**Friday, September 27, 2019**

**Location: RWC, H-2 & Zoom**

**Time:** 10:00 AM-12:00PM

**Chairs:** Marina Whitchurch, Mary Middleton

**Attendance in H-2:** Karl Brake, Steven Crum, Daniel Elash, Allison Fahrner, Felishia Jenkins, Kristi Kowalski, Glen Moulton, Deb Murphy, Tracy Redd, Troy Scevers, Tina Weyland

**Attendance via Zoom**: Mary Ann Blinkhorn, Andrew Childress, Donna Mae Fiore, Carolyn Oates, Jim Shaw

**Recorder:** Amy Durst

**Guests:**  Robert Felthousen, Chelsea Kelsey

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Discussion** |
| 1. Introductions and Welcome: All | Everyone introduced themselves and the department they work in. |
| 1. Guest Speaker: Robert Felthousen – WDYT Student Evaluations System | This is hopefully the end of a project that came out of the Dept Chair/Coordinator working group in Spring 2016 to look at the questions students are answering in the What Do You Think survey and if there could be improvements to that system. It’s gone through a few committees – Faculty Senate and back to the DC/CO group. Now there is a task force of ten that has been created to complete the project this term.  Robert researched other schools’ systems; others do not have questions where the students rates themselves. He will advocate that we remove/change drastically those questions as they are not valuable to how the class can be improved. The average number of questions other schools have is around twelve. Robert will also advocate for what each group as asked for; the comments to occur at the beginning of the survey, versus the end and designed to solicit specific information.  We hover around 15-18% on response rate, which is a higher rate than most other schools in the state. *(Correction: since 2015-16 our lowest completion rate was 35.06% and highest was 62.20%.)* Can the taskforce look at incentives for completing the survey other than release grades early, etc.? The largest incentive to student filling out the survey is faculty in the classroom explaining the importance of completing the surveys. Some instructors give class time to filling out the survey.  How is this information used (by administration) and is 15-18% a proper sample set? Is the information just for faculty use?  The goal is to have questions clearly defined to evaluate what occurred in the class and others more for evaluation. Question, in general, should not be leading in any direction or outcome. Also, those who look at the student feedback should be trained on how to read data. There should be a rubric/guide on what to expect when looking at the feedback for new administrators/new department chairs.  Is going back to paper better? The taskforce has been tasked with improving the WDYT taskforce. Does the Senate want to take a stance to do away with the WDYT system totally? Many instructors/programs still use paper surveys to ask more in-depth questions.  **Action: Faculty Senate would like to look at the completed project and have asked Robert to come back to report.** |
| 1. By-Laws/Co-Chair Eligibility   a. By-Laws subcommittee | Marina was not assigned classes this term, which leads to a larger conversation about whether a faculty member can serve as co-chair when not being assigned a class. The By-laws state: 5.03 Full time and Part time faculty members teaching during the forthcoming academic year shall be eligible to be elected as group representative, but it does not address co-chairs. Mary was given assurance that Marina will likely get classes in Winter/Spring.  As a group we need to decide how to proceed in this scenario, with the reminder that we are setting precedent for the future. Mary Middleton presented these options to discuss and decide on a course of action:  1. Find an interim co-chair until classes are assigned.  2. Co-chair can remain as long as classes were assigned in the academic year.  Should we use the standard that if they are employed with HR, they are eligible? That would be an easy way to place verbiage in the by-laws. We should establish what length of time is acceptable.  We also need a by-laws subcommittee to go through and update the language.  By-Laws Committee: Mary Middleton, Tracey Redd, Steven Crum, Troy Scevers, Deb Murphy, Glen Moulton  **Action: Amy will collect previous pertinent meeting minutes and all versions of by-laws to the sub-committee**  **Action: The sub-committee will decide on the verbiage for adjuncts not assigned classes and report back to the group for a vote.** |
| 1. 2018-19 Survey Results and Discussion | At the All-faculty/last Faculty Senate meeting in June each member was asked to fill out some responses to questions about work environment (working as a faculty, at RCC, and the future). Three big take-aways:  1. Workload  Here are some responses:  *“Frustrated by deans and others at the top who don’t understand workload and the many other tasks put upon faculty.”*  *“The pace has felt frantic; rarely able to check with colleagues, constant additions in terms of tasks/requirements/responsibilities due to cuts in the department. It has been tiring.*  *“I love my job and I always have but it feels like the gas pedals got stuck lately. Press down.”*  *“I’ve never felt exhausted to the extent that I often do now.”*  *“The work continues regardless of how we feel. You feel like you could stop and no one would notice, but you keep going because that’s the job.”*  Discussion/solutions: One thing faculty senators can do is bring to our conversations and back to our departments is a sense of self-care and caring for each other. Teaching and learning is what we should be talking about, but to do that we have to take care of ourselves. Can we put something together for faculty self-care? We want everyone to be able to re-center, re-focus, re-balance, and be a part of the group or we lose our productively, creativity and our focus on the students.  Can we create an anonymous format to be able to ask administration to ask neutral questions to the administration? FAMAT is the bargaining until, but Faculty Senate has shared governance included in our mission statement. We can send a message (re:workload) in conjunction with conversations with Jeremy Taylor, our RCC OEA president, next month.  2. The Focus of Faculty Senate should be on teaching and learning.  Here are some responses:  *“Faculty Senate should stay away from Shared Governance but could support a separate Rogue Senate.”*  *“If we want to use Faculty Senate as a positive place for discussion then the atmosphere needs to be intentionally positive and the focus needs to be on what motivates us as teachers…..more on teaching and learning and how we can share our craft.”*  *“I’m still new at RCC but I’ve found that there is quite a bit of support for building instructional skills. I hope that the Faculty Good Ideas sessions continue at Inservice.“*  We need to more clearly define Shared Governance.  A call will go out for ideas for the GIFTS sessions for in-service in the newsletter.  3. Other:  Here are some responses:  *“ Too many changes: leadership swinging doors, 200 classes cut…a wonky year.”*  *“ Concerned that certain teachers that are considered unqualified because of transcripts may in fact be superior teachers than those who are BEAF and part-time.”*  Make certain you get your transcripts in if you have received a letter/email.  Is there any help for those that are currently still paying on school debt?  No- the Faculty Development Funds will extend additional funds for those fulfilling faculty qualifications. (For FT and BEAF status only) |
| 1. Faculty Senate Goals for 2019-20 | Goals for 2019-2020   * By-laws reviews * G.I.F.Ts at each meeting. (5-10 minutes each) This would help create larger sessions for Inservice * Collaboration with Green Team – subcommittee? * Collaborative spaces * Develop a WDYT type-tool to apply it to survey faculty opinion * Speaker(s) about Mental Health and/or conversations about mental health * Improve Communication with deans, VP’s and other committees * Clearly define and understand Shared Governance.   **Action: Prioritize above goals at October Faculty Senate meeting** |
| 1. Announcements | 1. Call for book reviews for the Faculty Senate newsletter: the Bright Sun Dispatch. The newsletter comes out at the beginning of the week before the Faculty Senate meeting.  2. Diversity Programming Board events:  10/8 HIV Screening -RVC Library Study Cove, 10a-2p  10/10 Impact of Addiction on Brain Functioning, Darryl Inaba (flyer attached)  RVC HEC 129, 6-8pm  10/14 Oregon Humanities Conversation Project, The Hate We Live In  RWC 9-10:30am Student Center, RVC 1:30-3pm HEC 129  10/22 HIV Screening -RWC Student Center and Library, 11a-4p  Wesley Hamilton, Disabled But Not Really (DSNR) – partnership with SOU …………..SOU Music Recital Hall, 7:30-8:30pm  10/23 Hoop of Life, Kevin Locke – Indigenous storytelling, flute, and dancing  RWC Student Center 9:30-10:30am with Q&A afterwards  11/6 Veterans Appreciation Days  RVC and TRC, details TBA  11/7 Veterans Appreciation Days  RWC, details TBA  11/21 Inclusive Hiring Training for all interested RCC staff – part I  TRC 8:30am-12:30pm  11/22 Inclusive Hiring Training for all interested RCC staff – part II  TRC 8:30am-12:30pm (with supervisor’s approval)  3. Next Meeting:  **Friday, October 25, 2019**  **10 a.m. - 12 p.m. RVC, G16**  **Zoom:** [**https://roguecc.zoom.us/j/8018334781**](https://roguecc.zoom.us/j/8018334781) |