

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, October 3, 2016, 3:30-5:00
STC Board Room
Faculty Senators

Call to order: Megan Chilson, Megan Kelly, Ashley Carlson, Erin Zavitz, Estee Aiken, Delany Hansen, Linda Lyon, Tyler Seacrest, Fred Chilson, Jack Kirkly, Michael Hengler

- Fred moves to approve the minutes with the amendment “Waiters” should be “Walters”. Erin seconds, motion passes.

- Course Evaluation
 - The old course evaluation system under SUMMA has been discontinued, so we are forced to choose another system. We have chosen Remark OMR software using our own questions that have been developed by the Course Evaluation Committee (Ashley Carlson, Laura Strauss, Eric Dyreson)
 - We will move ahead with this questions this block, but these can be changed in the future. Give feedback to the Course Evaluation Committee.
 - Online course evaluations were considered but the response rate for non-in-class evaluations is poor (and doing online, in-class evaluations may not always be feasible)
 - To get at experiential learning, question 19 which refers to “variety of in-class activities” was used.
 - Instructors will see the handwritten comments of the students, which does potentially put their anonymity at risk. However, this was seen as an acceptable risk.
 - The question was raised whether the free-response questions should be anonymous as they could potentially include personal attacks. However, it has already been agreed with the provost that the free-response questions are formative only.

- Grade Appeal Procedure
 - We talked over several potential changes to this procedure document.
 - Change the title to “Final Grade Appeal Procedure”
 - Change the Grade Appeals Committee to the University Court
 - Add language for the Provost to substitute a member of the University Court in case of a conflict of interest raised by either party
 - Drop reference to the faculty association, and instead simply say that faculty can pursue a “formal grievance” if they feel there was a problem with the case to that point.
 - We will discuss these changes next time with Nicole Hazelbaker.

- Academic Misconduct Procedure
 - A question was raised: where do Maxient reports go and who sees them?
 - Could we clarify the structure of the whole process? For example, could there be a summary of the procedure at the top?

- Instead of the instructor informing the student on appeal procedures, the instructor should simply refer the student to the dean of student's office.
 - The academic penalty from the instructor should be separate from the university sanction. For example, if the university sanction is reversed, the academic penalty could still stand.
 - We will discuss this next time with Nicole.
- Good of the order
 - October 14th Model Classroom and Legacy Plaza Dedication
 - Professor Steve Running giving a presentation to the public on climate science research October 3 at 7:30 in Block Hall 311.
- Fred moves to adjourn, Jack seconds. We hefted our bags before our eyes were blurry, we threw open the door, we left in a hurry. We ran and we jumped and we slid down the rail, we galloped, we sprinted (but we did check our mail). We hopped in our cars, we cruised down the street; finally, we were home, and we could rest our feet. Sit back, eyes closed, we started to fade. But then we remembered: Twenty exams left to grade!

Course Evaluation Committee - Question Recommendations

1. Why did you choose to take this course?
 - a. This course is a requirement for my degree major or minor.
 - b. This course is a choice among several courses required for my major or minor.
 - c. This course is a general education requirement.
 - d. This course is an elective.

2. How would you describe your attendance in this course?
 - a. I attended every class meeting.
 - b. I was absent 1-2 times.
 - c. I was absent 3-5 times.
 - d. I was absent more than 5 times.

3. How much effort did you put into this course?
 - a. I put a lot of effort into this course.
 - b. I put some effort into this course.
 - c. I put a little effort into this course.
 - d. I put very little effort into this course.

4. How would you describe your level of preparation (completed homework, readings, etc.) for class meetings?
 - a. I always came to class prepared.
 - b. I usually came to class prepared.
 - c. I sometimes came to class prepared.
 - d. I rarely came to class prepared.

5. Was a syllabus provided at the start of the course (either paper or online)?
 - a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 - c. I don't know.

6. Did the syllabus clearly describe the requirements and expectations for the course?
 - a. Yes, it was very clear.
 - b. Yes, it was mostly clear.
 - c. No, it was unclear.
 - d. I don't know.
 - e. There was no syllabus.

7. Did the professor provide clear instructions for graded assignments?
 - a. Yes, they were very clear.
 - b. Yes, they were mostly clear.
 - c. No, they were unclear.
 - d. I don't know.

8. Was the professor available during office hours?
 - a. Always.
 - b. Usually.
 - c. Rarely.
 - d. I did not use office hours.

- d. Not at all.
 - e. I don't know.
17. Did this course provide opportunities to practice skills required in this subject area?
- a. Frequently.
 - b. Sometimes.
 - c. Rarely.
 - d. I don't know.
18. Did this course introduce you to new ways of thinking?
- a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 - c. I don't know.
19. Did the professor provide a variety of in-class activities?
- a. Frequently.
 - b. Sometimes.
 - c. Rarely.
 - d. I don't know.
20. Did this course meet as scheduled?
- a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 - c. I don't know.
21. Did the professor regularly shorten class meetings?
- a. Never.
 - b. Sometimes.
 - c. Often.
 - d. Always.

Written Responses:

What things about this course worked well for you? Why?

What things about this course could be improved? Why?