

Augsburg University Faculty Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 10, 2018 at 3:40 p.m.
HC 150B, Augsburg University

Parliamentarian Bob Groven presided and called the meeting to order at 3:44 p.m.

First Word

Associate Professor of Chemistry, Joan Kunz, and Assistant Professor of Education, Joaquin Munoz, provided a First Word.

Approval of Minutes

The Faculty Meeting minutes from 9/12/18 were approved.

Approval of Agenda

One small change to the agenda, an announcement by David Matz, Interim Dean of Arts and Sciences, was added.

Announcements

David Matz introduced Kerri Maher, new program coordinator for the Arts and Sciences.

Bob Groven made an announcement about scholarship weekend, which will take place January 25 and 26. The committee will need help from faculty for one hour on Fri., Jan. 25, either 3-4 pm or 4-5 pm to help conduct and evaluate interviewees. Training will be provided. Hoping to invite 100 students. Will need 25 faculty evaluators.

Faculty Senate Report - Milda Hedblom

Milda announced Bob Groven's election as the Faculty advisor to the Board of Regents. She spoke about the president's visit with the Senate regarding budget adjustments following the enrollment shortfall. The UC Resources Committee has been asked to work on long-term budget matters, especially considering possible lower levels of enrollment in the future.

The Personnel Policies Committee has been meeting with Faculty Senate, and reporting on their work in updating the Faculty Handbook. They are working on faculty rights in naming members to search committees. Senate had a role in naming members to the Dean of Arts & Sciences search committee.

The Gen Ed redesign team also made a report at a recent Senate meeting. The issue of cost and time associated with implementing the new plan was raised, especially at a time when departments are cutting budgets. Questions raised included: Are stipends available? What is the cost for experiential learning programs? There is a need for data about how we think these changes will improve student outcomes.

A request came in this week to have the vote for the gen ed revision done by ballot. Milda asked Bob Groven to speak to this matter. Bob said that any faculty member can request a vote by

ballot, and that we can vote to make a future vote by ballot, but that that decision could potentially be overturned in later meetings prior to the ballot vote. No vote was made at this time.

University Course Survey Working Group - Diane Pike, Scott Krajewski, Kristen Chamberlain, Kelsey Richardson-Blackwell (Terrance Kwame Ross, Ben Denkinger)

As a result of listening sessions, the group has created a list of FAQ. The group talked about the changes the institution has undergone in 14 years since the last survey was created. There are reliability and validity issues with the current form. The team wanted to increase response rates, the utility of the data, and increase information regarding student experiences in the classroom. They wanted to bring in expertise from across campus, and, in particular, worked with student government representatives to make sure students find the tool relevant and informative.

The group believes that the proposed form more accurately captures student experience in the classroom. Attempting to measure teaching effectiveness and student learning with a form like this is highly problematic. Peer review is a better measure of teaching effectiveness than having students try to review teaching techniques. It was felt that the new form can provide a baseline of student classroom experience, and help determine when further investigation may be needed.

A vote was called to replace the old University Course Survey with the new form. The floor was then opened for discussion on the motion to replace the survey. Responses include:

- Concern that students have not received the type of education we have promised them, and that this form is not asking students to lean in, but to keep the institution at an arm's length.
- The current form opens the door to lots of problems regarding race and gender discrimination. With an improved form, this is an opportunity to demonstrate to our students that we care about the content of the form, but also care about other deeper issues.
- This new form does not prohibit faculty from asking other questions that they find to be important. Response from member of the working group that certain information is needed at an institutional level and department or course level questions are better pursued at those levels, not on a campus-wide form. This form is different because it's about what students want to tell us, not just what we want to ask them.
- First-year students might not have the context to respond to some of the questions on the revised form. If this data is broken down for chairs, feedback for faculty who teach a lot of first-years may appear to have skewed data. She said she would like to see work done before next fall to create a form that departments create with help from the committee that asks more specific questions.
- Can individual questions can be added to the form? Response that it is best to keep additional questions at the department- or course-level survey form.
- While Moodle is not required for each course, students generally expect online information to augment their face-to-face experience.
- These forms would be made available

Motion to close debate passed. Bob Groven called for a vote on the motion to install the new University Course Survey; motion carried.

Question about the intended audience of this form, particularly as it relates to the faculty review process. The primary audience for this university-wide form continues to be the course instructor and department/program chair/director in order to facilitate the understanding and improvement of student course experiences. In compliance with the Faculty Handbook, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion will have access to summaries of the student responses on this revised form as they have had with the previous form. In order to address concerns about response rates, faculty are asked to have forms completed during class time.

General Education Re-design - Jacqui deVries, John Zobitz, Doug Green, Marc McIntosh, Rebekah Dupont

The committee announced one more scheduled large group listening session regarding the Gen Ed redesign - scheduled for next Tuesday, 10/16. Lots of small group sessions remain as well.

One big idea the committee has been wrestling with is equity. They will be sharing other ideas and areas of emphasis at future faculty meetings. They expressed the need for an integrating symbol and organizing metaphor for the document. That document was inward facing for faculty, not so for students or prospective students. The committee ran through a few potential ideas for symbols and slogans but asked for more ideas.

The committee sees this change stemming from the following factors:

- Student body change in demographics
- Ethnicity and religious changes
- Equal amounts of students in the bottom percentile and top percentile of ACT reading scores
- 40% of incoming students are transfers

The committee is hoping to define equity in the curriculum as it seeks to provide a high quality, transparent education that identifies equitable pathways to student success.

Timeline: This fall is an open comment period. At the earliest, a vote may happen in the spring.

Open mic questions and comments:

- Student diversity in terms of age and background - we need to be careful about lumping together students who may seem similar at first blush (e.g., noting the importance of the AU program, but a gen ed program appropriate for an 18 yr old is not the same as one appropriate for a 45 yr old). We need to be careful that the revision is equitable towards all students.
- When asked about the learning outcomes that the proposal is hoping to meet, Jacqui confirmed that it is tied to the institutional Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

- The re-design group is still working to determine the number of (and specifically, which) courses meet certain requirements, and criteria for meeting those requirements.

Personnel Policies Committee - Matt Haines, Bob Groven

The PPC is seeking feedback regarding potential changes to Section 8 of the Handbook. In particular, the topics being considered include who runs faculty meetings and who are the voting faculty. A link to the PPC Moodle site is available on the Faculty Senate website in order to view the changes and leave feedback. Faculty can also talk directly to PPC members.

Bob Groven mentioned the awkwardness of the parliamentarian running a faculty meeting. PPC is proposing that the Senate President or designee run meetings, instead of the president, provost, or parliamentarian. Concerns/questions were expressed regarding the symbolism of the president or provost not presiding over meetings and looking at how the senate president is elected -- should this change? Should this position, then, continue to be elected by just the senate or should it be elected by the full faculty?

PPC is taking feedback now, and there will be a discussion at the Nov. 7 faculty meeting. A vote on who will preside at faculty meetings could occur at that meeting.

Milda Hedblom, Senate Chair, also asked that PPC consider the length of term for Senate members and the Senate Chair, as more time in those positions could help them to be more effective.

Meeting adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Jacob Walter, Recorder