

Draft Minutes for Faculty Senate

February 15, 2012

3:00-5:00PM, SC310A

Attending: M Peters (AAS), M Reedy (ART), B Winning (BIOL), T Brewer (CHEM), M Evett (COSC), D Crary (ECON), S Norton (ENG), C Mayda (G&G), J Koolage (H&P), G Dumitrascu (MATH), W Zirk (M&D), P Koehn (P&A), E Martin (PS), K Saules (PSYCH), R Orrange (SAC), S Gray (WGST), T Moreno (HPHP), J Carbone (HS), S Nelson (NURS), M Bombyk (SW), M Rahman (ACC&FIN), D Chou (CIS), P Francis (L&C), L Lee (SPED), J Texter (ET), K Kustron (TS), T Brewer (Grad Council), R Baier (LIB), R Longworth (Assoc. Provost), K Schatzel (Provost)

Not attending: K Stacey (CMTA), M Zinggeler (WL), K Banerji (MGMT), D Barton (MKT&LAW), P Smith (TED)

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (approved)
2. (3:05) Approval of the minutes of the 2/1 meeting (attached)(approved)
3. (3:10) Resolution inviting regular AAUP participation at Senate meetings [Randy Baier for the FSEB]
 - a. AAUP and Senate leaders have discussed ways to improve communication between the two bodies.
 - b. Especially important where issues like bylaws are negotiated.
 - c. A representative from the AAUP will be a non-voting member.
 - d. In the past, we have been lucky that we have had some overlap between the two organizations.
 - e. Resolution brought forward:
 - i. In order to improve communication between the Faculty Senate and the Bargaining unit, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate express a standing invitation to a representative of the AAUP executive committee to attend and participate at Senate meetings without voting rights.
 - f. Comment: Perhaps we should be more specific about the role of the AAUP representative.
 - g. Comment: These (FS Meetings) are open proceedings, with minutes distributed. It seems that this is not enough? (Minutes are distributed after the fact)
 - h. Purpose of this resolution is to establish a policy, one that exists regardless of President.
 - i. Comment: Part of the motivation is to formalize the relationship, with clear lines of communication between the groups.
 - j. Comment: Having an official member to advise on the contract is important and useful – they will know more about the contract.

- k. Comment: A single individual will not sway the entire room. It always comes down to the vote, and the representative is not a voting member.
 - l. Comment: There are important distinctions between the AAUP and the Faculty Senate, the Senate was in place before the AAUP came along, in a slightly different form.
 - m. Comment: This resolution doesn't go far enough. Would like to see the chairs of all college advisory councils having a seat at this meeting.
4. (3:15) Parking issues [Mike Hague, guest]
- a. Parking moved from DPS to Finance around 18 months ago to ease the load on DPS.
 - b. See attached notes.
 - c. Raised parking rates
 - d. Instituted the shuttle routes to/from free parking.
 - e. Selling AATA bus passes at a reduced rate.
 - f. Pay-in-lane machines replaced booths, and can operate 24/7.
 - g. New citation machines coming in soon.
 - h. Question: Have the number of faculty parking spaces changed? (no.)
 - i. Comment: University vehicles occupy useful slots for parking. (the parking committee is working on this)
 - j. Every lot will be painted and re-stripped on a 3-year cycle.
 - k. Capital plan calls for \$1M a year, but parking lots are very expensive. The Bowen lot renovation was around \$1M.
 - l. Comment: How far do we need to go to get *free* bus passes? (These are very expensive! Discounted passes are a good step.)
 - m. Comment: Faculty lot near the Ann St. lot is empty much of the time. These reserve lots anger our students. These reserved spots can be shared, and this shared use is encouraged.
 - n. Question: Do we use a cadet corp or students for ticketing? (Student crews work events and some ticketing. DPS handles handicap slots.) Is there some way to build some relief into the assignment of slots – Friday evening the Oakwood lot is 1/3 full, and there are *lots* of tickets in evidence. (There are no more free lots on campus.)
5. (3:35) Honoring Sally McCracken's Senate service
- a. After many years of service, Sally McCracken is retiring. She has led the Faculty Senate and the AAUP.
 - b. Resolution attached
6. (4:00) Resolution to support changes to the GenEd QR requirements [Chris Foreman & Chris Gardiner, guests]
- a. AAUP contract requires the FS to approve changes to General Education programs/courses.
 - b. Original set of 12 outcomes were not in any logical order, and were confusing. These 12 steps were re-organized into 4 steps, with all prior steps included in them.
 - c. The deleted step came under discussion.
 - d. Resolution passes, 23 Aye, 1 Nay.

7. (4:15) Resolution supporting EEFC's call for Classroom Technology [David Crary]
 - a. This resolution is up for a vote.
 - b. FSEB has discussed this resolution, and has added a little more detail concerning technical support and maintenance.
 - c. Suggestions: Please specify the dimensions of the blackboard/whiteboard, and consider making sure that both types are available. Rooms that can be darkened are important as well.
 - d. Locking rooms: Unpleasant that the rooms need to be locked in between classes. Perhaps making laptops available to faculty would obviate these needs.
 - e. Comment: There is a worry that a one-size model won't fit the variety of needs different departments have? Is there the necessary flexibility? (This proposal is to create a system – we currently don't have one! The document does specify that there will be departments that will have special needs.)
 - f. Comment: Good chairs in the classrooms are necessary – most of ours are 50 years old.
 - g. Comment: VCRs?: (Are recommended to be available on request.)
 - h. Moved and seconded.
 - i. Approved, one abstention.
8. (4:25) Provost Office's "Minutes"
 - a. Cake was terrific.
 - b. Potential changes to student advising? (R Longworth)
 - i. Arts and Sciences does not have a college advising system. They are considering re-establishing a system, however.
 - ii. BoR had seen a lot of the data concerning student dissatisfaction with advising, and has started discussions.
 - iii. Online note system has been proposed – this will store all notes about how a given student has been advised.
 1. Might reduce "Answer Shopping"
 - iv. Also looking at other models for advising.
 - v. Not looking to move resources away from colleges.
 - vi. Comment from K Shatzl: has spoken with students, "we have too many moving parts" in our advising system.
 1. Number one issue with students is advising. Every student she spoke with had a personal story of advising problems.
 - vii. Comment: It is important for there to be a set of documentation that both the advisor and the student receives.
 - viii. Comment: Is this notes system too expensive for us to buy? (It is not cost prohibitive, we're just not ready to commit on a system.)
 - ix. This system will work for both undergraduate and graduate programs.

- x. Comment: We have no idea who to send students to for non-major advising.
 - xi. Comment: "Advising" is too broad of a term. There are many sub-categories to advising. The system needs to include new words for different kinds of advising.
 - c. Repairs in the library have proceeding nicely. The hangers for pipes had to be redesigned and rehung.
 - d. The Provost has now completed her tour and appreciates all of the support.
 - i. Common themes:
 - 1. Budget process
 - 2. Advising
 - 3. International issues
 - 4. What are we doing with EPEO?
 - 5. What are we doing with the College of Technology?
- 9. (4:35) Appointments:
 - a. GenEd Course Vetting (monthly, M 3:30-5:00) (3 yr. term)
 - i. U.S. Diversity (Beth Currans, WGST) (Appointed)
- 10. (4:40) Committee Reports
 - a. EEFC [David Crary]
 - b. Univ. Budget Comm. [Mahmud Rahman]
 - c. Student Success Council [Marti Bombyk]
 - d. eFellows/FDC [Randy Baier]
 - i. eFellows will announce the next series of proposals on Friday 2/17, due date is 3/16
- 11. (4:55) President's Remarks
 - a. The February Board of Regents meeting
 - b. Moving the Senate office
 - c. Next FS meeting: March 7, 2012, in SC310. Next FSEB meeting is February 22, 2012, SC304.

A Resolution Supporting Classroom Technology

Resolution 20120215.1

From the Faculty Senate Executive Board

The Faculty Senate accepts the EEFC December 2011 Classroom Technology Proposal as a crucial step in supporting and enhancing educational delivery at Eastern Michigan University and recommends its implementation, with reliable equipment, as a high priority.

The Faculty Senate further recommends that the EEFC consider in more detail:

- 1) maintaining adequate technical support for existing equipment.
- 2) providing campus-wide tech support for evening and weekend classes, at least at start of each semester.
- 3) maintenance, reliability and user-friendliness of current equipment.
- 4) supplying in-class reference materials describing the use of equipment and "Help" contact information.
- 5) adding lecture capture as an additional enhancement for classroom equipment.

Changes to the Quantitative Reasoning Component of General Education (from Chris Foreman, GenEd Director)

[Please note that the footnotes are on the last page of this agenda]

As we enter the fifth academic year since launching EMU's General Education Program, *Education for Participation in the Global Community*, we reflect upon the impact on student learning, and begin the process of making any recommendations and/or adjustments to learning outcomes and/or teaching practices.

A group of faculty teaching courses in the Quantitative Reasoning category¹ have met at various stages over the past three year to discuss the outcomes, review current external benchmarks, review internal assessments of student learning, and discuss possible ways to enhance teaching and learning in QR courses. For the purposes of better clarifying the QR outcomes and simplifying the assessment process, the following regrouping and modifications are being recommended. In addition to faculty focus groups and dialogues, data from a two-year assessment of MATH 110 courses is also referenced NOTE: The modified outcomes indicate the original outcome being addressed. With the exception of the deletion of the original outcome #7, there are no significant changes other than a clustering of the original outcomes into four (4) outcomes with indicators of learning.

This recommendation has been reviewed, and approved, by the General Education

Assessment subcommittee, the General Education Course Vetting subcommittee, and the General Education Advisory Council.

Additionally, the proposal was submitted to all departments with QR offerings and has been reviewed and endorsed by the following departments: Computer Science, Mathematics, Philosophy, Political Science, Sociology, and School of Technology Studies.

In accordance with Article XIII(388), and given that this involves “credit producing areas and instructional matters ... affecting more than one (1) college,” the General Education Advisory Council is requesting the Faculty Senate to review the “Proposal to modify the Quantitative Reasoning (QR) Outcomes and provide applicable recommendations to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

Proposal to modify the Quantitative Reasoning (QR) Outcomes

Listed below are four (4) QR outcomes with indicators of learning. Please accept these four outcomes as defined as replacing previously articulated outcomes for Quantitative Reasoningⁱⁱ

Students will learn to solve real-life problems using a mathematical modeling process.

They will learn to:

- 1) Build an appropriate model.
 - a) Estimate an answer to the problem [5]
 - b) Identify important components of the model [1]
 - c) Collect or generate appropriate data [3]
 - d) Analyze the situation using arithmetic, geometric, algebraic, and probabilistic or statistical methods. [4]
- 2) Use the model to solve the problem.
 - a) Propose a solution [6]
 - b) Evaluate **the reasonableness of the solution.** [6] ⁱⁱⁱ
- 3) Communicate the results of their analysis.
 - a) Share the findings in oral **or** written reports using appropriate mathematical language. [9]^{iv}
 - b) Write summaries to explain how they reached their conclusions. [10]
 - c) Communicate quantitative relationships using symbols, equations, graphs, and tables. [8]
- 4) Evaluate the model.
 - a) Draw other inferences from the model. [11]
 - b) Identify the assumptions of the model [2]
 - c) Discuss the limitations of the model. [12]
 - d) ~~Predict outcomes in other situations based on what they have learned from their analysis.~~ [7]^v

BALLOT

1. Appointments:
 - a. GenEd Course Vetting (monthly, M 3:30-5:00) (3 yr. term)
 - i. U.S. Diversity
 - ii. Arts

ⁱ Bill Sverdlik (COSC); Gisela Ahlbrandt (MATH); Kim Rescorla (MATH); Sandy Becker (MATH); Chris Gardiner (MATH); Carla Tayeh (MATH); Jeff Bernstein (PLSC); Donna Selman (SOCL); Paul Schollaert (SOCL); John Preston (STS)

ⁱⁱ The original QR outcomes:

1. Identify an appropriate model
2. Identify and discuss assumptions
3. Collect or generate appropriate data
4. Analyze a situation using arithmetic, geometric, algebraic, and probabilistic or statistical methods
5. Estimate answers
6. Propose and evaluate solutions
7. Predict outcomes in other situations based on what they have learned from their analysis
8. Understand and communicate quantitative relationships using symbols, equations, graphs, and tables
9. Share their findings in oral and written reports using appropriate mathematical language
10. Write summaries to explain how they reached their conclusions
11. Draw inferences from a model
12. Discuss the limitations of the model

ⁱⁱⁱ rationale: The outcome as originally written is confusing; for example, "evaluate" what? In order to refine anything, there must first be something evaluated, which is whether or not the proposed solution is "reasonable". If reasonable, then it is appropriate.

^{iv} rationale: It is essential that students communicate the result of their analysis, but there are times when written reports are more appropriate than oral, and times when oral reports alone are sufficient

^v rationale: Based upon data from a two-year assessment of MATH110 and other MATH QR Choice courses, there is significant evidence to suggest that "predicting outcomes in other situations" is a higher-level outcome that is difficult to achieve in an introductory course in quantitative reasoning. Whereas faculty would identify this as a desired goal, most would also agree that this what is more essential is that students can draw inferences, identify assumptions, and discuss limitations.