

Faculty Senate 26 June 2026, 11:00 am

In attendance: Darrel Malamisura, Vincent Mateescu, Julie Orr, Dharshana Arachchi, Kristin Hicks, Jack Sheffler

N.B. Meeting not called to order due to lack of quorum.

Overview

An earlier executive committee discussion focused on concerns about a possible college-wide mandate to adopt OER (open educational resources) texts for all courses without exception, with participants debating academic freedom, workload, accessibility, cost, and implementation timing. Participants also raised related operational topics including course proctoring/AI-cheating mitigation, promotion & tenure (P&T) Moodle templates, and campus facilities priorities.

Major discussion topics

1. OER adoption: mandate vs. incentivization
 - Core concern: Administration or online-college leadership may require all courses to use OER, not just optional online-college courses.
 - Darrel and others argued mandatory OER would infringe academic freedom by dictating course resources; they cited lack of state or federal legal requirement to force OER adoption.
 - Julie reported Concord faculty reportedly “getting on board” but also noted Concord communications may be inconsistent; Darrel will verify whether Concord’s adoption is mandatory or incentivized.
 - Jack, Kristin, Vincent, Dharshana, and Julie voiced support for faculty choice — using OER voluntarily where appropriate but resisting forced adoption.
2. Workload and quality concerns
 - Darrel and others emphasized extra work for faculty to convert/create OER materials (tests, content, ADA compliance), especially for courses lacking suitable OER (e.g., many nursing courses and courses using complex simulations) where faculty would essentially have to become their own publishers.
 - Several faculty noted that initial stipends for creating OER were insufficient and often temporary; previous incentives “dry up” (Darrel noted the extra pay dries up this summer).
 - Concern expressed that forcing OER could drive attrition/early retirement and make hiring more difficult due to increased uncompensated workload.
3. ADA accessibility and third-party publisher compliance

- Administration's stated rationale: ADA compliance and accessibility requirements across online content.
- Darrel reported vendor (McGraw-Hill) responses indicating most publisher content is being adapted to meet ADA requirements, with interactive elements still under development; McGraw-Hill claims test banks and many modules are close to or already ADA-compliant.
- Kristin and others pointed out that when faculty use third-party publisher platforms, compliance documentation exists and reduces faculty burden; conversely, OER places responsibility for accessibility on faculty.
- Timeline ambiguity: Darrel noted ADA requirements are referenced for 2027–2028 rollout, but no firm college timeline has been announced.

4. AI, academic integrity, and proctoring

- Faculty raised concerns about wholesale AI-assisted cheating. Dharshana and others have voluntarily built test banks and other safeguards to mitigate cheating.
- Kristin discussed publisher tools (keystroke logging, plagiarism/AI-detection features) and whether Moodle integrations can prevent or detect AI misuse; Darrel questioned the effectiveness and practicality.
- Proposed mitigations included proctored in-seat exams, lockdown browsers, reducing frequency of low-stakes online assignments in favor of proctored midterm/final exams, and returning to more in-person testing to reduce opportunities for AI/cheating.

5. Administration transparency, shared governance, and potential escalations

- Darrel expressed distrust over lack of formal announcement and perceived executive secrecy (multiple recent executive sessions of the Board of Governors).
- Darrel pledged to pursue formal grievances and union action if the administration tries to implement mandatory OER policy without faculty input; he said he would publicly withdraw support for the President if a policy were imposed without shared governance.
- Participants emphasized the need for transparency, advance notice, and consultation rather than top-down, last-minute decisions.

6. Practical issues for specific programs

- Nursing: Kristin emphasized many nursing courses currently lack appropriate OERs; ADA compliance and simulation accessibility create special challenges in nursing curriculum.
- Math: Vincent noted Hawkes Learning (used for Math 101/101L) is already on track to meet accessibility requirements; Vincent and others highlighted successful organic faculty transitions to OER in some math courses without central mandate.
- Courses with simulations or substantial publisher integrations (e.g., McGraw-Hill LearnSmart modules) present significant barriers to replacement with OER.

7. Other operational items raised briefly

- P&T Moodle template: P&T committee meeting next week to finalize a centralized template for yearly evaluations and promotion/tenure portfolios; anticipated faculty access after Cody's approval.
 - Library renovation vs student-facing spaces: Jack raised concerns an \$800K investment for a library location on the hill may be inconvenient for students; participants preferred student lounges in academic buildings where students wait between classes.
 - Accreditation workload: Darrel noted an upcoming accreditation deliverable due July 14 and concerns about inadequate resourcing and late timelines; faculty expected more assistance (stipends/release time) historically given for accreditation work.
-

Risks & concerns identified

- Academic freedom erosion if the administration decides to officially move forward with requiring OER usage for all courses.
- Significant uncompensated faculty workload to create/convert OER, especially for courses with few existing OER options or with simulation/interactive content.
- Potential faculty attrition and hiring difficulties if mandate is imposed without adequate compensation/support.
- Confusion and inconsistent communication from administration and between deans, faculty, and external partners (Concord).
- AI/cheating vulnerabilities if course designs rely on frequent online low-stakes assessments without robust proctoring or detection measures.
- Accreditation and compliance risks due to compressed timelines and lack of institutional support.

Motion to adjourn made by Kristin Hicks at 12:08 pm, seconded by Jack Sheffler. Motion passed via acclamation.