

Academic Faculty Senate (2024-2025) Meeting MINUTES 2/14/25; 1:30-3:30 p.m.

<b>Academic Senate</b>	Call to order at 1:30 pm	ZOOM
<b>Members Present</b>	Rachelle Bassen, Patrick Bell, John Duerk, Robin Eppard, Jaspreet Gill, Mary Gillespie, Curtis Kupferschmid, Tim Mayo, Martin Schmidt, Heather Reardon, Jessica Rowe, Amy Ghilieri	
<b>Members Absent</b>		
<b>Guests</b>	Dave Riske, Ron Belbin, Geri Pope, Gretchen Stanerson, Justin McMenomy, Brigitte Dillet, Kim Desoches, Winnie Kortemeirer, Susan Priest	

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>1. Approval of Minutes for 12/13/24</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Action
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	Heather Reardon – move to approve Tim Mayo – second Passed unanimously

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>2. NWCCU Year 7 Accreditation Report (G. Pope)</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	<p><i>An overview of WNC's Year 7 Accreditation Report, highlighting key findings and faculty-related accreditation expectations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report is available on the WNC accreditation page <a href="https://wnc.edu/accreditation.php">https://wnc.edu/accreditation.php</a></li> <li>• A diverse evaluation team has been selected.</li> <li>• Faculty forum will be 2pm Wed April 2<sup>nd</sup>. Faculty should make themselves available for the forum.</li> <li>• Evaluation team will send visitation schedule to GeriP. who will make dates available to faculty/staff.</li> <li>• Within the report, evidence links will be active for anyone to browse.</li> </ul>

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>3. Scheduling Processes &amp; Course Mode Definitions (G. Stanerson)</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	<i>Regarding scheduling processes and review course mode</i>

*definitions with faculty, providing clarity on delivery formats and scheduling expectations.*

- Textbook updates: Textbook Brokers will no longer serve WNC.
- WNC textbook project phases:  
**Phases of the Project**
  - Creation of spreadsheet to capture faculty resource selections
    - 1st Phase created
    - Discipline Workbooks ready
  - Communication with Faculty
    - Initial Survey sent to Faculty via Dr. Ryan email (2/4)
    - 2/14 Gretchen attending Faculty Senate
    - 2/18 Rebecca will host a zoom, "How to Identify your Course Pacing"
    - 2/27 Gretchen open zoom hours for textbook question
- Faculty should enter textbook information when requested by division directors. Double check versions of textbooks and material (i.e. book edition). Auxiliary committee is responsible for coordinating process.
- Example of textbook spreadsheet was modeled. Drop down menu for how course resources are provided (to enter textbook information, learning platform, link to resource, etc.)
- Instructors will identify instructional modes and pacing type for courses taught.

Questions/Comments:

- Brigitte D. Is there an option for additional materials? Yes the team can add a drop down for additional materials. Is there an option for low-cost book that is not OER? Faculty would just choose the textbook option that is not OER. Will change category form to low cost rather than low cost OER.
- Patrick B. When will students be able to see textbook information? WNC website is being considered for an option for students to look up their textbook information.
- Dave R. Do students have an option to purchase their own preference of textbook (digital or physical or from different sources)? This would require faculty to enter different ISBN numbers for textbook options.
- Kim D. Is there a way to link the textbook information directly to students when they enroll? I.e. A personalized list for individual students on what textbooks they will need? Team will look into whether this is a possible option. Will ask Kyle Kelly on how this option might work.
- Martin S. Will links to textbooks show up in the WNC online course catalog? Will look into if this is a possible option.
- John D. Independent textbook sellers can take much longer to deliver to students. Suggestion is to provide students with links to which textbook sellers are the most efficient.
- Dave R. There are concerns with black market course access codes. No way for faculty to resolve this issue with students. Students need to be warned to use only approved sources (institution codes).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Martin S. How quickly can information be changed (i.e. if an instructor decides to change a textbook)? Ideally at least a month out to ensure students have not already purchased the old textbook (i.e. deadlines to return textbooks).</li> </ul> <p><u>Additional discussion on scheduling a classrooms for use:</u> It is still helpful to fill out the request form to ensure classroom is not being used. Goal of form is to find the best possible space to meet faculty needs.</p>
--	---

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>4. Faculty Development Course (J. McMenemy)</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	<p><i>Introduction of the new faculty development course, designed to support faculty in instructional growth and professional development.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This course is designed to support new faculty by providing essential best practices for quickly developing and managing a course. It offers a high-level overview of key components, including syllabus creation, module design, assignments, rubrics, mentor check-ins, peer discussions, and instructional videos, with ready-to-use templates. The course also guides instructors in meeting WNC requirements while incorporating effective teaching strategies across various modalities. Topics covered include time management, lesson planning, diverse assessment methods, student feedback, instructional reflection, unit planning, course evaluation, and strategies for wrapping up a course.</li> </ul> <p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brigitte: Who initiated this? Dr. Ryan initiated it. Who is it for? To assist new faculty in developing an effective course. We did have Irene S. go through the course module and found it very useful. Who runs the course? Josh. Is it self-paced? Somewhat self paced but regular check ins with mentor (biweekly). Who designed the course? A varied of members contributed to the course design. Who is the mentor? Josh is the course mentor.</li> <li>• Winnie K: New faculty are typically overwhelmed. This extra course may feel overwhelming for a new faculty given the course loads they may have.</li> <li>• Robin E. Is this required for all new faculty to take? No, faculty can opt out. Credit releases can be offered for current faculty if they want to participate (i.e. to review and add feedback).</li> <li>• Martin S. How is it scored? Faculty are compensated at the end, not necessarily scored. As long as faculty member is completing 70-80% of the course.</li> <li>• Justin M. Course is available for any faculty to review if they wish.</li> <li>• Curtis K. Thinks this would be very useful for new faculty.</li> <li>• Jessica R. Good option for directors to offer to newly</li> </ul>

	hired faculty. Also a suggestion is to set up connections with other teaching peers.
--	--

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>5. Online Course Review Rubric (J. McMenemy)</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info/Discussion
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	<p><i>Regarding the rubric developed by the Digital Education Committee and its impact on course quality and faculty support.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justin and Patrick presented on the OSCQR rubric on how it benefits faculty, students, and WNC as a whole.</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <p>The discussion focused on the implementation of a new rubric for online course evaluation and its impact on faculty review processes.</p> <p><b>Role of Reviewers and Observers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Susan P. asked about the role of observers in the course review, and it was clarified that they serve as content reviewers.</li> <li>The DLC would manage the peer review process but would not replace existing faculty evaluation methods.</li> </ul> <p><b>Rubric Implementation and Expectations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brigitte inquired whether the new rubric would replace the current evaluation tool for online classes, and it was confirmed that this is the goal. However, faculty will first have time to familiarize themselves with it before full implementation.</li> <li>Rachelle asked who would use the rubric, and it was clarified that it is currently intended as a self-evaluation tool. The DLC committee does not evaluate faculty but can facilitate peer reviews to enhance course quality.</li> <li>Rachelle also suggested a review of each subsection of the rubric to clarify expectations.</li> <li>John D. asked whether the rubric would become part of official online course evaluations and who would enforce changes. It was explained that the rubric would be part of the overall evaluation process, with faculty support provided in consultation with department directors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns and Policy Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Martin S. raised concerns about workload implications.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brigitte noted that faculty were previously required to conduct self-reviews and used Quality Matters as a rubric. Justin confirmed that the new rubric would replace Quality Matters.</li> <li>• Brigitte expressed that this was the first-time faculty senate had seen the rubric, but Justin countered that it had been presented the previous year and that faculty were invited to provide feedback via a recent survey.</li> <li>• Martin S. concluded that the policy would continue to be reviewed in future faculty senate meetings.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the discussion highlighted the transition to a new online course evaluation rubric, its intended role in faculty self-assessment and peer review, and concerns regarding workload and policy integration.</p>
--	--

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>6. New Program Review Template (A. Ghilieri)</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info/Discussion
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	<p><i>A presentation of the updated program review template, outlining changes aimed at streamlining the process and aligning it with institutional goals.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WNC program review template. Goal is more consistent information. Provided to program review team. (see program review template in Google drive). WNC faculty will be asked to be on program review teams. Template includes academic program review process with timeline for review process.</li> </ul> <p><u>Questions:</u> Dave Riske: Is there a way program directors can access enrollment information to help determine direction of programs? Yes, directors and faculty can ask for data through IR process.</p>

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>7. NFA Updates (R. Bassen and H. Reardon)</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info/Discussion
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	<p>Updates from the Nevada Faculty Alliance, including discussions on contract negotiations, policy advocacy, and faculty rights.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The discussion covered updates on bargaining proposals, administrative proposals, and specific faculty concerns regarding pay, workload, and policy changes.</p>

	<p><b>Bargaining Process Updates:</b> Proposed changes include updates to office hour language, annual plans and evaluations, summer pay calculation, overload pay increases, support for lab maintenance, increased tenure awards, and a return to a salary schedule. Flex and remote video facilitators were also discussed. These proposals are not final and require approval.</p> <p><b>Administrative Proposals:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase student caps for nursing clinicals.</li> <li>• NSHE opposing changes to arbitration language.</li> <li>• Reduction of instructional credits for online labs.</li> <li>• Automatic capping of open-entry classes to allow for higher student enrollment.</li> <li>• No added timeline requirements for grading.</li> <li>• A standard 1-unit stipend for faculty development courses, primarily for adjuncts.</li> <li>• Emphasis on physical presence for meetings before the semester starts, including fall welcome back and graduation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Discussion Points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about increasing open-entry course caps, as feasibility depends on the course and instructor workload.</li> <li>• Martin S. asked about distance learning stipends; admin is considering removing them but discussing a multi-campus stipend and potential mileage reimbursement for faculty traveling offsite.</li> <li>• Robin E. questioned the relationship between overload and adjunct pay. It was clarified that they are technically the same, but there is an effort to establish clearer definitions and distinctions.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the discussion focused on proposed policy changes, faculty compensation concerns, and administrative adjustments affecting workload and course management.</p>
--	--

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>8. Chair Report (M. Schmidt)</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info/Discussion
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	<i>Updates from the Faculty Senate Chair, including ongoing</i>

	<p><i>initiatives and upcoming priorities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with Kyle (open forum). Suggestion is to form a committee (5-7 member) to meet with the president outside of the faculty senate. Is there a need? Given he currently attends faculty senate. The idea is a more open forum for discussion.</li> <li>• Brigitte: Forum was helpful, but perhaps not specific people attending all of the time. Keeping it an open forum to keep communication open.</li> <li>• Will meet with peer evaluation committee on using the SUNY online course evaluation rubric.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>#. Executive updates (Dalpe)</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No update from Kyle this meeting.</li> </ul>

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>9. Policy 15-1-2: Outstanding Faculty Award</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Action
	<p><i>Faculty will vote on the proposed updates to the Outstanding Faculty Member Award policy, incorporating revisions discussed in the previous meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewed the changes in the policy decide on by faculty senate.</li> </ul> <p><u>Vote:</u> Curtis K. – move to approve John D. – second Passed unanimously</p>

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>10. Policy 15-1-2: Outstanding Faculty Award</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Action
	<p><i>Faculty will vote on the proposed updates to the Outstanding Faculty Member Award policy, incorporating revisions discussed in the previous meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 3-3-6: Grade Changes</li> <li>• Policy 3-3-7: Instructor Approval on Late Student Registration</li> <li>• Policy 3-3-12: Faculty Assigned W's</li> <li>• Policy 3-4-1: Admissions, Registration, Grades and Examinations</li> <li>• Policy 3-4-3: Even Exchange of Course</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 4-3-1: Classified Staff of WNC</li> <li>• Policy 4-3-3: Reclassifying an Existing Classified Position Guidelines</li> <li>• Policy 7-3-1: Purchasing</li> <li>• Policy 7-7-2: Institutional Sustainability Policy</li> <li>• Policy 15-1-3: Outstanding and Honored Administrative Faculty Award</li> <li>• Policy: Wildcat Esport Arena (New)</li> <li>• Policy: Video and Audio Equipment Usage (New)</li> <li>• Safety Committee Bylaws Approval</li> </ul> <p>Changes and items set aside for further review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3-4-1 to reinstate “immigrant” wording</li> <li>-Policy on Video Audio Equipment Usage set aside for further review of policy on students recording in the classroom.</li> <li>-Policy on members from Liberal Arts, WCTE, and Nursing.</li> </ul> <p>Concerning with varied safety concerns with each department. Proposal to change language to “three faculty” one from each division.</p> <p><u>Vote:</u>  Tim Mayo – move to approve  John D. – second  Passed unanimously</p>
--	---

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>9. Public Comment</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Info
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	None

<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>
<b>Action Taken</b>	Unanimously Adjourned at 4:29pm
<b>Summary of Discussion</b>	N/A
<b>Assignments/Potential Agenda Items</b>	
<b>Comments/Information</b>	Submitted by Patrick Bell, Recorder