more than that and in anticipation of potential budget reductions. Enrollment numbers are higher than the 9500 FTE budgeted and that additional tuition funds will be used to absorb this cut from the Governor and to pay for increased instructional cost with the increased enrollment. Dr. Charlotte Tullos presented the President's Cabinet with a second report on student success having been working with the Student Success Council. One of the first waves of activity will be to shore up advising activities on campus, especially for new and undeclared students. Dr. Tullos will be talking with various groups on campus to start the feedback process. President Gaudino is putting together the steering committee for strategic planning/visioning. Faculty Senate Executive Committee has nominated four faculty for this committee. President Gaudino asked that everyone participate in this process as will be help in constructing the university of the future.

**PROVOST:** The Provost reported that enrollment has hit a high water mark this year with approximately 11,000 students. There are about 3,000 new students between freshman and transfers. The first round of data indicates that the students enrolled have slightly higher GPA and standardized test scores in comparison to previous years. Number of Hispanic students is up this year, while white students are on the decline and others remain stable. The Provost reported that when you look at state funding and enrollment over the past 40 years it has been up and down, however the gap between enrollment and state funding has continued to get larger. We are currently being funded by the state at the same level as 1991. Senator Gray asked if the student measure data would be released to the Faculty Senate. Senator Jackson asked that the admission index information and how that is calculated be included with the student measure information.

**Motion No. 10-05: (Approved)** Senator Alsoszatai-Petheo moved to extend the Provost's discussion time by 5 minutes. Motion was seconded and approved.

**Provost continued:** The Academic planning process is being finalized at the department and dean level. The Provost will be receiving this information and will be reviewing this information with a small group to look at programs and sort them into the categories of reallocation, maintenance, combination and adjustment or cuts. Provost reported on a meeting he just had with the Dean of CEPS regarding academic planning. Adjustments have been made this year in class capacity, program directors and sequencing of classes. The merger of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs is more complex than just changing reporting lines. One of the first efforts will be student advising. A small committee is developing facts and will be meeting with departments to gather information.

## REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS

### SENATE COMMITTEES:

#### Executive Committee:

**Motion No. 10-02(Approved):** "Adoption of 2010-11 Operating Procedures/Roberts Rules of Order attached as Exhibit A"

**Motion No. 10-03(Approved):** "Nominations for the 2010-11 Faculty Senate Parliamentarian." Nomination: Warren Plugge. No additional nominations.

**Motion No. 10-04(Approved, 2 nay, 4 abstentions):** "Endorsement of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) form as presented in Exhibit B."

Senator Snedeker, who is the chair of the SEOI task force, gave a brief report on what the task force has done and how they came up with this document. The task force was charged to come up with an effective tool to evaluate faculty teaching. The committee has taken this document to the Student Senate, UFC, PAC, ADCO, University Assessment Committee, Faculty Senate and the faculty at large for feedback. Jeff indicated that while, this document may not be perfect, it has received fairly positive feedback. What the summary will look like for faculty or administration has not been decided. The committee would like to see the delivery of this evaluation be online. The committee realizes there are still issues and concerns with online delivery that need to be resolved. The Lab and online course forms are currently being worked on and are almost finished. The Skills and performing arts evaluations are farther behind, but hope to be able to present these forms at a future Senate meeting. There will need to be a formal integration plan of utilizing these new forms with the current evaluation process. Those farther away from promotion, and tenure could use the new forms. Realize that some faculty closer to tenure and promotion may need to use the old forms and they will still be made available. If departments want to use the online format this fall they need to contact Tom Henderson. Paper versions of the form will still be made available.

Senator Lori Braunstein expressed concern about how many students an online version would capture, especially if it wasn't done during class time.

**Academic Affairs Committee:** No report

**Bylaw and Academic Code Committee:** No report

**Curriculum Committee:** No report

**Evaluation and Assessment:** Senator Snedeker reported that he has sent out a request to all administrators who participate in the Assessment of Academic Administrators. The next assessment will take place this spring. The committee is working at making the questions more relevant to the individual administrator. So the committee has received no responses.

**General Education:** No report

**Faculty Legislative Representative:** No report

**CHAIR:** Chair Bransdorfer indicated that the General Education committee has put in a substantial amount of work looking at program reform. Last spring the committee provided a proposal with their year-end report. Chair Bransdorfer expressed a desire to work with administrators and the General Education committee to give the students a General Education curriculum that makes sense is efficient, easy to administer and doesn't cost a lot and is assessable. The Curriculum Committee is working on electronic forms for the curriculum process that would include electronic signatures. Last year several Computer Science students developed this process as their senior project. The committee is working on testing the system now and hope to have it available sometime this year. Chair Bransdorfer reported in conversations with the Provost the Faculty Senate is planning on merging the University Assessment committee with the Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment committee.

**CHAIR-ELECT:** Chair-Elect Loverro expressed the Senate has a lot opportunity with the review of shared governance. Faculty Senate has the potential for a larger role in a lot of aspects of university business that we haven't been involved in for a while. Chair-Elect Loverro indicated that the Senate Executive Committee would like to clear up some of the communication lines this year. Please let us know how we can address some of those issues.

**STUDENT REPORT:** No report

**NEW BUSINESS** - None

Meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

# Exhibit A

## 2010-11 Faculty Senate Operating Procedures:

1. Robert's Rules of Order, THE MODERN EDITION (ISBN 0-425-11690-5) will be the accepted authority for procedural operations. The senate's bylaws take precedence over Robert's Rules of Order.
2. Committee reports will be automatically accepted. If there is an action item that a committee desires to submit with any report, it is to be separately stated as a motion and the motion will then come before the senate for discussion and debate. The committee will be asked to submit a report and written copies of any motion or action that it would like to have taken.
3. Committee reports and motions shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate office by noon on the Tuesday of the week preceding the senate meeting in which action is expected. This policy allows for the timely posting of the meeting agenda. All committee motions submitted for action by the senate must be accompanied by an abstract-size plain English summary stating the content, reason for the proposal, and intended effect of the motion. This summary will be sent to the faculty prior to the initial Senate meeting in which the motion will be considered for adoption. As a general rule, substantive committee motions that do not accompany the agenda will not be discussed and voted on until a subsequent meeting. An extended agenda will be sent to all Senators, who shall give it to their Alternate if they are unable to attend the meeting.
4. Concerning discussion rules, senators will use the procedure of seeking recognition from the Chair if they want to speak to an issue. Speaking without Chair recognition is out of order. Discussion on arguments for and against the issue will be alternated. A visitor will be given recognition if the floor is yielded by a senator. If no senator desires to speak and a visitor would like to make a point, the Chair will recognize the person. A visitor will be recognized if a preliminary request is made to the senate office for an opportunity to speak or if the Chair invites a person to speak.

## Exhibit B

# CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY - STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

- Use a #2 pencil to make dark, solid marks
- For each question mark ONE answer only and erase errors completely

Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Time of day: \_\_\_\_\_

### 1. STUDENT LEARNING ENVIRONMENT. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. instructor fostered a fair and respectful learning environment?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. instructor seemed genuinely concerned with whether students learned?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. standards of classroom behavior were clearly communicated and enforced?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. instructor met class at scheduled times unless otherwise arranged?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No			
e. Did you seek help from the instructor outside of class during the course?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>			
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
f. If <b>YES</b> , was the instructor available to provide extra help?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

g. Please provide additional comments on the areas addressed in #1.

### 2. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. course objectives were clearly communicated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. overall course content was presented in an understandable sequence?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. instructor used a variety of methods, as needed, to make content clear?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. assignments and tests were connected to course content?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. evaluation and grading techniques were clearly explained?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. instructions for class activities were clearly communicated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. instructor provided useful feedback on student work?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. instructor provided timely feedback on student progress?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. class sessions were well organized?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. out-of-class work was useful in understanding course content?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. instructor encouraged students to connect course content to issues beyond the university classroom?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. course activities challenged students to think critically?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

m. Please provide additional comments for the areas addressed in #2.

**GENERAL INFORMATION****3. How would you compare this course with all other courses of similar credits at this level (i.e., 100, 200, 300, etc.) taken at CWU? Was the...**

	Much more than most courses?	More than most courses?	About average?	Less than most courses?	Much less than most courses?
a. amount of work OUTSIDE of class	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. level of engagement/active learning IN class	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. intellectual challenge presented to you	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d. Please provide additional comments for the areas addressed in #3.

**4. For this class, about how many hours outside of class did you spend in a typical 7-day week studying, reading, conducting research, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities?**

- 0 (no) hrs/wk     
 1-3 hrs/wk     
 4-6 hrs/wk     
 7-10 hrs/wk  
 11-15 hrs/wk     
 16-20 hrs/wk     
 21+ hrs/wk

**5. Why did you take this course? Please mark all that apply.**

- Major requirement     
 Minor requirement  
 Certificate requirement     
 Fulfills General Education requirement  
 Reputation of instructor     
 Time of day  
 General interest     
 Other?

**6. What is your class standing?**

- First year (0 - 44 credits)     
 Sophomore (45 - 89 credits)     
 Junior (90 - 134 credits)  
 Senior (135 or more credits)     
 Graduate     
 Other (e.g. post-baccalaureate)

**7. What grade do you expect to get in this class?**

- A   
 B   
 C   
 D   
 F   
 Other (Pass/Fail, etc.)

**8. Please provide any additional comments about the course or instructor (e.g., instructor's teaching effectiveness, course materials, classroom facilities, etc.).**