Faculty Senate Minutes

May 13, 2013

SU 313 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

**Present:** Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Todd Carney, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Doug Gentry, Fredna Grimland, Kevin Sahr, John King, Byron Marlowe, Rich May, Mary Russell-Miller, Gerry McCain, Kasey Mohammad, Larry Shrewsbury, Robin Strangfeld, Jamie Vener, Jody Waters.

**Absent:** Prakash Chenjeri, Steve Jessup, John Richards, Ellen Siem.

**Guests:** James Klein, Jadon Berry, Dan DeNeui, Karen Stone, Jane Picknell, Steve Thorpe, Dale Vidmar, Brian Stonelake, Pat Acklin, Hart Wilson, Mark Krause, Sue Walsh, Jim Hatton, Lee Ayers, Stephanie Keaveney, Andrew Ensslin, Sarah Westover.

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:02.

**Approval of minutes from April 29**

Carter moved that the minutes from the April 29 meeting be approved. Mohammad seconded the motion, which passed. King, Gentry, and Belcastro abstained.

**Announcements**

* Waters announced that the Varsity Theater will host the upcoming Student Film Festival as part of SOAR. This event is judged by a panel and normally fills the Meese Auditorium, so the Varsity has donated space from 7-9 Tuesday, May 14.
* Vidmar announced that Pre-SOAR events will begin at 11:45 tomorrow in the SU Courtyard.

**Comments from Provost Klein**

* Klein announced that Richard Hutton is on campus and will speak. Hutton teaches in UC Santa Barbara’s Film and Media Studies program, and he was VP at Vulcan Productions. Hutton’s talk will take place at 7:00 in the Meese Auditorium tonight.
* The Faculty Brass Quintet will perform at 7:30 to kick off SOAR festivities.
* Prioritization reports will be released on Wednesday, and a forum will be held to answer questions. Klein will be a guest on Thursday’s 8:00am broadcast of Jefferson Public Radio to discuss the report.
* Senate Bill 270 is still alive—The 300+ page document is currently in the Ways and Means Committee for review.

**ASSOU Report**

ASSOU elections were held, and new officers have been elected. The transition to the new leadership team has begun.

**Advisory Council Report**

King attended the House Forum that took place during AC, so he was not in attendance at the meeting. Waters reported that AC discussed agenda items for this Senate meeting.

**Information Items:**

**Embedded Assessment, Assessment Committee – Jim Hatton**

Hatton reported that the Assessment Committee recommends implementing embedded assessment for next year. Seniors (through their Capstone advisors) will submit their Capstone project to the university for assessment.

**Discussion:**

* Gentry asked if the committee has a rubric for assessing the Capstone projects? Hatton imagines that the university has a universal writing rubric that could be adapted. Assessment tools would be developed as the process goes along. USem faculty will advise since they already use this sort of rubric and assessment at the first-year level.
* Transfer students would need to be evaluated to assess how they perform compared with students who have been at SOU.
* Vidmar explained that the committee wants to look as what students are invested in as measured by the foundational goals. Departments could assess departmental goals. Outstanding samples of student work could be gathered in the Library’s Archive for use by future students.
* Part of Vidmar’s sabbatical will be spent developing a rubric for bibliographies.
* Belcastro asked if the plan would be to continue assessing foundation skills from the first USem sample, midlevel in the student’s program, and at the Capstone project. Are we currently assessing all foundational goals?
* Gentry said we are assessing Writing, Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy. The vision is to assess our students against transfers from other schools.
* McCain asked if this is a pilot. Vidmar explained that yes, this spring, a Moodle site will be open for voluntary submission. Then the committee would build the rubrics.
* Waters asked how are students recruited for participation, and she brought up the issues of confidentiality and student consent.
* Vidmar asked that professors tell students that they will get notification about the Capstone Repository, which is where they can upload papers.
* Hatton says the details will be distributed to Capstone advisors. He has talked to IRB about confidentiality and the collection of this information.
* Russell-Miller wants a timeline for this process. Hatton explained that it needs to happen by the end of the term. Wilson will send a notice to the 573 students enrolled in Capstone credits that explains the project and gives details.
* Ettlich wonders if Capstone Advisors can be copied in on these notices, and Wilson says yes, they can.
* King sees the value of this exercise but is concerned about faculty workload. Who will do this assessment? Will it be the Assessment Committee? The Capstone advisors? Hatton acknowledges that the workload is high, many options will be considered in terms of compensating for workload later.
* Sahr noted that this assessment applies to Capstone projects that are writing based. How will Capstones that are project-based be evaluated when they do not contain writing? Hatton said that the committee might consider other writing samples from senior-level courses.

**Shared Governance – Bill Hughes**

Hughes presented a document designed to work through changes in the OARs. Each institution must figure this out. It allows ASSOU to function with a clearer idea about shared governance. Wanted to make sure students get what they ask for and that we are in compliance with OARs. Feedback?

* Gentry pointed out an error, and Hughes explained that this document will be edited again.
* Ettlich noted that the first paragraph is a broad scope. Perhaps language should be clarified in order to prevent situations where students might be brought in to sensitive situations in regards to faculty issues.
* Ayers explained that there must be room for flexibility in this document in order to make effective in the long-term.
* OAR or Campus Policy: Ettlich wonders if this means at a high level? Should it also say “campus or departmental policy”? Gentry suggested that a campus policy could dictate that departments make certain rules.
* McCain inquired about the timeline of this document. Hughes explained that the document was originally drafted in 2003. Klein explained that this is the first collaborative draft. Thorpe added that in Education, students participate in committee work. Waters suggested that language be added to cover these situations.
* Ayers noted that all OUS schools have documents covering this, though they vary in length.

**Discussion Items:**

**University Studies – Lee Ayers**

Three “shell” courses have been approved for Strand courses. They are broken out by strands: H, I and J. Each one has passed through several layers of evaluation, ensuring that each meets all requirements for which it is approved.

**Discussion:**

* King asked if students who take one or two courses, not the whole set, would have met all or part of the strands. Ayers explained that all students must take all three strands and have them represented, which is an attempt to eliminate the “double counting” aspect. Each can only be counted once.
* Waters wondered if students might request that courses already taken could count as requirements. Ayers explained that this shouldn’t be a problem since the Honors College curriculum is prescribed.

**Curriculum Committee – Pat Acklin**

Acklin explained the courses and programs that are in the works. Innovation and Leadership was withdrawn for discussion today. The committee gave its unanimous support for the first three courses: HSem 101, 102, 103. Approved courses are here today, pending program approval. Only the courses are coming forward.

* Ettlich clarified that we are voting to approve courses, not the program.
* Acklin explained that the committee did not have the actual proposal. They approved the courses, but they did not have a program proposal document, so they created one.
* Ettlich feels more comfortable not voting on the program. Acklin explained that approval of these courses is essential for moving forward in fall teaching these courses.
* Sahr asked about the Houses being a pilot program. If they are pilot programs, is it possible that we approve the courses as pilots? This idea began as a pilot, but is it still?
* Karen Stone explained by defining “pilot.” She views it as a 5-6 year test period. We can’t start and stop curriculum.
* Sahr wonders if the five-year limit was the defined period. Stone explained that incoming students are coded by House and by cohort. Can’t be done in a one-year pilot. Retention issues have to be run over time. Is it a pilot? Yes. The word “pilot” is not used in documents coming forward because it might limit things to one year, which won’t work.
* Waters clarified that one year of courses has come forward. That is what is being discussed.
* Ayers explained that fall schedule is live now, and Hawaii recruiting begins next week. This approval is critical because of enrollment for fall term.
* Grimland explained that in Honors, courses have been carefully crafted by faculty and vetted by others. Perhaps it would be better to trust those with the expertise to make these decisions. Why question these decisions?
* Richards feels that we have a responsibility to review this carefully.
* Belcastro wants more specific language around the word “pilot.”
* Marlowe supports the House model, but from an ethical standpoint, how will these credits transfer?
* Gentry explained articulation of USem credits to other universities and imagines that HSem courses will be similar.
* Ayers explained that we align with ACCand U to follow national practices.
* Waters wonders if we approve the courses, are we approving the new structure?
* Carter asked about the $200 course fee. Stone says it is to cover the cohort experience. That is a maximum, and the Social Justice House isn’t charging this right now.
* Waters wonders about adjusting this fee now that tuition has increased. King says probably not.
* Waters expressed concern about those who can’t afford the fee.
* Ettlich moved to suspend the two-week rule, and Gentry seconded the motion.
* Ettlich moved that the three new HSem courses (without program), plus OAL and Military Science classes be approved. Carter seconded. The vote passed with all in favor, none opposed. There were no abstentions.

**Action Items**

**University Studies—Lee Ayers**

Ayers brought forward new courses from University Studies for approval: HSem 101, 102, 103 to be accepted as H, J, and I strands, Art 133, as an E strand, and Chem 325 as an H strand.

* Richards moved that we approve the recommendation of University Studies Committee. Sahr seconded the motions, which passed with all in favor and none opposed. There were no abstentions.

**Curriculum Committee – Pat Acklin**

Two Honors courses are coming forth from Curriculum Committee.

* Ettlich moved that we accept the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee with a minor language change discussed by Chenjeri and Ettlich at the last meeting. Sahr seconded the motion, which passed with all in favor, none opposed. Belcastro abstained.

**Ranks Language, Constitution Committee – Sherry Ettlich**

Ettlich explained that we are not voting on this now. Constitutional Committee needs direction and advice to move forward. They would like to have a charge from Senate.

* Sahr wants to table this discussion and address it in Executive Session.
* Ettlich explained the pros and cons. PSU is at about 50% tenured faculty and they are worried that implementing the Professor of Practice will increase the number of non-tenured faculty.
* Marlowe explained that for Business, this new rank is a great recruiting tool.
* Carney wonders about the legal issues concerning use of Executive Session. Waters explained that discussion surrounding rank and tenure qualify us for Executive Session.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20pm.

**Executive Session**

Non-Senate members and guests were excused, and Senate continued meeting in Executive Session.