

Meeting: Faculty Senate
 Date: November 5, 2019
 Time: 2:01 p.m.
 Location: BA 290
 Adjournment: 4:20 p.m.

Minutes

Members present: Hongmei Jia, Annette Taggart, Gerard Huber, Johanna Delgado-Acevedo, Stephen Starnes, Gil Naizer (for Laura Isbell), Julia Ballenger, Vipa Bernhardt, Dimitria Smith, John Smith, Jason Davis, Sandy Hayes, Susan Stewart, Yasemin Atinc, Brandon Randolph-Seng, Thomas Boucher, Brock Johnson, Debra Mahoney, Cheri Davis, Robert Rodriguez, Benton Pierce, Gracie Brownell, Vivian Dorsett, Andrea Williams

Members absent: Bob Williams, Bilal Abu-Bakr, Lavelle Hendricks

Issue/Topic	Summary of Discussion	Decision/Action
<p>Invited Speaker:</p> <p>Dr. Yvonne Villanueva-Russell, Dean of College of Innovation and Design</p>	<p>The meeting opened at 2:01 p.m.</p> <p>Dr. Villanueva-Russell visited the Senate to discuss the new College of Innovation and Design that became official on August 1, 2019^t. This college was created at the request of Dr. Rudin. It exists at Boise State and he wanted to replicate it here. There were no new hires for the college – all staff within the College were re-allocated staff and faculty. Dr. Villanueva-Russell then gave a breakdown of how the new college works and provided a flow-chart for reference. She said that the college is there to serve in part as an incubator for new ideas that are too big to house in one college/department and that they have more latitude for failure. The programs housed within this college are: the University College that deals with incoming freshman and First Year specific courses and needs; the Institute for Competency-Based Education (which reports to the state of Texas); Career Development; the Aurora Institute – this is a Presidential Initiative – which is about promoting entrepreneurial initiatives. There are plans to host something similar to “Shark Tank” to allow students to potentially secure funding to pursue new ideas. One of the goals of this new college was to provide an identity for programs that were shuffled around and allow them to potentially grow into multiple departments with their own department heads. Senator Taggart shared that it’s been nice at faculty meetings to have a big enough</p>	<p>Moved to approve by Senator Ballenger, seconded by Senator Delgado-Acevedo</p>

<p>Dr. Madeline Justice, Dean, College of Education and Human Services & Mike Smith, Educational Technology Innovations Manager, Office of Academic Technology</p>	<p>group to share larger ideas. Another benefit of the new college is in targeting the adult completer market; those out there with some college done but without the final degree as well as promoting industry learning and using advisory boards to make sure that people are getting the knowledge and skills that those doing the hiring are looking for. Senator Starnes asked about the reaction so far to the college and Dr. Villanueva-Russell said that so far there's been positive faculty interest.</p> <p>Dr. Madeline Justice and Mike Smith came to discuss Quality Matters. Dr. Justice explained that 4-5 years ago the Chancellor looked for ways to measure the quality of courses and offerings. One way was by looking at the syllabi – are there quality syllabi, do they give you what you need to know, do they actually lay out what will be learned? Mandate given to get all of the syllabi on the same framework – this is something that the University has to do – at this point it's just about decided what that method will be used. The preferred choice right now is to use Quality Matters as the metric by which to measure these. It is not something that has been adopted yet; President Rudin is asking that we adopt it and then resources will be allocated to implement it. QM has become the frontrunner because feedback from faculty who have gone to the workshops agree it is the best. At this point they are looking for feedback on whether or not to move forward with QM or to pick something else.</p> <p>Senator Ballenger shared how she has found using QM for her online courses. Using is to revise those courses has allowed for ease of student use. Just because she knew where everything for the course was didn't mean the students did; using QM helped to fix that. She is strongly in favor in favor of adopting QM, but acknowledges some bias as she has found it so useful. Senator Taggart shared that what she benefitted the most from QM training was looking at the course as a student sees it and learning how to best structure online courses. Senator Stewart posed the question about how this would work with d2l and not purely online courses. Mike Smith said QM was there for help of course design and that syllabi are a part of what Dr. Justice spoke of using for general course standards and how it can be tailored for what we want out of it. Mr. Smith also shared that QM has been used on campus for a while now; this would just be moving to have it more widely applied. Mr. Smith also said that there would be an interest group on Nov. 6th about his topic. Senator Smith asked for clarification on what the points mean and what courses will go through this. Mike explained the points are used to certify a course, things worth 3 points are considered essential needs and working down from there and a course needs to accrue a specific number of points to be certified and that is where there's some flexibility and where it can be adapted to various courses. What course it's applied to is</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Dr. Dan Su, Executive Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Research</p>	<p>being worked out, online courses first then gradually moving through all courses. Dr. Justice is looking for a decision in December.</p> <p>Senators asked for clarification about whether QM is for syllabi creation or course design. QM is intended for course design but as syllabi play a large part in course design it can be applied to that. Senator Randolph-Seng asked if QM was an independent company and Mr. Smith said that yes it is so if we adopt it we will have to pay a yearly subscription and then also pay for training. Mr. Smith also stated that the plan with faculty focus groups is to gain faculty support. Senator Randolph-Seng said that his department found using some of these as a base for peer evaluation to be useful. Senator Ballenger offered that by phasing this in and choosing which standards we want to adopt (starting with the 3 pts ones and adding more as we go) would allow for a gradual build. She said that she has found the 23 essential are important and has been very pleased with the difference it has made in her courses. It has made for fewer calls from students and proved easier for student to hit the standards for her classes. Senator Brownell said that the school of social work has tailored specific standards for that field. Dr. Justice aid that most schools have something like that and QM would be something to work alongside that. Senator Smith asked if the plan was to have everyone go through training to get all of our courses certified. Dr. Justice said that is what the Chancellor wants, they want a system wide standard that they can point to and hold as a quantifier and qualifier of standards. Senator Smith pointed out that this seems to have a whiff of distrust and can create too much focus on box ticking for the students and not on actually learning – losing the forest for the trees. Senator Taggart pointed out that QM was designed for online courses and that not every course needs to hit all the points and should be reviewed so that it doesn't become about how we teach but in making sure things are structured in such a way that students can consistently find what they need. Mr. Smith said that we would have flexibility in what we adapt in order to create an across the board standard. The goal is to create a purposeful way of looking at courses that can be peer reviewed on a department level. Dr. Su also pointed out that standardized syllabi can often help with the accreditation process.</p> <p>Dr. Su came to speak about the administrator 360 evaluations that were done last spring. It was the first time doing it; this evaluation focused on the Provost, Deans, and Department Heads. The 360 evaluations consist of direct reports, peer evaluation, management evaluations and self-evaluations which are them compiled. They were give \$4000 from Dr. Humphries to fund the evaluations. IER went with the Qualtrics company for the evaluation and with that funding were able to do the basic form. They were unable to start</p>	
---	--	--

<p>Sandi Patton, Director, Student Disability Resources and Services.</p>	<p>the evaluations as early as they would have liked due to communication issues with the company as they were being bought out at the time. The response rates were as follows: Provost – 65%, Department Heads – 76%, Deans – 73%. The plan is to do these evaluations every other year to check improvement. Dr. Su was the only one to know all the details; results were presented to others after it had been aggregated. Senators asked the question of how we would have that conversation with the Dept. Head if we don't have access to the evaluations, should we wait for them to bring it up? Dr. Su stated that it was on them to share the results and be open about it. The idea being that it's not a weapon but an opportunity for improvement of leadership. Senator Starnes said that the Deans have been asked to encourage the Dept. Heads to share as well as being encouraged to share their own evaluation results with the dept. heads in their college. Dr. Yu said that as the results are only open to the individual it is up to them with regards the depth of the results that they share. Senator Starnes said that this idea that we don't really have much to hold them accountable with should be kept in mind for next time. The staff council is currently in the process of getting a second round of 360 evaluations out. It is proving difficult as there is a lack of chain of command data. They're putting together a committee to make sure they iron out the process and making sure that anonymity is preserved as that is also a concern. The hope is that the process will continue to get smoother and better as it continues to be implemented.</p> <p>Sandi Patton came to talk about the office of student Disability Resources and Services. She spoke of how most of the office has been there for less than a year and they were embracing it as an opportunity to see what's working and how they can best help faculty and students. She shared that 10-12% of all higher ed students have a disability but only 3-5% go to the disability office. They want faculty to encourage students to go to the office if they need help. They are at work to develop a social media presence, creating a newsletter with FAQ and provide information on where you can send anonymous questions, and creating a faculty resource section on the website. They plan to e-mail faculty with lists of resources and tips on working with people with a disability. They plan to bring in national speakers to talk about working with students who have disabilities. There is a pilot program being done specifically for students on the autism spectrum. This program helps to deal with acting out related to disability, going to remediation for conduct issues, working on being very direct with students on the spectrum. Senator Stewart asked what population of students in on the Spectrum. Sandi replied that there are 5 in the pilot program – it still relies of self-identification. But that current rates are 57 out of every 100 babies born is on the</p>	
---	--	--

	<p>spectrum. They are working with region 10 schools to see what might be coming down the pipeline to make sure that we can be well prepared. As far as the disability office goes, the highest percentage of what they deal with are psychological issues, the next is learning disabilities and nationwide it's about 8% that are on the Spectrum.</p> <p>Sandi said her office is always willing to sit down to work out the best plan for dealing with various disabilities. Accommodations are a fluid thing, the accommodation that works for one type of class may not work for another – they can't make changes to our class or make it impossible to evaluate the student. So, their office wants feedback if an assigned accommodation doesn't work for that class to find out what the accommodations should be. They are also working with off-site places to make sure they get the same resources. They are also working to introduce tech that will help to liberate the students from 3rd party help. Tech is a great liberator and can help with transferable marketable job skills.</p>	
<p>Communications</p>	<p>The Faculty awards banquet has been scheduled for Thursday April 9, 2020. Spring convocation has been scheduled for Wednesday April 15, 2020.</p>	
<p>Committee Reports</p>	<p>Academic Life: Absent Academic Practice: Absent Admission and Retention of Students: Nothing to report. Budget: Senator Delgado-Acevedo had a meeting with Tina Livingston where a main topic being discussed for the budget is the summer compensation model. According to the survey professors want a raise in percentage of salary, 3 credit class being 8% instead of 7.5% and that most professor do want to teach in the summer but don't always get to, and that there should be a rotation of teaching assignments. The Summer Planning Taskforce is going to put together a proposal to give to the President. Senator Taggart asked if there was support for such a raise. Copies of the current budget are in the library. Curriculum: Nothing to report. Faculty Awards: The Piper rubric was revised moving from a 70 point to a 100 point evaluation, giving more points for teaching since it is a teaching award. Recommended Dr. Steven Shwiff as the nomination for the Piper award. E-mail has gone out with nomination forms for faculty awards. All nominations should be sent to Senator Brownell. Each department can only nominate one person per award. Senator Stewart asked that when nominees are notified this year that it be worded to make it clear is a department nomination and not the senator making the nomination. Organization of the Senate: Nothing to report. They did ask for a 3rd member for the committee. To clarify this committee is</p>	<p>Senator Jason Davis seconded the nomination. Senator Taggart moved to a vote. Senator Smith seconded. Motion carried.</p>

	<p>essentially “guardians of the constitution”, they look over and make revisions or changes that need to be made. Scheduling and Facilities: nothing report.</p>	
<p>Unfinished Business</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussion about affiliate faculty tabled until Dec. meeting. 2. The proposed change to the Tenure and Promotion policy was voted on and decided to keep as is and not make the changes proposed by the Deans. 3. Further discussion was had on the idea of creating a rotation for Department Heads. Senator Smith pointed out that there might need to be a procedural change to move from a Dept. Head to a Dept. Chair to allow for that flexibility and if so, the term should be longer than 3 years. Senator Stewart spoke of the importance of having an effective way to take on the issue of a bad/ineffective Dept. Head. Senator Randolph-Seng proposed the idea of creating a sub-committee to discuss the details of such a proposal, as there is no clear procedure at the moment. The idea of the differences between a Head and a Chair, the idea of external versus internal searches. Senator Dorsett spoke of the problem of a show of hands vote on hiring within or without and the lack of secrecy. Senator Rodriguez said that it seemed to him the Provost was looking for a sense of whether we like the idea or not, and also pointed out the inherent problem of the Deans’ veto power over this position. It was decided to get a sense of the vote of faculty versus appoint by the dean – discuss with our departments and come back. Maybe we should propose a procedure? 4. Senator Pierce brought up the question of the new college proposed by the Provost earlier this year. He pointed out that it won’t go away and we should discuss it so we can stay on top of it. Senator Stewart said we should get information from the administration about what they want to accomplish with the new college, the benefits and drawback etc. We as the senate can discuss what departments should go into the college. Senator Stewart suggested getting representatives from the departments involved to get together to decide what they think a new college should look like. Senator Starnes said he would send an email about who might be involved to get them discussing. 	<p>Senator Delgado-Acevedo moved to keep policy as is, Senator Brownell seconded, motion carried.</p>

New Business	<p>Senator Stewart asked about having graduate students on Faculty Senate, can they serve on subcommittees. Should we create a position on the Senate for graduate students until the planned graduate student organization reestablishes itself?</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 4:20pm.</p>	
---------------------	---	--