



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
STUDENT
ACADEMIC SENATE

General SAS
April 18, 2017

Call to Order

Ryan calls the meeting to order at 7:04pm

Attendance

Present: **Aerospace Studies, Anthropology, Art, Aviation, Chemistry, Computer Science, DHC, Economics, English, Family & Consumer Sciences, Finance Supply Chain, Philosophy and Religious Studies, Psychology, Geology, Political Science, Music, Graduate Studies, World Languages, Carolyn Thurston, guest Maurice Watkins, guest Dr. Bisgard**

Additions or Correction to the Agenda

Strike Advisor Report Carolyn Thurston
Strike Anthropology Funds Request (\$300)

Approval of the Agenda

Ryan entertains a motion to approve the agenda
Finance & Supply Chain so moves
Economics seconds
Motion **PASSED** 18-0-0

Approval of the Previous Minutes

Ryan entertains a motion to approve the minutes from April 4, 2017.
Economics so moves
Philosophy and Religious Studies seconds
Motion **PASSED** 18-0-0

Announcements

- a. **Dr. Bisgard:** one of our charges is to increase SEIO response rates since online rates have gone down moving away from paper. Are there things faculty can do to improve response rates? Do you all have questions? **Political Science:** it will be more convenient to allow students to do them during class. Dr. Bisgard: we have talked about that, in class could mean distribute iPads. The sheet I handed out was the copy of my SEIO's; this is all we get. Any comments are on the back. These are completely anonymous, we cannot set them as faculty. **Economics:** Dr. Sippage has made a lot of suggestions, Dr. Bisgard: what kind? Economics: critique on the scales and data stuff. There are some statistical issues. **DHC:** why does it stop before finals? We cannot critique the final. Dr. Bisgard: some situations we can have a really good class and then the final has strong feelings. We are getting an evaluation of the course but not the exam. If there is an exam how long will they be open, do you get the grade and then do the SEIO? Often I hear is I wait until I see what grade I got, if I get a bad grade then I will complain. **DHC:** is that the end goal,

my previous school was the last day of classes. One of the finals was unfair and that is something that should be able to be critiqued. Philosophy and Religious Studies: you're asking students for feedback but then you are rejecting relevant material. You're choosing faculty interest vs student interest. What is the purpose? Dr. Bisgard: speaking from the math dept. we do look at SEIO's. If someone has a no good track record of SEIO's, we talk to the faculty member and ask them to change how they do assignments. For example last year I had several comments that say I am not approachable and that is something my chair has taken me aside and said be more approachable. So then I address the issue, such as not putting exclamation points on homework. I have changed how I assign homework based on comments. We in the math dept look at what students want. Currently one of the only things that comes up is rankings on certain teaching. Philosophy and Religious Studies: you have raised other questions, what's the experience of the student and what's the effectiveness of the teacher. Also sounds like this is an aggregate and then trying to fix the problem then. That would be an argument to include like the final. If there is validity in the aggregate. Guest: I think the main problem is to get more responses, I would want students to say how the teacher is doing teaching like effectiveness. Dr. Bisgard: there is Faculty Senate document that has guidelines about five different areas like classroom management and who should be grading it. Classroom management: students have the most weight. Economics: is there another way to access them like through canvas? Ryan: you can download an App called Evaluation Kit. It seemed pretty doable. Dr. Bisgard: we really like the comments, the more specific you can be about good and bad is very helpful. Economics: rate now? Dr. Bisgard: About 30-35 percent. I had a class with 5 students and only got 2 out of 5. Ryan: what do you as students think is a good rate? 50-60. Dr. Bisgard: some professors get very high rates with incentive like extra credit. It's certainly the case that gets rates to go higher. We could set up an assignment that is worth 0 points. I've heard versions of that. Ryan: we could out it on the to-do list. Computer science: I've had classes that the points are only worth trivial points. Bisgard: but how are they seeing you're doing them. I don't want to know who does respond. Faculty cannot be able to see who writes what. Geology: I've heard stigma only used for tenure, I know that's not the only thing, that's a main reason they don't do them. That's the talk I've heard. Dr. Bisgard: there is more than tenure like promotion, reappointment happens every five years, if people want a pay raise they have to show excellence in 2 of 3 areas for merit pay. Geology: so promoting those and attacking the stigma. Dr. Bisgard: I am fine showing an electronic binder that shows all research classes, and seeing if I am doing a good job for every course I have taught. As faculty we do not promote SEIO's well. It's a reasonable question: why? How do they help you? I have used them to do these things. Some faculty tend to be not very self-confident in their teaching. Computer Sciences: there is a deadline? Since some have finals on Thursday, you could extend the class. Bisgard: that seems reasonable. How do we get that communicated and implemented to the shop? Guest: helpful to designate time before in the computer lab and take five minutes that could help responses. Everyone who teaches that kind of course gets the same SEIO. Online version, lab, lecture, faculty can ask questions themselves. There are short and long forms. The only things it has boxplots. Bisgard: the report is 8 pages long. Guest: some of these are very open ended, some of these questions are not a good evaluation there. Guest: suggest to have just a dept. average posted? If I see low participation I would participate seeing they are low, it would be more relevant seeing the data. Bisgard: that's a good one. DHC: suggest if you were to give yourself a low or high score you couldn't do it unless you gave comment why. Also if you have students who give poor rates, is there any way we can follow up with them to help with the curve, I feel finals should be a part of the evaluation, Ryan: does that prevent you or just piss you off? DHC: that didn't come until I wanted to do them. Philosophy and Religious Studies:

we need to incentive it as a priority, if I have to choose priorities and SEIO's with no incentive I will choose not to do them. It seems more beneficial to faculty not students. Bisgard: in terms of SEIO's serving faculty, I'm curious what the student should see teaching evaluation as? Ryan: I would like to continue this and if you have any questions email them to me, Carolyn: as the advisor of SAS, the number one thing I have heard the students say was why can't we evaluate after finals. Instead of their being a theory let's try the students see data. We have low rates and what faulty says is they are really high or low and that washes out the evaluation. We are concerned you might throw them out if they are in the middle. World Languages: if you are worrying about bias why ask in the first place.

Advisor Report

~~Carolyn Thurston~~:

Chair Report

Ryan: new funds packet is live and online. Still a PDF but we are working on a fillable PDF so hopefully you can do it all online and I want to see an online signature option that way things are much cleaner and quicker. Working on Associate Provost Search Committee.

Committee Reports

- a. **Seat Auditing Committee**: under process of editing bylaws and getting prerecs right.
- b. **Student Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee**: met last Friday and with Carolyn on Tuesday. We are reading through the materials and going to meet next week.
- c. **Course Scheduling Committee**: sent questions to registrar, we have replies. If you want to know them let me know, we are going to meet, if you are on my committee come see me.

New Business

a. Funds Requests

~~i. **Anthropology (\$300):**~~

- ii. **Family & Consumer Sciences (\$3000)**: attend annual conference in Las Vegas. Look at technology. Computer sciences: this was turned in before we made the adjustments. Just numbers change. Ryan: report back will be in the fall, we will figure out how to get you in before the fall. Will anyone be here? I do not know. We don't have a meeting after the 28th so come see me and accounting.

Political Science motion to approve Family & Consumer Sciences for \$3000

Art seconds

Motion **PASSED** 19-0-0

- iii. **Psychology (\$3000)**: Ryan: this request is for Des Moines and Ellensburg and funding will be evenly distributed for each student not each group. Presenter: we are going to WPA conference in Sacramento. There will be over 30 speakers and 16 universities. There will be graduate programs to see future schools for us and we are also presenting our own research. We did fundraisers and have earned about \$700 and have more planned for the spring. There are 31 students. We had requirements to

go so not just anyone could apply. After everything we still need \$7,528. Philip Zambardo will be there and it will be really cool to meet him.

Geology motion to approve Psychology for \$3000

Philosophy and Religious Studies seconds

Motion **PASSED** 18-0-0

b. *Report Back*

- i. **Anthropology (\$950)**: 15 people went. We went to the NWA conference. Two presented papers, they had a little job fair and seen grad schools. Ryan: favorite part? The job fair. Geology: did you get a job? Pretty much.
- ii. **History (\$628)**: went to Phi Alpha Pheta. About 90 students went from all over region. Had students nominated for papers. Learned a lot about historical research.
- iii. **Music (\$1800)**: report back at later date.
- iv. **Chemistry (\$2200)**: that extra money was great so thanks. Got back from San Francisco. Got to go to an expo and see technology. And got to talk to different industries. Fav part? Job fair and when we got to see poster presentation.
- v. **Political Science (\$1500)**: went to Las Vegas, 8 of us went and each presented at different times. Subjects were from policy to education and environmental issues. It was really great, mix of students and professionals. Very nerve-racking to be surrounded by professors. We learned a lot. Fav part: getting cut off because I ran out of time getting cut off so I learned to give a presentation in half the time.

c. **Executive Board Nominee: David Terray (DHC)- Special Programs:**

Finance & Supply Chain motion to nominate David Terray for Exec Board-Special Programs

Economics second

Political Science: if he is voted in is it now? Ryan: no it's on Friday. World Languages: what does it stand for? Ryan: Douglas Honors College.

Motion **PASSED** 18-0-1

Old Business

Issues, Concerns, and General Comment

Ryan: SAS now has two candidates. Maurice Watkins is here. Maurice: I am running for SAS, I am a freshman. I plan on majoring in psychology, and I'm just here checking out SAS. I hope you can come to the next event. Ryan: the SAS forum is May 2nd. David did bring up a chemistry 181 issue. DHC: one class is being offered, effecting at least two students. It's weird that 181 is being offered at 183 but not 182. Ryan: David sent me an email with students and I am going to send a blanket email to them.

Adjourn

Economics entertains a motion to adjourn

Computer Science seconds

Motion **PASSED** 19-0-0