

Eastern Oregon University – Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

October 5, 2010 3:00 p.m., Hoke 301

Presenter and/or Time	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action and Outcome
President Kathleen Dahl, 3:00 pm	<b>Call to Order and Welcome</b>		
	<b>In Attendance, Introductions</b>	Kathleen Dahl, Jeff Johnson, Frederick Pratter, Leandro Espinosa, Frank Bushakra, Karyn Gomez, Mitchell Ornelas, Steve Adkison, Beth Upshaw, Jeff Dense, Darren Dutto, Sarah Witte, Charles Lyons, Jessica Plattner, Jodi Varon, Ted Atkinson, Doug Briney, David Drexler, Mary Fields (Phone), Tonia St. Germaine	
K. Dahl	<b>Minutes Approval</b>	June 1, 2010 minutes will be approved at the November 2 meeting.	<b>Minutes approval postponed.</b>
	<b>President's Update</b>	None.	
K. Dahl	<b>Action Items</b>	<p><b>Old Business:</b></p> <p>None for action.</p> <p><b>New Business:</b></p> <p><b>Election for Senate Secretary for 2010-11</b></p>	<b>Jessica Plattner agreed to serve as Secretary for Fall Term.</b>
K. Dahl, K. Shorts, L. Jerofke, S. Adkison	<b>Senate Information Items</b>	<p><b>Kathleen Dahl</b></p> <p>Shared Governance Committee met on 9/23 – K. Dahl, K. Shorts, Jennifer Forbus, B. Davies, S. Adkison. They will meet once or twice per term to increase the flow of information between Senate and University Council. Generally discussed upcoming issues and Dahl asked for and received funds to send people to meetings.</p> <p>Issues discussed: 1) Improving flow of communication, 2) Growing pains associated with incorporation of Distance Education Division, - Need a “face” for DDE – Need to stay at the forefront of distance education; 3) Meetings coming up: Oregon Faculty Senate presidents or representatives’ retreat in Eugene, Oct. 25, 2010 and AAUP Share Governance Conference/Workshops in Washington, D.C. in November 2010. Jeff Dense has volunteered to attend these meetings and report back. The President’s and/or Provost’s offices are covering travel costs.</p>	<b>Jeff Dense attending OFS retreat at AAUP conference. President/Provost will support travel.</b>

Eastern Oregon University – Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

October 5, 2010 3:00 p.m., Hoke 301

Presenter and/or Time	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action and Outcome
		<p><b>Kathryn Shorts</b> Not in bylaws to have a University Council representative at senate. However, it helps to keep information flowing in both directions. Doug Briney agreed to serve as liaison between the two groups</p> <p><b>K. Dahl for Linda Jerofke</b> The two colleges now have disparate review procedures and the Faculty Handbook needs to be updated in order to clarify the review process for Senior Instructor and Fixed Term Assistant Professor. The Promotion and Tenure link on the web site still has language from 2009. The link needs to be updated with the correct language.</p> <p><b>Steve Adkison</b> stated that if there are procedural questions, these should go through the senate committees (such as EPCC) or to senate directly. The same is true for Faculty Senate Committee, but there are some things that there are no stated procedures for. There are a range of tasks coming to different committees this year and we need to have clear and open communication but that doesn't always happen. We need procedures clarified for communicating between different committees and senate. Agreed that the Faculty/Staff Handbook needs to be updated (e.g. process for moving from Assistant to Full and DPD-related questions relative to the review process – These discussions would come to senate before EPCC and would be changed by the Provost's Office).</p>	<p><b>Doug Briney agreed to serve as liaison between University Council and Senate.</b></p>
<p><b>S. Adkison, et al</b></p>	<p><b>Senate Discussion Items</b></p>	<p><b>S. Adkison</b> Course evaluations discussion. Consider the following: Why do we use them? What do we use them for? What are we trying to find out? Do we need them for formative feedback? (yes). Do we use them in an annual review? (yes). How well does the professor know his or her subject? We ask students to give feedback on the instructional behavior they experience. The course evaluation doesn't need to be a direct measure of teaching. It is an indirect data source to look at patterns of teaching behavior. We can check information from a syllabus review, which should have clear expectations communicated to students. We can triangulate data.</p> <p>Offered the UC Berkeley model c. 1992 (updated since then) regarding classroom behaviors. Not suggesting all 40 items, but all are backed by reams of</p>	

**Eastern Oregon University – Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

October 5, 2010 3:00 p.m., Hoke 301

Presenter and/or Time	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action and Outcome
		<p>data regarding validity and reliability (for each survey item). We could pick and choose and could do a midterm and end of term evaluation regarding the effectiveness of running the class. Cal State Faculty Development Office has a model. Used in Denver. Used to help faculty measure teaching effectiveness. High correlations (.8) between learning and teaching effectiveness. What might we use to construct meaningful data? Departments he has worked with in the past have looked at parts of this (an instructional behavior survey for students with open-ended questions). We can set up a common bank of questions and create software that would allow us to deal with data in a matter of minutes.</p> <p><b>Jodi Varon / Charles Lyons</b> Reported that the most current draft of faculty evaluation revision had been on the senate page and taken to the schools but nothing was finalized at the end of spring term. They collected other schools' forms for on campus and online evaluations. We also deal with the fact that students would not necessarily fill it out for online classes. In some schools, students can get their grades early if they fill out the evaluation. One problem is that the evaluation is not given to the professor in a timely manner and is therefore not formative feedback.</p> <p><b>Steve</b> If the senate approves an evaluation form, his office will operationalize it. Need to keep in mind ranking scale, legality questions, how many questions to ask, word-smithing. Needs to work within the FPC to create a one-size-fits-all model – equivalent method that the accreditation review team asked for.</p> <p><b>Discussion (various speakers)</b> Consider the differences across disciplines and across modalities. Consider outcomes assessment. Consider where knowledge comes from. It is critical that we settle this quickly on behalf of those up for review. Quantitative data and qualitative data. Each individual item has been vetted for reliability, but not the whole instrument. Jeff D. said we need to work with what was on the table last spring. May need to start over but we are so far down the old path we need to put that one in place or as a senate restart whole process.</p> <p>Steve said his office could meld the old and the new as a starting point. Jodi said it was not clear in the process when to talk with constituents and how their input was considered. It was never clear when the process would end; there was</p>	

**Eastern Oregon University – Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

**October 5, 2010 3:00 p.m., Hoke 301**

Presenter and/or Time	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action and Outcome
		<p>always ongoing revision and dissatisfaction at some level. Darren said a set of these assessment questions could be for both on campus and online, and some would just be for online. We need to consider what is important for both. Frank asked if schools could make their own from this list. Steve suggested doing a small core of the same questions then add different ones for different disciplines that are more process-oriented.</p> <p>Frederick asked us to remember what we are doing this for. Is it for accreditation? Formative feedback? Evaluative/summative feedback? Should we be consistent across modalities? FPC and the Provost’s office can work to map new ideas onto last draft. Jeff D. discussed the response rates for online students and the need to access all students, not just those with an axe to grind. We should have students as a part of the discussion in developing the instrument.</p> <p><b>K. Dahl</b>            Jeff D. and Kathleen will meet with Bob to discuss plan for meeting about this. Kathleen will email faculty for input. Jeff J. stated the IFS provides the opportunity to discuss shared governance structures across institutions.</p>	
	<b>5 Minute Access</b>	None.	
	<b>Good of the Order</b>	None	
	<b>Next Meeting</b>	Next Meeting will be in November 2, 2010.	

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
 M. Ruth Davenport