

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes March 22, 2018 UC 221

Senators/Reps in attendance:

James Ayers, Kelly Bevill, Anne Bledsoe, Joshua Butler, Lisa Friel-Redifer, Kristen Hague, Darin Kamstra, Meredith Lyons, Chad Middleton, Nathan Perry, Dan Schultz-Ela, Carmine Grieco (Proxy for Elizabeth Sharp), Sarah Swedberg, Thomas Walla, Jared Workman, Sandie Nadelson (Proxy for Karen Urban), Ben Linzey

Senators/Reps absent:

Pamela Holder, Elizabeth Sharp, Karen Urban

Guests in attendance:

Lisa Driskell, Tim Pinnow, Kurt Haas, Karl Castleton

Minutes Recorder: Renae Phillips

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL BY SIGN-IN

The meeting was called to order by President Josh Butler at 3:32 pm.

President Butler welcomed guests and reminded senators and guests to sign the circulating Roll Call sheet.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Motion: to accept the items on the Consent Agenda (Swedberg/seconded); motion carried unanimously

Discussion: none.

- **A.** GCC Minutes 2/27/2018
- **B.** UCC Minutes 2/22/2018
- **C.** UCC Minutes 3/8/2018
- **D.** Faculty Success Minutes 2/5/2018

III. APPROVE FACULTY SENATE MINUTES OF 3/1/2018 MEETING

Motion: to approve the Faculty Senate minutes of March 1, 2018, as corrected (Ayers/seconded); motion carried unanimously.

Discussion: Middleton pointed out that in item IV.B, the phrase "President Butler broke tie, with yea, ..." has been found to be irrelevant according to Robert's Rules of Order because abstentions do not count toward determining whether a motion passes. That wording will be deleted.

IV. COMMITTEE MINUTES AND REPORTS TO APPROVE

A. Distance Learning and Technology Report

Motion: to approve the Distance Learning and Technology Report (Schultz-Ela/seconded); motion tabled.

Discussion: Clarification was requested of the meaning that online enrollment caps are "congruent" with current enrollment in face-to-face courses, which is stated as current policy under the Enrollment Cap Discussion of the report. The understanding of current policy is that there are no specific enrollment caps for online classes, but in general the online and face-to-face courses should be similar in size. Around 2013, the Department Heads met with Dr. Futhey and President Foster. At that time, they decided that the enrollment cap for online courses should be no larger than for face-to-face courses. That decision was reaffirmed by Dr. Pemberton, so that is the current policy.

Swedberg asked why online would be capped at 40 but face-to-face has a larger cap, such as 55 and some up to 80. Discussion points included the need for the institutions' financial support for more faculty to allow for more, but smaller, sections. The Distance Learning committee only considered online courses—not face-to-face courses—so they cannot speak to the issue of class size for the latter.

Middleton asked whether the committee voted on the report and if any members dissented. Castleton confirmed that an e-mail vote constituting a quorum was majority positive, but there were some non-responses that were considered abstainers.

Middleton asked about "the research generally makes recommendations..." What research recommends, for example, a cap of 40? The committee can delve into the specifics of that, but the section in question was indeed data driven, including a list of papers in a dissertation.

Friel-Redifer stated that she does not teach online, but does supplemental online discussions and it seems that online contact requires more time to review and teach than face-to-face. Do larger online enrollments encourage more automated instruction? Pinnow agreed with the time commitments and cited that Quality Matters criteria aim for a cap of 35 for an online course.

Questions arose about taking instruction completely out of our community and supplementing it with instructors elsewhere. Some online students still come to campus to meet with faculty. We have many departments that cannot hire enough adjuncts within the local community to facilitate the course sizes of face-to-face as well as online courses. Does that take the instruction "out of our hands" by having faculty members who are not within the Grand Junction community? Discussion ensued about how increasing faculty through online adjuncts, etc., could show demand for more 0.8 or tenure track positions on campus. Many of the problems with class size and compensation are institutional and "hidden," rather than specific to the discussion of online instruction.

Is there a way to monitor student satisfaction to help determine enrollment caps? No research on that, but willing to take a look at it as a possibility for support. Did anyone pull CMU data? Congruence means that there are not generally significant enrollment cap differences for online versus face-to-face, but that is a good review area for those courses that do have different sizes.

The process to fully implement the recommendations is going to be gradual, probably over about three years. The committee recognizes that there are costs built in.

A questioner asked how many faculty will be affected by the changes—potentially over 35 or so faculty teach more than the proposed enrollment cap of 40 online students in a class. Those faculty tend to be clustered in specific departments.

The cost/fees of an online course are similar to face-to-face courses, which the faculty appreciate.

Walla stated that although the biology department does not have large enrollments, his concern is that online adjunct faculty may be out of the Grand Junction community and we cannot regulate the number of classes they may also be teaching at other institutions.

Middleton said that he would be sure to add recommendations from the Faculty Senate to specific points he will make at the Board of Trustees meeting.

Discussion ensued about compensation, which is intertwined with the enrollment caps. Pay based on a flat rate per hour would be horrendously expensive. Some faculty would have their salary cut because of decreased enrollment under the recommended cap. A compensating increase in sections runs into the limit on overloads. However, a larger number of faculty could see increased pay because of the increased rate for small classes, although the aggregate amount of losses could be much larger than the gains.

Concerns were raised regarding a lack of feedback from departments and uncertainty about voting.

Motion: to table discussion of the Distance Learning and Technology Report until the April 5, 2018 meeting.

(Ayers/seconded); motion carried unanimously.

Motion: to thank Karl Castleton and the Distance Learning and Technology Subcommittee for this Report.

(Avers/seconded); motion carried unanimously.

V. CONTINUING BUSINESS

A. None

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. None

VII. REPORTS

A. CFAC report, James Ayers

Report: Department heads will be solicited for committee memberships. Ayers will be stepping down as the CFAC representative—a replacement will be needed.

B. Student Government Report, Ben Linzey

Report: ASG is focusing on elections. Organizations are hiring, so any students who might be looking to expand their experiences should be encouraged to apply—contact Linzey if interested. Luau tickets are on sale. Follow-up discussions with Pua Utu and John Marshall have been held concerning safety on campus. All classrooms without locks are being addressed.

C. Executive Committee Report, Dan Schultz-Ela

Report: Nothing substantive to report.

D. Faculty Trustee Report, Chad Middleton

Report: None

E. President's Report, Joshua Butler

Report: John Marshall says there will be several campus safety training sessions in April; you are urged to attend.

F. Update from Academic Affairs

Report: The round of spring position requests has been decided. Budget reports have been essentially finalized. Department Heads should know the results.

VIII. ADJOURN

Motion: to adjourn the Faculty Senate meeting of March 22, 2018 (Swedberg/seconded)

Meeting adjourned at 4:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Renae Phillips, Minutes Recorder