Casper College Faculty Senate
Approved Minutes
Monday, January 23rd, 2012
PS 103

Call to Order: Chair Cammy Rowley called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senators</th>
<th>Senators</th>
<th>Guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cammy Rowley, SBS, Chair</td>
<td>Pete Van Houten, SBS, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Dave Cherry, VP of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Baker, FAH, Secretary</td>
<td>Bill Mixer, B&amp;I, Treasurer –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Hentzen, S, Past Chair</td>
<td>Melanie Booth, FAH – excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Burkett, S</td>
<td>Teresa Corkill, HS – absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Hornecker, S</td>
<td>Mark Kuhlman, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Lareau, FAH</td>
<td>Kelsee Miller, CEd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Moline, HS</td>
<td>Sue Morrison, HS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Murrell, EdR</td>
<td>Liz Ott, B&amp;I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Roberts, B&amp;I</td>
<td>Art Washut, SBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Cherry, Vice-President of Academic Affairs: Dr. Nolte sent out an email dealing with VP search with a breakdown of the search committee and timeline. The Gen Ed committee is closer to finishing work and issuing a report to the Senate. Dr. Cherry encouraged us to be thoughtful about our role in the process, setting a direction for the college for years to come. Enrollment for Spring is down about 7% from start of last semester; this is not a final figure due to late-starting classes. The legislature is meeting; Wyoming is in pretty good shape, but not as good as it was (we need a cold snap to make natural gas prices rise). Dr. Cherry provided some perspective on how energy prices have historically affected the college budget. It is nice to deal with increasing budgets; this makes new program decisions easier, whether to do more overload, etc. There is a possibility that we may have tighter budgets again in the midrange future, which puts pressure on small programs; but we are much better off than most schools in most states. The Senate has been working on the dean evaluation tool; as soon as we get it to Dr. Cherry he’s happy to use it and give the faculty a chance to evaluate deans. Kent Brooks discussed using open source software at the back to school meeting; he’s very enthusiastic about it, so we’re likely to use more of it at the college. The policy committee is looking at the process of moving people from probationary to continuing contract (i.e. tenure); Dr. Cherry is not sure given the policy committee’s process speed that it will be done in time for next year. There is an effort to move the process from an evaluative process to more of a mentoring process, which should be better for everybody; with a mentoring process, Dr. Cherry expects a 4-6 year process instead of a 3-5 year one. Close to 20% of our FTE is Distant Education; we don’t have a lot of full-time DE instructors, they tend to be supply rather
than tenure-eligible. As the college presence in DE becomes larger, we might need to revisit this process and decide if we want to consider making full-time DE instructors eligible for continuing contract.

Audrey: What is the best avenue to pursue that discussion—Faculty Senate, policy committee, tenure committee? Dr. Cherry: Tenure vs. continuing contract would require board approval and be a political decision; the process of revising the tenure procedure provides us the opportunity to consider that for DE in the future. Faculty will want to discuss this because from an administrative point of view it’s seductive to do more things with distant and adjunct faculty—they’re easier to manage. Dr. Cherry likes flesh and blood, full-time, tenured faculty—the kinds of things we do on, say, Senate and advising and committees, and the humanness we bring to the institution is good. More adjuncts and virtual faculty lose something that makes this place what it is. Dr. Cherry thinks the faculty should seriously consider the ramifications and whether it’s good for the institution (not just for the faculty) before making a recommendation. Audrey: Understands this point, but believes that giving DE a higher status and administrative support emphasizes its importance to the campus. Dr. Cherry: There are a lot of exciting things you can do with distance delivery, and he would rather have a well-delivered distance class than a poorly-delivered conventional class; on the other hand, the Senate is gathered here in person, not using Skype from our offices—how would we feel if a Senator lived in Connecticut? Cammy wondered if it will be conversations in individual buildings and at school meetings regarding thoughts on full-time DE, what expectations would be, etc.; the new tenure portfolio is achievable (although community involvement would be different). Cammy: Is spring enrollment being down typical after a larger fall? Is this a larger attrition than previous springs? Dr. Cherry: The figure was comparing this spring to last spring. Heath: Is it a reflection on economy and job availability, cost of education, etc.? Dave: Numbers across the state are down except in Powell; in a small state even a small movement can make percentages look big. He hopes that this means people are working and will need training in future and not that people are leaving the state to find jobs. Cammy: When thinking of money, if we need to make reductions, our overload pay can be a lot—would the administration look at load numbers, small programs put on hold, larger class sizes, or what? Dr. Cherry: I’ve been here when small programs get closed, it’s not pretty—we are certainly not there in the short term, CC has substantial reserves; I’m just feeling a change in the weather. This is just a heads-up for the midrange term—maybe I shouldn’t have brought it up. Kelsee: Having had time to process Dr. Nolte’s email, she noticed that admin, staff, the academic schools, and academic resources are represented, but not continuing ed—does Dr. Cherry know why? Dr. Cherry: No, let me take a look. Perhaps it’s a question of how finely the college should be subdivided and how big the committee should be.

Approval of Minutes: Pete moved to approve, Heath seconded, motion passed.

Treasurer’s Report: No report due to Bill’s absence; hasn’t changed from January’s Alliance meeting.

Chair Reports: No questions or comments.
**Management Council:** No recent meeting.

**Board Meeting 12/20, 1/17:** Kent Brooks’s presentation on open source software was very interesting.

**College Council:** No recent meeting.

**VP Cherry 1/18:** Will meet with Dr. Cherry again 1/25.

**Standing Committee Reports:**

**Curriculum Committee:** Packet for 1/18; Pete moved to approve, Jeanette seconded; motion passed.

**Gen Ed Committee—Heath Hornecker:** Nobody threw anything after the speaker; there have been comments back and forth from the committee about the presentation; people generally thought it was interesting, but not sure how it actually tied into what we’re doing with Gen Ed. Liz: A lot of people are disappointed with how much money we’d spent on her and then not have it specifically tied to Gen Ed. Heath: Not sure why the disconnect happened—perhaps a communication breakdown between expectations and what was provided? She had some positive things to say that went towards instructional techniques. Audrey: Kind of embarrassed that we went to bat to get her that time slot, and then she didn’t fulfill what we wanted; we need to be careful in the future. Pete: One positive was we only had a one-hour meeting, and the administration agreed it was better; but no, we didn’t get what we’d expected. The document we have tonight is a packet including the mission, goals, skills, responsibilities, knowledge (already approved), and some of the outcomes being kicked around. These outcomes are mostly rephrased outcomes that already exist in the catalog, rewritten to be assessable; some subgroups added some new ones. These have not been approved yet, the committee is just informing Senate of wording changes. By Feb. 27th, subgroups should come up with final versions, or new outcomes, and seek input from people affected by these areas. Does the Senate have a preference to review outcomes as a package deal or as subgroups? Things that come with that: we have a new list of learning outcomes, and Heath is thinking ahead about how we fit these outcomes within the 32 credit hours for all of our graduates. We also give other degrees; HLC says all graduates regardless of degree should meet same outcomes. Do we pick out 10 for everyone and all 28 for the full gen ed, or what? Mike: Will subcommittees complete at different time periods? Heath: Yes; math, for example, is already done and has met with the math faculty. The science committee rewrote the outcomes, and is looking at possibly adding one that fits the category. Nathan: If we’re just looking at things that currently exist (as was conveyed at the FAH meeting), where are these new added outcomes coming from? Heath: Different subcommittees added outcomes as they saw necessary/appropriate. Pete would rather see the whole thing, so that missing things don’t go from area to area; unless they’re so spread apart that we’d have a tight timeline to consider a large bunch. Nathan expressed concern about the discrepancy between the different approaches of the subcommittees. Cammy: How and where do these get assessed? Are they tied to specific learning activities, documents, certain classes? Kathleen suggested we wouldn’t be assessing individual students, just assessing the program to see if it is working; but if we don’t assess students, how will we know the program is working? Heath: Really not sure, Kathy needs to
be the one to answer this. Liz: For that reason, she agrees with Pete, wants to see the whole thing to get the overall picture. Cammy: What is the role of the Senate—do we get feedback from our schools, or does the Gen Ed committee? Mike: Keep bringing drafts, we provide suggestions, but no vote until it’s all finished. Audrey: Trying to remember what HLC wanted us to do; it wasn’t reorganizing and redoing all the outcomes, it was having an assessment plan. Between course grades and a graduation survey, have we gotten towards meeting the actual directive? Is it time to ask Kathleen come visit again? The Senate decided to see the outcomes as a whole document when finished; we also want to hear where and how we assess the outcomes. The next GE meeting will be late February; if we had Kathy come to next Senate, it would be before the next GE meeting (Cammy will ask her to come).

**Working Committee Reports:**

**Tenure Committee:** Mike Moline: The group met a couple of times this semester and got a mission statement put together. The second meeting discussed portfolio requirements; how do we have a minimum bar that can be utilized by all disciplines? The numbers are required items, and bullet points are suggested examples. Mark: Has weighting for these different points been discussed? Mike: Not yet, it might need to vary between schools and departments. Cammy: The mission statement shares the language of the college mission, and emphasizes quality of teaching, professional development, and student success; the portfolio reflects that. Mike: The order came from flipping through a portfolio; it doesn’t imply importance. Liz: Is a draft on Moodle? Cammy: Not yet, they’re reworking it and adding graphics; it should be there soon. Audrey: Has the committee talked about how these will be looked at and the idea of proficiency vs. excellence? Mike: We might need another document for this, perhaps a rubric/grading system with a minimum bar. Jeremy: The actual tenure committee can determine proficiency vs. excellence. Nathan: The standardized portfolio is great, but we should leave its evaluation up to individual committees/departments, as different disciplines value different things. Mike: The next step is to create a flowchart/timeline of the process, as well as a standardized classroom evaluation form. Kelsey: As someone on her 12th year of supply contract funded by grants, who is deciding how people affected by this policy fall? Mike: Not sure how much say Senate, policy committee, and HR will each have. Audrey: College Council has the say; the policy committee are just wordsmiths. Art: Dr. Nolte said he wanted this to be faculty-driven; they’ll go with our recommendation, so it’s up to us. Cammy: Ask the admin—if the money goes away, do we do away with the GED program? Our view should depend on their answer. Audrey: Input can be given by faculty as the policy committee addresses the different categories of contract and if someone can move to another. Mike: Faculty seem to strongly support tenure for long-term supply contracts. Jeanette: Someone was wondering if given this move from evaluative to mentoring and pushing from 3 to 4-6 years if there would be any concern about keeping duds around the institution longer than previously. Mike: This is the whole point of probationary contracts; you’re already evaluated year-to-year, and can be cut at the end of the year if you’re not doing well. Heath: Should we clarify that at any point in the process probationary contracts can be cut? Pete: Sometimes people turn around when mentored, so give them a chance if they’re working on it; searches are expensive. Ben: It would be good to see some way of assessing how the
faculty reacts to constructive criticism; do they take it well, do they dig their heels in, do they not know how to implement it? There should be some evaluation of how this advice is taken.

**Dean Evaluations:** A statement was presented of why we do this and how it supports the institution, bringing wording in from the mission statement. The process was outlined. Liz: Do we know how many deans at other schools are required to do this? Pete: Colleges are moving to transformational leadership, and processes like this are part of that. It helps that the deans are new here and that this was promised to us. Cammy: The form shows revised evaluation statements; do we need a comment box after every item? Nathan: A comment box after every question is probably too visually overwhelming; perhaps one box at the end of each page/after each section is sufficient? Heath: If you see Trevor, thank him for the nice, clean edit; thanks to Cammy as well for the statement of purpose and procedure. Nathan moved that the Senate express approval of the statement of purpose, process, and revised evaluation form (with one comment box per section); Jeremy seconded. Mike: Is a follow-up implied by the meeting with VP about goals and school meeting in fall? Heath: Another box or bullet would be useful for confirming that. Motion passed. Next Senate meeting we’ll see the finalized version and cast the final vote then.

**Faculty Development Grants—Pete van Houten:** One new request for $500, leaving $4452.82 for the year. Liz moved to approve, Kelsee seconded; motion passed.

**Old Business:** No old business.

**New Business:** No new business.

**General Faculty Comments:** Nathan asked if anyone else outside of the music department had problems with the new STARS scholarship electronic program. Several Senators immediately expressed similar frustrations and problems with the program and lost/missing scholarships; there’s no record of anything with the move away from written forms. Cammy will bring this up with Dr. Cherry.

**Meeting Adjourned:** 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathan Baker