

CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Faculty Senate - Meeting Notes 05/03

Date:	05/03/2021	Chair:	Peter Casey
Time:	3:30-4:30 PM	Notes:	Austin Rieger
Place:	Online (Zoom)	Agenda Maker:	Peter Casey
Zoom:	https://cocc.zoom.us/j/93162063774?pwd=RytHNGh6YlhXamtiODM1V2ZjSUdPQT09 (coccenate)		

Attendees:	Peter Casey - CUL, BUS/AV, CIS	Sara Henson - SocSci, WLC, LIB
	Riki Dela Cruz - ADJ/PT	Mike Artus - R/M/Prineville
	Amy Wheary – AH, NUR, NIR	Amy Harper* - Faculty Forum
	Jessie Russell - SCI, MTH, HHP	Betsy Julian - VPI
	Tony Russell - HUM, FA, COM	Michael Hansen* - Chairmoot
	Becky Plassmann - DEV MTH, WR, AD,	<i>* Non-voting members</i>

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Introduction of Guests
3. Approval / Correction of minutes (2 min.)

Fix next meeting date at bottom. No other changes needed.

4. Committee Reports, etc.
 - a. Chairmoot – Michael Hansen (5 min.)

Update from RSC committee. Some courses are being reviewed, have been given 1-year extension due to current conditions. Conversation about Winter and Spring 2022 classes. Discussed which delivery methods will be used. Will be reviewed in Fall. Reorganization of instructional departments is nearly complete; announcement will follow when final decisions are made.

- b. Academic Affairs (5 min.)

AA has not met since last Senate meeting.

- c. Other – Elections, Avon F. Mayfield Award (<https://bit.ly/2OTNOV9>) (5 min.)
 - i. Three nominations to date. Senate email vote May 10th, rank your choices....?

Peter will wait through the end of this week for further nominations. Will send out nominations to Senate next week. Will ask all Senators to vote for the winner. Will be ranked voting.

5. Communication/Blackboard (5 min.)
 - a. Suggestions
6. Discussion of Proposals: Second Readings
 - a. Student Evaluations: Removing Inappropriate Comments (5 min.)

Idea for a grandfather clause and timeline for addressing comments will be future proposals, not added to the current proposal.

Becky Plassmann motioned to approve the second reading of this proposal, Tony Russell seconded, motion passed unanimously.

- b. Service to the Community: Language (Tony Russell) (20 min.)
 - i. Tabled at last meeting, discuss edits.

Becky Plassmann motioned to approve the second reading of this proposal (as amended), Amy Wheary seconded, motion passed.

Tony shared an updated version of the proposal with edits that were suggested during previous Senate meetings. Updated proposal is similar enough that we are replacing it without starting over at first reading again.

7. Discussion of Proposals: First Readings (10 min.)
 - a. Emeritus Listing lasts forever in the catalog (Peter Casey)
 - b. Posthumous Emeritus status awards (Peter Casey)
 - c. Name a building for John Overbay (Peter Casey)
 - d. ADDITION: Grade Appeals Process (Sara Henson)

Proposal suggests having Faculty Senate take over process of appointing the Grade Appeals Committee as it should now be responsible for faculty concerns and issues. There are questions over where this process should live.

Tony Russell motioned for to approve this proposal for first reading, Peter Casey seconded, motion failed.

Senate discussion included whether grade appeals is a faculty concern or a student/academic concern.

Points made:

- Grade Appeals is a faculty member's decision being disputed, so it is a faculty issue
- Has Academic Affairs been asked how they feel about this?
- Will students feel that they are receiving as fair of a chance going to a Faculty Senate subcommittee instead of Academic Affairs?
- Only part about the grade appeals process that would change is the committee responsible for appointing members. Rest of process would stay the same.
- Faculty Senate does not have the authority to make this change, it would only be a recommendation to Academic Affairs if approved.
- Neither Faculty Senate's or Academic Affairs' charge mention grade appeals, maybe it should be added to their official charge.
- Grade appeals need to be fair and unbiased. Having the decisions made by Faculty Senate appointees could seem one-sided versus Academic Affairs, which has broader college representation.

Potentially will edit and bring to first/second reading at next Senate meeting.

8. Suggestions for potential proposals (time remaining)
 - a. Student Evaluations: Usage – Formative and Summative or only Formative Taskforce
 - b. Student Evaluations: Review Evaluation Questions Taskforce

- c. President's Senior Leadership Team: Add a non-voting Faculty Senate member
 - d. Increase 'Shared Governance' value for Faculty, training?
 - e. Incentives for Faculty to actively engage in at least the "top level" committees.
 - f. Limit faculty to one "top level" committee per year
Top Level: College Affairs, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs,
Faculty Senate, Promotions, Tenure
 - g. Require a minimum of four peer visits per peer team member
 - i. Require consistent use of peer review form (currently not available for full time?)
 - ii. Require consistent use of online peer review form for online courses. (draft available)
 - iii. Require classroom observation training (*defined in official practices*)
 - h. Create peer mentoring choice for all faculty (*currently only used for new faculty*)
 - i. Make peer team/peer mentoring higher value in summative evaluations
 - j. Provide additional clarity what "faculty-related issues" means in the Faculty Senate Committee Charge.
 - k. Invite the College President to the first or second Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year to discuss any plans directly affecting the Faculty.
9. Announcements (1 min)
- a. Next meeting: 05/17/2021, 3:30-4:30
 - b. Other?
10. Adjourn