5-7-2008

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/07/08

Janet Shields
Central Washington University, senate@cwu.edu

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

REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, May 7, 2008, 3:10 p.m.
BARGE 412
MINUTES

Senators: All senators or their alternates were present except:. Dan Beck, Gina Bloodworth, Scot Calahan, Jonathan Fassett, William Folkestad, Elise Forier, Boris Kovalerchuk, Mathew Manweller, Tim Melbourne, and Dieter Ullrich.

Visitors: Sheryl Grunden and Karen Francis White.

CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA - None

MOTION NO. 07-48(Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES of April 9, 2008

COMMUNICATIONS – Tracy Terrell – commencement and honors convocation. See letter in office.

FACULTY ISSUES: Senator Donahoe has been named Director of Elementary Education program. She expressed a concern regarding courses in other departments and colleges that impact the elementary education program. When a department changes the requirements or credits for one of their courses, that has impact on Elementary Ed, it is starting to cause problems. The Education department trys to keep the credits at 45 so the students can maintain a minor. Section 5-10 in the Academic Affairs Policy Manual outlines the process that course changes must go through and asked that departments be reminded to follow this policy.

Senator Erdman brought a concern about non-tenure track faculty not being eligible for the distinguished professor awards. The College of Business just awarded John Lasik a distinguished teaching award who is a non-tenure track faculty. Senator Erdman asked if this could be done at the university level.

Senator Lane brought a concern about departments changing how their courses are offered and the impact it has on other departments across campus. Specifically Music Education students are struggling to take their required education courses as well as their required music courses. Education department has changed from offering some of their course in Tuesday/Thursday or every day 50 minute format to block course style that cover approximately 1-1/2 to 2 hours. This is causing problems with these students and the Music department is having to waive some of their courses to be able to help these students out.

PRESIDENT: President McIntyre attended the P-20 council in Olympia today. This is a committee that was created in July to represent the different sectors of education. Several of the issues the committee is working on it math preparation and transition from community college to a four year institution. The External Diversity committee met on the Westside a couple of weeks ago. President McIntyre held her 2nd annual address and forum last week. Starting to gear up for the next legislative session which is a biennial budget year. There are rumblings that there will be no money, but is hard to tell what will happen by next January. President McIntyre reminded the Senators of the Senate reception at the President Reception Center on May 14th at 3:00 p.m.

PROVOST: Provost Quirk said there was good news from PESB site visit on April 19 – 22 on all the standards. He congratulated all the faculty who helped to turn things around from 9 months ago. He thanked and acknowledged the leadership team headed by Jim Depaepe and Connie Lambert. They are looking forward to the board making their final recommendation on May 21st. Provost Quirk gave a quick update on the letter from the state auditor that has made the media recently. The letter was sent to the Board of Trustees, United Faculty of Central and Faculty Senate. It was not sent to the President or Provost which is where these issues should have been addressed. Provost Quirk indicated not only was it misdirected the allegations weren't substantiated and was outside the purview of the auditors office. Provost Quirk has just met with the ITAM department and is working with the department to create and sustain a collegial atmosphere. All media requests should be directed to the Provost. Provost Quirk introduced the new McNair program director Karen Francis White.

Karen Francis White – The McNair program is a capstone program, federally funded and serves low income first generation students and low represented students. The program currently has room for additional students. Karen indicated that the McNair eligibility doesn't really mesh up with what Institutional Research looks at, so is sometimes difficult to identify students who would qualify. There is the availability of a summer research project, $4,100, for students who have completed their undergraduate studies. If faculty are looking for research assistant this summer there is a program where students can earn credit for this. Please let Karen know if you know of any students you think would be eligible for the program or if you are interested in the research assistance program.

OLD BUSINESS - None

REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS

SENATE COMMITTEES:

Executive Committee:
Motion No. 07-49(Braunstein): "Accept nominations and vote for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Member-At-Large position. " Nominee(s): Susan Donahoe, Education; Michael Braunstein, Physics; from the floor: Motion was moved and seconded to close nomination. Motion approved.

Motion No 07-50(Approved): "Ratify Melody Madlem as a one year replacement for Dorothy Chase on the 2008-09 Executive Committee."

Motion No. 07-51(Approved as amended): "Approve a pilot student evaluation of instruction instrument for online courses to start spring quarter 2008 as shown in Exhibit A."

Discussion: Chair Snedeker indicated there is not an SEOI form for the online courses. This form has been taken from the current Form A and slightly adapted for the online format. This is intended to be a stop gap measure until a review of the entire SEOI process can be done. Senator Wellock asked if an option for N/A (not applicable) could be added to the 1-5 scale. This allows students to opt out of an answer that might not apply. It was suggested that post baccalaureate be added to question #32. Senator Dittmer suggested that "time of day" be taken out of question #31.

Motion No. 07-51a(Approved) Senator Ogden moved to approve a pilot student evaluation instrument for online courses to start spring quarter 2008 and conclude spring quarter 2010 or until a replaced with a permanent evaluation instrument.

Motion No. 07-52(Approved): Approve the pilot assessment instrument for evaluation of the Faculty Senate as shown in Exhibit B.

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Dittmer reported that the committee will have a grade inflation report soon. It is in the final editing process. The committee has been working on a number of surveys that will be sent to the Executive Committee this week.

Academic Code and Bylaw Committee: No report.

Curriculum Committee:
Motion No. 07-53(Withdrawn): "Recommends that section 5-10.5.3.3 "Curricular Criteria" of the Curriculum policies be amended as outlined in Exhibit C.

Motion No. 07-54(Withdrawn): "Recommends that section 5-10.5.4 "Cross Listing" of the Curriculum policies be amended as outlined in Exhibit D."

General Education: No report

Faculty Legislative Representative: No report

CHAIR: The Executive Committee has developed an assessment instrument to evaluate itself. This assessment will be sent to the Senators and alternates not in attendance here today. The assessment will also be sent to student representatives, senate committee chairs and academic administrators. The Academic Code and Bylaws committee has developed draft language for a dispute resolution process for issues outside of the CBA. This has been distributed to administration and UFC and waiting to receive their input. Senate was asked to provide input for Standard 6 of the accreditation self-report. Chair Snedeker summarized the activities of Senate over the past 10 years. If anyone would like to see that, he would be glad to share it. Reminder of the reception for Senators and alternates at the president reception center next Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. The Executive Committee has been working on a recognition program for non-tenure track faculty in addition to the current distinguished professor awards. This is still in the formulation stage and the draft has been shared with administration. The Presidential search committee has a webpage with timeline and forms available for feedback. Forums will be held next week. An email was sent out with the schedule. The search committee would like the help of everyone to formulate the position description that will be used to attract candidates to Central. The new CWU history books is now available in the bookstore.

STUDENT REPORT: Mike Bogatay reported that ASCWU had nine application for the BOT student position and

have forwarded 4 names to the Governor. ASCWU celebrated the 2nd annual graduate lunch today. They had a 12% turnout for their election, which is better than in years past. The Washington Student Lobby meets twice a year and will be meeting this weekend.

NEW BUSINESS – An assessment of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was handed out to those present at the meeting. Those not present will be mailed a copy to be filled out.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45.

Exhibit A

DIAGNOSTIC FEEDBACK ABOUT THE INSTRUCTOR   Always = 5, Never = 1

1. The instructor was actively engaged in the class.

2. Course activities were well organized.

3. The instructor provided useful feedback on student progress.

4. I was confident in the instructor's knowledge.

5. The instructor exhibited genuine interest in the subject.

6. The instructor encouraged students to express themselves.

7. Instructor communicated in a timely manner.

8. Instructor provided extra help when requested.

9. Course objectives were clearly stated.

10. The instructor gave clear explanations.

11. The instructor presented alternative explanations when needed.

12. Answers to student questions were clear and meaningful.

13. Instructor raised important questions or problems.

14. Appropriate examples and illustrations were used.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE COURSE Always = 5   Never   = 1
15. The technology used for the course(s) allow for easy navigation.

16. Online technologies were used effectively to facilitate interaction among students and instructor.

17. Instructor was interested in whether students learned.

18. Instructor helped develop an appreciation for the field.

19. Instructor applied course material to real world issues.

20. Course objectives were met.

21. Assigned readings and other offline work were useful.

22. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were fair.

23. Amount of work was appropriate to course level and credits.

24. Student responsibilities and requirements were clearly stated.

25. Instructor treated students with respect, regardless of sex, race or age.

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE?   High = 5, Low =1

26. The intellectual challenge presented to you.

27. The amount of your effort needed to succeed in this course

28. Your involvement (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.)

GENERAL EVALUATION   Excellent = 5, Very Poor = 1

29. Course as a whole was:

30. Instructor's teaching effectiveness was:

GENERAL EVALUATION ABOUT YOURSELF:

31. Why did you take this course? (mark as many as apply)
- □ In my major
- □ In my minor
- □ General Ed. requirement
- □ Elective
- □ Reputation of instructor
- □ Time of day
- □ Curiosity
- □ Advice of advisor
- □ Advice of friend
- □ Offered online

32. Class
- o Freshman
- o Sophomore
- o Junior
- o Senior
- o Graduate
- o Other

33. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this class?
- o Under 2
- o 2 - 6
- o 7 - 9
- o 10 - 12
- o 13 - 15
- o 16 - 18
- o 19 - 21
- o 22 or more

34. What grade do you expect to get in this class?
- o A
- o B
- o C
- o D
- o F
- o Other (Pass.fail, etc.)

35. How many online courses have you taken before this course?
- o none
- o 1 to 2
- o 3 to 4
- o more than 4

36. What online technologies were utilized in this course (please select all that apply):

- □ Announcements
- □ Discussion Board
- □ Collaboration (Chat)
- □ Email
- □ Messages
- □ Pronto
- □ Groups
- □ Digital Dropbox/Assignment Manager
- □ Calendar
- □ Glossary
- □ Tests/Surveys
- □ Gradebook
- □ Turnitin
- □ iTunes
- □ Other _____

37. How strongly do you agree that the technologies used were reliable?
        High = 5, Low =1

38. Which of the online technologies were most useful for your learning?

38. Which of the online technologies were least useful for your learning?

40. What suggestions do you have for improved use of the online technologies?

Comments (optional)

I.   What aspect of the teaching or content of this course do you feel was especially good?

II.   What changes could be made to improve learning in this course?

Exhibit B

In 2007-08, the Faculty Senate:

1. Projected a positive image across campus as a governing body.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

2. Fulfilled its responsibility as an equal participant in the shared governance of CWU.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

3. Acted effectively on behalf of the university's faculty with respect to academic issues.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

4. Acted effectively on behalf of the university's faculty with respect to curricular issues.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

5. Provided a constructive forum for faculty issues to be discussed.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

6. Provided opportunities for useful university service for faculty.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

In general, when conducting business, the 2007-08 Faculty Senate:

7. Conducted business efficiently.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

8. Conducted its business effectively.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

9. Created new policies and procedures that are in harmony with the university's charter and stated mission.
   5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
   Based on: ☐ Actual Events   ☐ Global Impression ☐ Both

10. Upheld existing policies and procedures in a fair and meaningful manner.
    5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
    Based on: □ Actual Events   □ Global Impression □ Both

11. Was responsive to faculty issues brought to its attention.
    5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
    Based on: □ Actual Events   □ Global Impression □ Both

12. Considered student interests in making decisions, when appropriate.
    5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
    Based on: □ Actual Events   □ Global Impression □ Both

13. Communicated information on activities and policy changes effectively.
    5   4   3   2   1   ○ Cannot Judge
    Based on: □ Actual Events   □ Global Impression □ Both

Written Comments

1. Did you have any awareness of activity or interaction with any Faculty Senate committees (e.g., FS Academic Affairs Committee, Curriculum Committee, General Education Committee, Code and Bylaws Committee, etc.)? If yes, please describe your awareness or interaction, and your response (e.g., favorable/unfavorable, effective or not, and why).

2. What Senate activities in 2007-08 were especially useful or noteworthy?

3. Do you have any recommendations for improvement? (specific examples will be appreciated)

4. This is a pilot assessment instrument. Do you have any recommendations for future versions of it?

Exhibit C

5-10.5.3.3   Curricular Criteria.   Graduate curricula are usually more specialized than undergraduate curricula, focusing on a few academic or applied areas. Introductory courses and courses that can be approached by a student without extensive preparation are not appropriate to the graduate level.

Graduate courses assume comfortable use of the terminology, knowledge-gathering methods, practical skills, and basic understandings of the discipline. Nearly all graduate students have a grade point average above 3.0 for their last two undergraduate years, and therefore, graduate courses should challenge the learning skills of these students. Graduate instruction places a greater burden on library, equipment, faculty, and administrative resources than undergraduate study. Curriculum proposals must recognize these special demands.

See Section 5-10.5.4 for Cross Listing graduate courses.

Exhibit D

5-10.5.4   Cross Listing

5-10.5.4.1   Cross-listed courses are courses offered by two or more departments or by the same department. Any cross-listed courses offered by two or more departments must bear identical course descriptions, numbers, credits and titles, only the departmental prefix will be different. Cross-listed courses within the same department bear the identical course description, credit and title but may differ in prefix and number.

Graduate credit for cross-listed/blended courses is given only for courses cross-listed with 400-level courses, not 300-level or lower. Cross-listed/blended courses at the 400- and 500-level provide faculty the opportunity to augment course material with graduate-level content and expectations in a way that meets the intellectual rigor graduate students' need and enhances the teaching of upper-division undergraduates. Distinctions expected between these corresponding levels typically focus on differences in content and/or evaluation stemming from each graduate program's specific educational objectives. In general, it is expected that these distinctions require a greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capacities than would be expected at an undergraduate level in a related discipline.

The distinctions must be clearly identified in the content and evaluation methods outlined in each course syllabi, as well as in the university catalog course descriptions. Examples of potential content differences include, but are not limited to: 1) additional readings or additional writing expectations; 2) differential credits; and 3) additional laboratory, field, performance or studio work. Further assessment distinctions might include: 1) different grading scales; and 2) evaluation of additional work.