CMU Faculty Senate
MEETING MINUTES
Date: December 7, 2023, 3:30 – 5:00pm
Venue: Center for Teaching and Learning

Senators/Representatives present:
Margot Becktell, Karl Castleton, Ann Gillies, Eli Hall, Nate Bachman (for Kristin Heumann), Deb Kennard, Christopher McKim, Kyle McQuade, Steve Merino, Josh Meuwly, Brian Parry, Nate Perry, Markus Reitenbach, Stacie Schreiner, Bill Wright (for Rhema Zlaten), Aleena Gomez

Senators/Representatives Absent:
Kathy Diehl

Guests:
Laureen Cantwell Jurkovic, Cher Hendricks, Megan Sherbenou

Renae Phillips- Recorder

I. Call to Order and Roll Call by Sign-In
   a. President Schreiner calls meeting to order at 3:30pm

II. Consent Agenda
   a. Salary and Benefits Committee Minutes, October 2023
   Motion: to approve Salary and Benefits Committee Minutes from October 2023 (Hall, Seconded McKim); Motion Carried

III. Approve Faculty Senate Minutes from November 16, 2023
   Motion: to approve Faculty Senate Minutes from November 16, 2023 (Gillies, Seconded Becktell); Motion Carried

IV. Committee Minutes and Reports to Approve
   a. Library Advisory Committee November 6, 2023
   Motion: to approve Library Advisory Committee, November 6, 2023 (Hall, Seconded Bachman); Motion Carried

   b. DFAC Minutes, November 13, 2023
   Motion: to approve DFAC Minutes, November 13, 2023 (Becktell, Seconded Meuwly); Motion Carried

   c. CMU-Tech CC Minutes, November 14, 2023
   Motion: to approve CMU-Tech CC Minutes, November 14, 2023 (Meuwly, Seconded Merino); Motion Carried

   d. UCC Minutes, November 16, 2023
   Motion: to approve UCC Minutes, November 16, 2023 (McKim, Seconded Kennard); Motion Carried

e. Academic Policies Committee Minutes, October 4, 2023
Motion: to approve Academic Policies Committee Minutes, October 4, 2023 (McQuade, Seconded Reitenbach); Motion Carried

f. Academic Policies Committee Minutes, October 25, 2023
Motion: to approve Academic Policies Committee Minutes, October 25, 2023 (McKim, Seconded Gillies); Motion Carried

V. Information Items
   a. Proposed curriculum manual change
      i. GCC will revise wording and bring back in 2024.

VI. Continuing Business
   a. Faculty Evaluations
      i. Discussion: Schreiner heard from 3 faculty members in Health Sciences. One is at an instructor level who stated that they liked the new form as it is more straight forward. One is program coordinator of MLT program and believes that the form captures more of her work than prior evaluations. One asked for a space for a longer-term performance improvement plan and if they are doing the bare minimum of a 3 and if they need a performance action plan. Cher mentioned that would be a separate process and not necessarily documented originally on the evaluation form. McKim received 2/12 gave feedback, one was an appreciation on the reduction of narrative to write and the second had appreciation of the form, but wanted to know if there was a way to integrate or auto-populate student evaluation data into the form as those took a great deal of time to add. Also, scholarship for festivals, screenings, conference panels, media interactions, etc. with the same weight as publications on the evaluation. The department would like to see a "sample" evaluation of how it would be filled. Cher confirmed there would be examples and support on how that works. Merino had four long reviews from faculty in the department, one would like to know what the nature of the five year review, is it a cut/paste from prior evaluations or otherwise. Questions about enrollment for courses and how that is utilized. There are limits to activities and how that is presented as scholarship. Cher asked for unidentified copies of the responses for further review. Wright in Social & Behavioral Sciences had ten responses from faculty with three areas of concern: procedure itself of making changes to the forms ahead of changes to the handbook, so there is a good will/good faith concern; clarify how the forms will duplicate, reduce or replace departmental forms; concerns about student evaluation and the if the weight has increased or changed; consistent identification of how biased student evaluations have been found in relationship to race and gender; concern of context clarity, no notion of how the evaluators or context of the evaluation number as it opaque. Kennard didn't have any comments in PEC, however, would like clarification on service and advising. So if the evaluation requires that you meet 80% of

service/advising and there is only one meeting a semester as opposed to once a week, how is that quantified with the scale, suggesting that service may be identified as a number of hours as opposed to number of meetings, etc.; student advising, want to know the difference between planned and organized aspect of advising; a way to identify the efficacy of effort toward the course preparation, i.e. large enrollment courses that use D2L testing as opposed to lower enrollment courses that have more hands on grading, etc. Gillies had two responses in Teacher Education, both were positive, however wanted to know why there was an enrollment number on the evaluation. Cher explained it is more for understanding of time commitment. McQuade had some responses in Biology, there was happiness that the narrative would be eliminated or constrained, but some concern that the lack of narrative would limit the ability to communicate context, mitigating experiences or teaching that didn't go the way they wanted. There was some discussion that the narrative could be valuable to junior faculty to get more substantial feedback during their early years. There was some encouragement that these are truly rough drafts as we work through the next few years. Bachman stated that Kinesiology had quite a bit of feedback, will send a summary to Schreiner. Support and clinical faculty looking at clinical evaluation form, having an issue with overload, such as the PA program, as they keep the credit hours low to keep the cost low and doesn't necessarily represent the work associated with the courses. Need to have a metric for professional practices. Professional Productivity area on the evaluation, the Program Directors feel that they should be the ones completing the evaluation of their faculty (i.e. PA/PT/OT) because they are well versed on the accreditation and requirements that the Department Head may not be as knowledgeable about and many accrediting bodies requires direct supervisors to evaluate their faculty. Department and University average scores along with personal scores to be added to evaluation. Castleton in Computer Science/Engineering had some procedural questions about keeping track to their reasoning of their self-evaluation points, as in the past they would use the narrative to do that. Perry in Business questioned if the evaluation will be offered as a Word or a fillable pdf document. It is suggested that it be a fillable pdf document. All other departments didn't have specific recommendations to share.

Motion: to recommend suspending the section of the Faculty Handbook on service and advising for this year, so that we merge service and advising for this upcoming year until it can be permanently changed.
(McQuade, Seconded Hall); Wright voted to opposed; Motion Carried
  a. Discussion: Wright suggested to be cautious with suspending faculty documents

Motion: to recommend that we replace the previously used instrument for evaluation with these draft forms that have been circulated.
(McQuade, Seconded Becktell); Wright voted to opposed; Motion Carried

a. Discussion: Parry asked about the timeline of revisiting the evaluation. Cher expects to have recommendations back to Faculty Senate by May 2024. Thus, the item will be a continuing business at that time.

VII. New Business
   a. Sabbatical Committee recommendations to senate
      i. Recommendations related to the Handbook language has been received.

VIII. Reports
   a. VPAA Report, Cher Hendricks
      i. If you attended President's meeting, please give feedback.
   b. Faculty Trustee Report, Brian Parry
      i. No report; meeting on Thursday
   c. CFAC report, Margot Becktell
      i. No report
   d. VP report, Margot Becktell
      i. No report
   e. Student Government Report, Aleena Gomez
      i. Working on many items: Adopt-A-Family, Food for Finals, Food Pantry will be closed during the holiday week. Presidential cabinet is all female led and are visiting California schools.
   f. Executive Committee Report, Kyle McQuade
      i. No report
   g. President's Report, Stacie Schreiner
      i. No report
   h. General discussion
      i. Meuwly: Fall Tech Signing Event on December 13th @ 5pm at CMU Tech

IX. Adjourn
   Motion: to adjourn the meeting
   (Becktell, Seconded McKim); Motion carried 4:26p