Department of Social Sciences  
Agenda  
February 10, 2017  
9:30-11:00

Attendance: Luaren Madak, Leslie Bartely, Jacqueline Davis, Dawn Kulpanowski, Eric Seelau, Sheila Seelau, Terri Housely, Sabine Maetzke, Mark Herman, Matthew Vivyan, Bruno Baltodano, Brian Page, Harold Van Boven, Phillip Wisely.

Excused: Thomas Donaldson (Teaching ).

1. Textbooks

* The faculty discussed pending textbook adoptions. The deadline is February 28th. Professor Page noted the deadline has been moved up and that it is a little more firm than in the past.
* The Psychology Faculty are adopting a new text for DEP. The need to fill out the form was discussed. It was noted that the form should be submitted to Professor Page, who will then forward to Wendie Thompson for the Dean.
* The faculty noted they will be looking to adopt the new 2017 edition.
* Professor Page inquired about online course development for DEP. The team indicated the process is working smoothly. They were working to minimize the use of publisher material.
* Professor Housely inquired about the adoption process for SOP. Professor Housely, Bartley, and Kulpanowski have agreed to discontinue the use of Revel (the online buddle material). It was noted this will need to be address with the bookstore to ensure everything is in order.
* In addition to DEP and SOP, WOH will also be adopting a next text. The current text is ten years old and has created problems in the classroom with instructors. The decision was made to adopt just the text only and not the bundled material.
* Dr. Wisely noted the text for SYG will be adopted as optional.
* Dr. S. Seelau inquired about a new state rule to get your text for $99. After discussion, faculty were not aware of the program, but rather noted, this was in reference to a pilot program to roll textbooks in with tuition/registration fees. Dr. Page indicated he would inquire about results. In discussions with the textbook affordability committee he indicated there was some type of pilot program designed to lower prices and improve access to text.
* Professor S. Seelau inquired about Dual Enrollment students. Students are indicating that in the future their books will no longer be purchased by the school district. If so, this will make it even more important to get on the same page with textbook adoptions to minimize confusion and cost.

1. Assessment:

* Professor Eric Seelau provided a summary on assessment. He noted reports are available and if no one was in disagreement that he would inform Dr. Van Gaalen that it was acceptable to post the reports. The faculty were in agreement.
* Professor Eric Seelau also noted he will be in contact with individuals by discipline about assessment plans.
* The faculty were also informed about a new online course for assessment certification. This could be to learn more about the process and/or count as professional development.
* Lastly, noting definite, but in the future general education assessment may move away from “voluntary” to a random sampling process. Something to keep in mind when assessment requests volunteers.

1. Course Development:

* Proposal for a new Social Psychology Class. A discussion on the diversity vs. interdisciplinary component followed.
* The Department agreed to move support in favor of adding this class to the Social Sciences offerings.
* A discussion on Psychology II followed. It was agreed the course needed to be redeveloped to more of a research methods course. This would probably mean the need to discontinue PSY II and submit a new course proposal to reflect the class.

1. Curriculum Committee Representative:

* Professor Housely informed the department that she is finishing her term on the Curriculum Committee. Professor S. Seelau volunteered to serve as a representative from the Social Sciences.
* Professor Kulpanowski indicated she was finishing the third year of her term on the PD committee. She was willing to serve another term and would get back to the department.

1. Schedule:

* Professor Page inquired whether or not there were any questions about either the Fall or Summer schedules. There were no questions or discussion.

1. Faculty Evaluations

* Professor Page reminded the faculty of the February 13th deadline for evaluation forms.
* There was some discussion about the process. Faculty were still a little unclear on how and what to submit. It was noted this could be done in an email to the Dean. Only the student surveys and retention numbers were required, but certainly more could be submitted.
* Professor Page noted Dr. Clark will be reviewing the Social Sciences as they looked to divide the labor between the schools. There were no objections. Professor Page indicated he would inquire whether or not Dr. Clark should be copied with the submission of documents and forms.
* It was noted that this was a new process for everyone, and certainly, if there were items missing or needed after the 13th it could be corrected as the faculty, Deans, and college adjust to the new process.
* Professor Page did note he encouraged the Dean to meet with new faculty as they learn the process and expectations at FSW.

1. Chair Model

* Discussions followed about the proposed chair model.
* Faculty raised concerns about the administrative chair model idea and taking faculty out of the classroom. A discussion followed about how this process would work, pay and compensation, and what if no one wanted to be a full-time administrative chair. Would the college hire from outside? Would the college hire temporary/visiting faculty to cover classes? The department also wondered how this process would work if someone wanted to serve more than one term. Would they then loose their faculty status? It was noted that with a full-time administrative chair it would seem they should have their own dedicated office space and staff. There was concern that this would lead to the creation of new, unnecessary responsibilities in order to justify a full-time position. Professor Page reminded faculty this was only one idea discussed in the work-group as the college considers how to allocate responsibility and ensure chairs are fairly compensated. In the end, faculty members agreed no one in the department would want to leave the classroom and serve as a full-time administrative chair.
* The faculty made the following motion to keep a faculty-chair model. This was unanimously supported. No objections or abstentions
* A discussion about compensation followed. It was noted that while there may not be support for an administrative model, the department did believe compensation should be reflective of the responsibilities.
* The role of chairs in scheduling was discussed. The department wondered whether or not it had to be an “all or nothing” scenario. The faculty supported the chair having an increased role in scheduling classes. It was noted if there was a problem members would rather work it out with the chair. They also noted this would improve the relationship between the department and adjunct faculty. It was noted that scheduling process worked well in the Social Sciences, but each department was different. The conversation returned to compensation again.
* A discussion about compensation and course release followed. The department believed this should be revisited. More responsibilities have been given to the chair. They were not certain what the financial compensation should be, but the feeling were additional course release should be considered. The faculty again wondered whether or not this had to be an “all or nothing” scenario. Course release could be increased, allocated differently over the semester and throughout the entire year, and/or consideration could be given to the different departments and various responsibilities.
* Dr. S. Seelau wanted it to be noted an emphasis should be made that the chair could delegate responsibility especially when it came to interaction with part-time faculty.
* It was suggested that the exact wording on the role of chair in assessment be revisited.
* A discussion followed on the upcoming elections. Professor Page noted this was the end of his term. He wanted it to be made clear that the department should decide on what direction they believed would be best for the department. He indicated he was willing to serve for another term with the understanding others should consider serving in the future. Currently, the department supported Professor Page in his role. This will, however, be revisited when elections are to take place.

1. New Business

* Both Professors Page and Davis are serving on the Dean Search Committee. They will keep the department updated. Faculty were urged to attend any meetings and/or presentations with prospective candidates.
* A conversation followed on college resources provided for students in need. Dr. Wisely recently had an encounter with a student who was homeless, but was unable to determine the best way to reach out and help the student. The one college representative that did respond indicated the student should contact them directly. No additional information was provided. The department felt this was insufficient. Faculty noted that they wished there was more resources and/or at least information on how to help students in need was available.
* Professor Madak indicated she was having trouble with a difficult student and inquired about the best way to proceed. She noted the student was currently not identified as someone with adaptive services. The department informed her of the Behavioral Intervention Team and also encouraged Professor Madak to reach out to adaptive services for support. It was also noted she was perfectly within her right to remove the student from the classroom if the situation was becoming a disruption to the class.
* The Meeting Adjourned at 11am.