PURE Executive Committee Meeting –Minutes
April 19th 2018

I. Approval of minutes from January 2018 Meeting

    a. Attending: Stewart (for Sue), Adry, David, Ava, Margaret, Jennifer, Michael B, Shaun H, Paula, Gavin, Scott, GZ

    b. Minutes Approved: Unanimous consent

II. Membership & Meetings– No new members. Review meeting dates for spring.

    a. Nothing new; people have been great about sending in substitutes

III. Reports:

    a. AES report

        i. Tentative session schedule, poster placement & cultivating interdisciplinary interactions.

            1. Tomorrow is goal to communicate tentative schedule for MarCom & APAs

            2. Poster Placement:

                a. 2 small poster sessions in summit in morning and afternoon—the Grill & Deli will remain open but all food is take out

                b. much larger, multidisciplinary poster session will take place in Pacific Room after the room's been able to be reset; runs from 5-7 pm

            3. Working to remain within PURE's guidelines of encouraging inter- and intra-disciplinary engagement

                a. Materializes as people being out of their buildings

                b. Having coffee, tea during breaks as a way to foster conversation

                c. In poster sessions, have more than 1 discipline in any session

                    i. If there are a large number of posters from a discipline, they'll be moved to the evening so that they don't dominate any single poster session

                        1. Request for feedback

                            a. Some people are concerned/worried about attendance in the evening

                                i. Having the larger built-in audience will encourage/bring some people

                                ii. Hope location in Pacific room and right after the afternoon sessions will not negatively impact attendance

d. Visual design wants to be in Campbell Hall even though the space is too packed
    i. Comments about fire code concerns, spaces being packed
    ii. If we do move them to RWEC 101, then we will move them for AES 2019
        1. Want to get board support for that
e. It has been AES's policy to not schedule against the Plenary so that everyone can make it to the keynote
    i. HEX wants award ceremony during that same time slot
    ii. Want board to decide: make an allowance for HEX award presentations to hold when Plenary is held OR treat like everyone else and not schedule against the Plenary.
    iii. Ava: try to put similar events around the same times as opposed to putting in am and pm
    iv. Question: is Rice Auditorium falling under this?
        1. It's a different conversation
    v. Comment: they should be able to schedule if they want to overlap
    vi. Comment: different issues: making use AES space that is open vs individuals controlling where the presentations are held
    vii. Need consistency in enforcement
    viii. Comment: would like to give Creative Arts a heads up about both moving rooms in 19 and scheduling starting at 8
    ix. Comment: fine scheduling HEX awards as long as they don't move or change the set up; next year don't schedule against plenary
    x. Making a report to Senate about the growth, the changes, etc: space, time are all a premium
        1. Needs to be run more like a professional conference and less like a show
        2. Lines of communication have been a bit wonky
    xi. AES: Make exceptions this year, but won't be able to do that next year. Then determining, with the board, how to do this in the future.
    xii. Henry: would Board allow some oral presentation sessions to allow poster presentations in the same session
        1. This will be coming up in future meetings

      ii. Collecting submissions still for open and poster sessions
1. Sponsored sessions closed on April 10th
  a. Late students will be in multidisciplinary sessions—can't slip them into the sponsored sessions
  b. Multidisciplinary deadlines open through May 1st
  c. If students did not make April 10 deadline, then they will go into multidisciplinary sessions
  d. Comment: put up WHY deadlines are what they are (from email?) on the website so people understand

     iii. Deadlines & enforcement
1. Sponsored scheduled sessions will be fixed times
  a. Then multidisciplinary sessions
2. Need a guidelines document for downloading
  a. This is the process
  b. These are approved by Board, etc

     iv. Willamette Promise project
1. Inviting between 200-300 people to campus
  a. Targeting HS juniors—showing our students' work to them

     v. Plenary
1. Things are good!

     vi. Outreach: emails, office hours, classroom visits
1. Sending emails, outreach is ongoing, etc.
2. AES email address

     vii. SWOT radar: Disability/Accessibility, technological infrastructure, room scheduling process
1. Conversing with Malissa of ODS about way-finding, how rooms are set up, etc.
  a. Question about reverse interpreting from ASL presenters to spoken English
    i. Preference by presenters has been to not have audio translation—but we might be able to use the audio listening devices in the room
2. Technology issues
  a. Campus has zero tolerance for errors, so what we need is a strong technology team—this is a growing workload and we need a robust, sustainable team
  b. Need to have redundancy so there's not single point of dependency
3. Room scheduling

  b. *PURE Insights* report

      i. Proposed Timeframe for publication process (**see resource 1**)
- 1. Created considering the CBA and working sessions to help shape the calendar
- 2. Discussion of what's in the document
- 3. Are there any questions, concerns?
    - a. Is it possible to get this out to Division Meetings so folks know what the deadlines are?
        - i. Yes.
- 4. People seem to be good with the deadlines

     ii. Confining content to scholarly/research not creative
- 1. Currently creative works are within the scope of PI—but suggesting that we don't do creative works
- 2. Perhaps focus on research and scholarly work
- 3. Discussion of interdisciplinary work that is scholarly and creative
- 4. Keep creative in description for now

    iii. SWOT radar: growth, defining roles, DC complexities
- 1.

c. Proposal updates - none

d. Budget – $$7,765.35
- i. No travel this year?
    - 1. Not enough time to discuss

IV. Returning Business:

a. PKP poster judging (**see resource 2**)
- i. Will discuss electronically

b. Updates to post-AES survey for students (**see resource 3**)
- i. Will discuss electronically

c. PURE & Stem Scholars (**see resource 4)**
- i. Needs more discussion in the future

V. New Business:

a. AES 2019 theme
- 1. Not enough time to discuss

b. PURE storage moving to ITC
- i. Not enough time to discuss

c. AES & PI as metrics for university mission fulfillment
- i. Not enough time to discuss

d. Changes to allfacstaff email listserv & how we communicate about AES & PI
- i. Not enough time to discuss

e. Fundraising and sponsorship? Boundaries? (Erin McDonough coming in May)
- i. Not enough time to discuss

VI. Adjournment

NOTE: Old/Ongoing Business:
a. AES feedback Survey– target dissemination Fall 2018 (Discuss June 2018)
b. PURE website
c. AES Plenary Speaker Endowment Donor search
d. Funding Student travel
e. Alumni "tailgate" at AES
f. PURE Exec. Meeting "in service" week to review priorities for upcoming year

---

Resource 1:

Hello!

The last publication of PI came out Winter, 2018. In that issue, and on the website, it was announced that our next issue would be coming out in Fall, 2018. I do not believe this is a new publication cycle, but rather a return to the original one.

Realizing that I must work within the constrictions of the published publication term as well as within the terms of our faculty contract, I have set up and then revised our timeline. I have done this using feedback from Ava, Sue, and Scott.

- I would like to open PI for submissions before the AES and after our next PURE Executive Meeting. I plan to accept papers from that point until September 10, 2018. At that point, our faculty will be back on contract.
- 9/17/18 Reviewers will be assigned (they have 3 weeks to complete)
- **Week 2** 10/1/18 Reviewers will be notified they have one week left to complete reviews
- **Week 3** 10/8/18 Reviews are due & Students' are notified of the decisions & have 2 wks to complete and resubmit their revised paper
- **Week 5** 10/22/18 Revisions are due
- **Week 6** 10/29/18 I will review the final versions of the papers
- **Week 6** 10/2918 Cover Art is due. Jen Bracy has already notified her design classes that we are looking for cover art and we expect that our cover art will be selected before the end of Spring term. (I would like to put together a small committee of persons to make the final selection. Perhaps we have finalists and the students vote for their favorite cover design? To be worked out...)
- **Week 7** 11/5/18 Scott receives articles to begin formatting. He needs 2 weeks.
- **Week 9** 11/19/18 Sue receives formatted articles from Scott
- **Week 10** PI Issue 6 comes out.

I chose Dead Week/Week 10 for our Fall issue to come out because I think it is a positive distraction for students, a celebration of our students' accomplishments, and I prefer Dead Week over finals week for our issue release.

I believe that I am presenting a workable timeline, given the constraints of our faculty, our terms, and our receiving, reviewing, editing, and formatting needs. You will notice that our deadlines are on Mondays which will give us some flexibility in case someone or something in the process gets delayed for some reason.

Stewart has set the end of April as a deadline to have our electronic training materials completed for new Editors/Reviewers. (Go, Stewart!) I am hopeful that we will need to add to our Editors/Reviewers and these tools will be very helpful.

If you perceive a serious concern with this timeline, please feel free to share that with me. Also, this timeline is mostly internal, but the submission and acceptance deadlines will go public as soon we are in accordance with the timeline.

Thank you for your assistance and support for our next issue!

Best,

Paula

Paula K. Baldwin, PhD
Associate Professor l Managing Editor
Western Oregon University
345 Monmouth Ave N l Monmouth, OR 97361
503-838-XXXX l 503-838-8056 (fax)
insights@wou.edu l HSS 121

pure insights

No one undertakes research in physics with the intention of winning a prize. It is the joy of discovering something no one knew before.
Stephen Hawking

Resource 2:

Academic Excellence Showcase 2018 Outstanding Poster Rubric

The exhibits are graded on a raw scale of 0 (inferior) to 2 (superior). Points are earned in three areas: Content (12 points maximum), Display (12 points maximum), and Oral Presentation (6 points maximum). Each exhibit is evaluated by multiple judges drawn from the faculty at Western Oregon University, who are chapter members of the Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society. **Judges will be assigned at random. Students should expect that their entries are likely to be reviewed by judges from fields of study other than their own.**

Poster Presenters: _____

Title or Abstract: _____

Reviewers: _____

Criteria	Inferior 0	Moderate 1	Superior 2
CONTENT (12 points)			
1. Clarity of research question.			
2. Clearly outlined objective / purpose.			
3. Detailed background / context.			
4. Literature (w/ citations) provides support for the research question and the direction of the study.			
5. Applications and connections are included.			
6. Findings and Conclusions demonstrate the significance of the study.			
POSTER DISPLAY AND ORGANIZATION (12 points)			
1. Authors are clearly identified			
2. Poster looks professional and is aesthetically pleasing.			
3. Space is used effectively, and neither text or graphics dominate the poster. Figures serve a purpose and are appropriately titled and captioned.			
4. The text is legible and free of errors.			
5. Poster has appropriate headings and clearly defined sections. Information is presented logically.			
6. Fundamental points of study are clearly present, with little redundancy.			
ORAL PRESENTATION (6 points)			
1. Presenters are prepared and engaged.			
2. Presenters are able to answer questions.			
3. Presenters can elaborate on information.			
COMMENTS			

TOTAL POINTS: _____ / out of 30

Academic Excellence Showcase 2018 Outstanding Poster Rubric

The exhibits are graded on a raw scale of 0 (inferior) to 2 (superior). Points are earned in three areas: Content (12 points maximum), Display (12 points maximum), and Oral Presentation (6 points maximum). Each exhibit is evaluated by multiple judges drawn from the faculty at Western Oregon University, who are chapter members of the Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society. **Judges will be assigned at random. Students should expect that their entries are likely to be reviewed by judges from fields of study other than their own.**

Poster Presenters: _____

Title or Abstract: _____

*Reviewers:*_____

Criteria	Inferior 0	Moderate 1	Superior 2
CONTENT (12 points) *Learning Outcome: Demonstrate the role of empirical research, investigation, and original and scholarly and creative work in the production of knowledge and meaning. (IL)*			
1. Clarity of research question.			
2. Clearly outlined objective / purpose.			
3. Detailed background / context.			
4. Literature (w/ citations) provides support for the research question and the direction of the study.			
5. Applications and connections are included.			
6. Findings and Conclusions demonstrate the significance of the study.			
POSTER DISPLAY AND ORGANIZATION (12 points) *Learning outcome: Practice formal and professional communication of research and creative work conducted through the University's academic programs. (IL)*			
1. Authors are clearly identified			
2. Poster looks professional and is aesthetically pleasing.			
3. Space is used effectively, and neither text or graphics dominate the poster. Figures serve a purpose and are appropriately titled and captioned.			
4. The text is legible and free of errors.			
5. Poster has appropriate headings and clearly defined sections. Information is presented logically.			
6. Fundamental points of study are clearly present, with little redundancy.			
ORAL PRESENTATION (6 points) *Learning outcome: Discuss scholarly and creative work in both disciplinary and interdisciplinary settings. (IL)*			
1. Presenters are prepared and engaged.			
2. Presenters are able to answer questions.			
3. Presenters can elaborate on information.			
COMMENTS			
TOTAL POINTS: _____ / out of 30			

Resource 3:

Hi Brent

Thank you for meeting with me today. Here are the resources I mentioned during our meeting. The board meets next on March 13th. I send them a packet of information to review for the meeting a week before. If that is too soon to put something together for the survey let me know.

Priority for Different Surveys:
Priority is: revise student presenter post-AES survey (top priority), create a faculty/staff session chair and/or sponsor(mentor) post-AES survey (mid-priority), revise/revisit PURE reflection survey (lowest priority - not in use right now).

Scope of work for Student Survey Revisions:
• For the student presenter post-AES survey my notes are that you will work on (1) shortening the survey, (2) integrating questions to allow assessment of our IL program objectives (see email below), (3) integrate questions about the experience that lead up to the presentation, (4) question regarding what support is most needed for research experiences (eg wage/stipend, vs supplies/materials funds, vs travel to collect data funds).
• We also discussed ways of analyzing the data to compare against overall university statistics and identify any areas of bias in the types of students we are serving or those who report being able to engage in more extensive mentored research behind class projects.
• Finally, I also look forward to your ideas about how we can increase student response rates.

Responsibilities:
The AES Data Specialist (you now!) oversees the surveys connected to AES (including edits, administering them and data collection and analysis). The Data Specialist prepares figures/tables with the data to give to the PURE Director. The PURE Director puts these together into a report to give to administration and the Executive board. Depending on when Sue wants reports from me I'm not sure when I will need data analysis and figures from you. I will look into this and get back to you. In the past we have done most of this in June and I have met with Provost Scheck in July.

Let me know if I'm missing anything, if you have questions, or if you have a different idea of the scope of the work. Also I encourage you to articulate the boundaries on what you can do and when clearly so that we can make sure to keep this service commitment non-burdensome.

I also noted that you have most experience developing surveys with Survey Monkey, but that you are impressed with the greater functionality options and better end user experience with Qualtrics.

Thanks!
Ava

Academic Excellence Showcase Assessment Survey

Instructions: Please complete the following survey which assesses your experience as a presenter/performer at this year's Academic Excellence Showcase. Please note that your participation in this survey is completely voluntary. However, your responses, should you choose to complete the survey, will provide critical feedback that will allow us to assess the strengths and weakness of the showcase.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please direct them to aes@wou.edu

Thank you for your time and consideration, and congratulations on your successful presentation at this year's AES!

Demographic and Background Information

Q1 What is your class level?

☐ Freshman

☐ Sophomore

☐ Junior

☐ Senior

☐ Graduate

Q2 What is your major?

_____

Q3 Was your AES presentation/performance a major or course requirement?

- [ ] Yes

- [ ] No

- [ ] Not Sure

Q4 What was the format of your presentation? If you had multiple presentations, check all that apply.

- [ ] Lecture Presentation

- [ ] Poster Presentation

- [ ] Performance

- [ ] Panel Discussion

- [ ] Other

Q5 Which of the following describes you? Please check all that apply:

○ First-Generation Student

○ Non-Traditional Student

○ Student-Athlete

○ International-Student

○ Student who accessed Veteran Services

○ Student who accessed Disability Services

Q6 What is your race/ethnicity?

○ Native American / Alaskan Native (1)

○ Asian or Asian-American (2)

○ African-American (3)

○ Caucasian (4)

○ Middle Eastern (5)

○ Hispanic (6)

○ Hawaiian / Pacific Islander (7)

○ Other (8)

○ Prefer not to respond

Q7 What gender do you identify with?

- ○ Male (1)

- ○ Female (2)

- ○ Other (3)

- ○ Prefer not to respond

Q8 What forms of financial aid do you receive? Please check all that apply

- ☐ Federal Pell Grant (1)

- ☐ Oregon Opportunity Grant (2)

- ☐ Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (FSEOG) (3)

- ☐ Western Oregon University Tuition Grant (4)

- ☐ None of the above (5)

AES Experience Information

Q9 My presentation(s)/performance(s) provided me with a sense of achievement.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q10 While presenting/performing at AES, I used knowledge and skills I developed in courses required for my major.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q11 The skills I learned while completing LACC courses (e.g., public speaking) were useful for my presentation(s)/performance(s).

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q12 My major required that I practice the professional skills I used for my presentation(s)/performance(s).

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q13 Preparing for AES increased my knowledge of research/creativity within my major.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q14   My knowledge of formal and professional communication in my field has increased as a result of participating in AES.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

- -

Q15   My knowledge of areas outside of my major has increased as a result of participating in AES.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

- -

Q16 My involvement in AES has contributed to my professional development.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q17 I will use what I have learned during AES in my professional life.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q18 In general, WOU faculty/staff provided adequate guidance concerning my presentation(s)/performance(s).

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q19 The organizers of AES have provided adequate support for my presentation(s)/performance(s).

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q20 The faculty/staff of my discipline/major are supportive of presentations/performances during AES.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q21 My faculty/staff advisor/sponsor provided me with adequate support to be successful in my contribution(s) to AES.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q22 I put a great deal of effort into my presentation(s)/performance(s).

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q23 In addition to my presentation(s)/performance(s), I further participated in AES-related activities (e.g. attending other presentations/performances).

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q24 My presentation/performance was a strong example of scholarly/creative work within my major.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q25 I feel that my major courses prepared me for the type of scholarly/creative work that was represented at AES.

○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

○ 2 - Disagree (2)

○ 3 - Neutral (3)

○ 4 - Agree (4)

○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q26 I feel that there was adequate communication about AES and my part in AES prior to the day of the event.

    ○ 1 - Strongly Disagree (1)

    ○ 2 - Disagree (2)

    ○ 3 - Neutral (3)

    ○ 4 - Agree (4)

    ○ 5 - Strongly Agree (5)

Q27 My AES experience would have benefitted from the following: (check all that apply)

    ☐ Financial assistance for research/creativity supplies

    ☐ Finical assistance for research/creativity travel

    ☐ Financial support for student time invested in scholarly/creativity experiences

    ☐ Additional scholarly/creativity experience courses within my major

    ☐ Additional time for extracurricular scholarly/creativity experiences within my major

    ☐ None of the above

Resource 4:

From: Kathryn Duvall duvallk@mail.wou.edu 📎

Subject: Re: STEM Scholars & PURE

Date: March 15, 2018 at 10:29 AM

To: Patricia Flatt flattp@wou.edu

Cc: PURE pure@mail.wou.edu, Sue Monahan smonahan@wou.edu, Gregory Zobel zobelg@wou.edu

Hi Ava,

I'm glad the board is amenable to the idea. I agree with Patty that maybe some more information from them about what they are looking for would help us collaborate.
Unfortunately, I cannot be here on Wednesdays. Tuesday and Thursday mornings are better for me, but I think majority rules on the meeting time!

Thanks,

Kathryn

Kathryn Duvall
STEM Scholars Center Director
CECLC Website Maintainer
Western Oregon University
(503) 838-8737

On Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 10:18 AM, Patricia Flatt <flattp@wou.edu> wrote:

Hi Ava,

I look forward to hearing more feedback from the board. It was my understanding that your vision for merging the programs was because they do share so much overlap and similarity, such that, it would be advantageous to partner the programs together to share the workload to achieve desired outcomes. Perhaps it would be advantageous for the board to outline a model for integration that they feel would work better and then we can work together to see if the the goals of both programs can be adequately met by making a merger?

The first Wednesday at noon time slot works perfectly for my schedule.

Cheers,
Patty

Patricia Flatt, PhD
Chemistry Department, DFSC 209
Western Oregon University
345 N. Monmouth Ave
Monmouth, OR 97361

On Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 8:35 AM, PURE <pure@mail.wou.edu> wrote:

Dear Sue, Patty and Kathryn,

The PURE Board met Tuesday this week and considered the STEM Scholars proposal. The PURE Board feels that there there is much overlap in the PURE and STEM Scholars underlying goals; the board thinks that while joining the two programs is a worthy project, it is one that will require thoughtful consideration and careful planning. While the current proposal is a good starting point, the Board also felt it is not a suitable model for long term successful integration and stability of our programs. The Board plans to continue discussion of this topic at it's spring term meetings (the first of which is April 19th) with the goal of articulating more specific points of concern and suggested solutions. The Board also indicated that revisioning possible structures for a smooth integration is a shared responsibility, and they look forward to hearing about other possible structures or approaches STEM Scholars might bring to the table.

In the meantime, I would be happy to plan semi-regular meetings (maybe once per month?) with the STEM Scholarship leadership to begin the process of communication and collaboration between our groups regarding our activities and service to students. Would 12 pm the first Wednesday of each month work for you?

- Ava

Ava R. Howard, Ph.D.
PURE Director & AES Coordinator