

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 25, 2019

SU 313, 4:00-5:30p

Present: Melissa Anderson, Enrique Chacón, Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Carol Ferguson, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Marianne Golding, Cynthia Hutton, Dennis Jablonski, Marc Koyack, Laurie Kurutz, Charles Lane, Jesse Longhurst, Tiffany Morey, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Chad Thatcher, Elizabeth Whitman, Kemble Yates

Absent: Precious Yamaguchi, Justin Harmon

Guests: Susan Walsh, Linda Schott, Sherry Ettlich, David Humphrey, Dan DeNeui, Lee Ayers, Scott Rex, John King, Jim Bower, Karen Stone, Dave Carter, Matt Stillman

Meeting called to order at:
4:00 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from 2/11

- Ferguson moved to approve minutes; Kurutz seconded.
- Chacón, Condon, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Hutton, Koyack, Kurutz, Morey, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, Whitman, and Yates voted to approve. None opposed. Anderson, Gay, and Longhurst abstained. Jablonski & Lane were late and did not vote. **Motion passed.**

2. President's Report: Linda Schott

- President Schott noted that there was not a lot of news. Representatives from KCC and OIT were unable to attending the articulation meeting to be held that evening due to weather. We will plan something with them at a later date.

3. Provost's Report: Susan Walsh

- Tuition advisory council continues to meet weekly; this is a council meeting about any tuition increases that will be recommended to the board of trustees

- For those interested, information about the Tuition Advisory Council (TAC) is on the president's page and contains minutes, materials used for training, other materials of interest
- There are 4 students on the council, two from ASSOU and two from traditionally underrepresented groups, plus two faculty and two others. Matt Stillman, a division director, and others sometimes sit in as well. Meetings are open and you are welcome to sit in.
- Four candidates have visited campus for the director of the Honors College position. Walsh thanked Janet Fratella for her work on the search. There are three finalists after one candidate took another position and all are very good. The administration hopes to be making an offer very soon. Ferguson asked when the new director would start, and Walsh responded that they are imagining the person starting around June 15th or July 1st.
- Lane asked for the administration's estimate of the effect of the governor's budget on tuition. Schott responded that she did not think the governor's recommended budget would be the final budget. She is concerned about what the final number will be, though. The increase over the recommended budget would have to be 120 million or more for tuition to stay under 5%. Otherwise we could be looking at double digits.
- Schott also mentioned that a cabinet-to-cabinet meeting was held with ASSOU to listen to their priorities. Also, Jeff Golden will be on campus talking to students, and faculty and others can also make their thoughts known to representatives.
- Gay stated that he received an email from a faculty member about the new bill proposing that community colleges offer 4 year degrees. Walsh stated that for now it's just nursing, but plans are to offer applied business as well. Gay asked if RCC wanted to offer these programs, and Walsh answered that this is coming from a certain person in the legislature who has this as a project. Schott added that this kind of bill has happened in twenty-something other states, usually around applied degrees. Pam Marsh is looking out for us and has asked if we'd like to see language added stating that this would only apply if there isn't a four-year institution in the region. Schott believes the president of RCC actually did not support the bill. Our best defense against this sort of bill is the work we are doing with the Southern Oregon Higher Education Consortium, proactively talking with community colleges about how we can all work together to meet needs. Schott added that this was also a bill that was moving so fast, it could have hurt us more to oppose it.

4. Advisory Council report: Marianne Golding

- The provost and president signed the resolution from last time
- The president's contract is up, and the board may seek input on how the president is doing
- Schott added that the board is still discussing this, and hasn't decided what exactly they are going to do, but they would like feedback of some kind

- Ferguson asked if this was new, because we have a board now? Ayers mentioned the faculty senate-led evaluations of the past, but those are different from what this is and would happen next year. Walsh confirmed that the evaluation process is different, and this is a new approach. Schott mentioned that this was her idea. The board was talking about renewing her contract and she suggested they survey campus, for transparency

5. American Association for the Advancement of Science Report: Jim Bower

- Bower introduced himself as an affiliate faculty member in Biology and explained made an arrangement to become executive director of the AAAS Pacific Division. It is an organization that is very active in Washington D.C. with grants and other issues, publishes *Science* magazine, and more. There are three divisions, and the Pacific is the most active.
- The 2019 meeting of the AAAS Pacific Division will be here in Ashland June 18-22, and Bower encourages everyone to participate
- The meeting will be highly interdisciplinary and very broad in scope. There will be symposia, workshops, poster sessions, etc.
- SOU students will get half-price admission of \$26, faculty presenters will be able to register for \$80
- There will be lots of music, art, and theater at the meeting, including a public opening of an art and science exhibit at Schneider museum
- Meeting will emphasize local and community issues such as forest fires, diversification of agriculture, farm to table programs, aging and nutrition, as well as scientific publishing, precision medicine, AI, history of science, and much more.
- Bower is working on a certification of sustainability for the meeting, as well as a First Friday-type Science Night downtown on the Wednesday 6/19
- AAAS is very interested in undergrad, grad, even high school student participation
- For more info contact bowerj@sou.edu

6. ASSOU Report: Alexis Phillips

- Alexis Phillips was not present

7. New Proposals from Academic Policies Committee (Possible Vote)

- Gay explained that two proposals are to remove the 48 subject code requirements for the BA/BS degrees, and remove the early registration for online students.

- Golding clarified that the language requirement for the BA is “second year of a foreign language” not “year of a second language”; the wording on the proposal makes it sound like only one year is required. Stillman said he would make sure that gets fixed.
- Fedorek moved to approve both academic policy changes; Lane seconded
- Jablonski commented that Stillman had said that with the early registration removed, there might be a system for online degree students and asked if that was still an intention. Stillman confirmed this, and said he could reach out to programs and reserve seats if necessary.
- Jablonski asked when policies would go into place; Stillman said that Spring registration was already open, so it would be Summer or Fall and departments would be notified
- Anderson, Chacón, Condon, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Lane, Longhurst, Morey, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, Whitman, and Yates voted to approve. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
- Stillman asked if he could go ahead and make the catalog change now, and general consensus was yes

8. New University Studies Proposals: Dale Vidmar

- Vidmar was not present; Ayers stated that University Studies had prepared a list of courses to approve, including three new exploration courses and four new integration courses
- Ferguson asked about the language in the COMM 486 proposal stating that the particular focus of the health literacy communication would be “lower educated populations” and not broader health literacy; even well-educated people have difficulty evaluating health information for credibility/accuracy. Ayers responded that she did not remember that question coming up, but Ferguson could reach out to the faculty member (Kristin Hocevar) for clarification about this. Whitman confirmed that faculty often welcomed this kind of feedback
- Gay reminded senators that all were invited to the University Studies drive to see full proposals (which are not in Senate drive). All should have access to it; if you don’t, let Ayers know.
- Gay asked about US committee vote for Music 210; Ayers explained that three committee members had previously asked for missing information to be supplied before voting. The day the proposal came back for voting, the four members present voted to approve it.

9. Director’s Report on Post-Tenure Review

- Gay explained that report in Drive was based on questions authored by mostly previous Advisory Council and a little by Gay. Ettlich was original contact for this

discussion and can provide context. At the end of question #7 there are suggestions for potential bylaws changes--perhaps Ettlich can give summary

- Ferguson asked why Senate was inquiring about this topic.
- Gay briefly recapped history: A discussion came up last year around a potential bylaw change for post-tenure review and expectations. The bylaw change failed, but Advisory Council discussed it further and decided to ask directors for evidence that the current process of post-tenure review was not effective. Yates and Jablonski created the questions, and then Gay polished them and sent them out during Fall term.
- Ettlich explained that the discussion centered around two things; we have definitions around deficiencies, and there are certain policies you have to follow, but the bar is very low. Post-tenure and post-promotion, there is no standard for what is expected. The proposal is to get some tools to deal with this. Maybe we need another column for the standard for someone at this level. The directors dodged some of the questions because they felt like they weren't quite getting at the real issue.
- Ferguson asked for clarification. Ettlich explained that in question #4, Senate asked about ratings, but directors don't do that. Faculty self-rate in their FPARs. Directors can communicate, but they don't have a way to evaluate. In question #6, Senate asked about finding deficiencies, but the way it is now, it is very hard to rate someone that low, so there isn't a hard number to cite. Ferguson stated that this was anecdotal evidence; directors were asked for numbers. Ettlich explained that they don't have numbers since occurrence is so rare.
- A lively discussion about what kind of feedback directors can give ensued. Gay stated that directors don't rate, but they do give feedback. DeNeui stated that the process is implied, but the bylaws don't say that directors should give feedback. Ferguson clarified that the process allows feedback, and Ettlich stated that the tool allowed it, but there isn't a process because the bylaws don't say anything about it, and there isn't any action that follows.
- Siders asked if the evidence showed there was no problem; Oliveri suggested that the disconnect between what people do and how they self-rate might be evidence of a problem. Ayers stated that she has to remind people to report everything they do in their FPARs; they will go back to them when they go up for promotion.
- DeNeui said that directors may be faced with FPARs lacking evidence, but since the person has already self-rated, and the chair has already rated the person, the directors don't really have a lot of authority to ask for more evidence. Anderson asked if directors can send "back" FPARs lacking in evidence or otherwise incomplete. DeNeui responded (later) that directors can send FPARs back to previous step (chairs)
- King said that we shouldn't be looking at this only for deficiencies; that is a missed opportunity. We should broaden the thinking and approach post-tenure review in a way that is supportive and collaborative.

- Ferguson noted that chairs were referenced in report too. The chair would know more detail. Maybe chairs are also not doing their job; the role is very important and that is where faculty should be getting feedback.
- Ferguson also asked what role of FPAR is; it seems to have morphed into something bizarre; it might be related to accreditation. Walsh noted that the post-tenure review language is in bylaws; it's just a tool to record it that has changed. Walsh stated she enjoys reading them and learns a lot about what people are doing when she reads them.
- Rex stated that he felt Activity Insight has made the process more meaningful; it has been helpful to him; seeing the feedback from Chairs and giving feedback didn't really occur before
- King stated that this process is an opportunity to make what you do visible and acknowledge it, reward it, support it; it gets what you do out on the table. Now we just need to decide what to do with it. Post-tenure review can get us into a conversation about what to do with this information
- Ferguson noted that King's comment was very positive; but she felt the document from the directors felt more punitive. Gay noted that the framing for the questions was more problem-focused.
- Gay noted that the Faculty personnel FPC is going to come in 2 weeks and talk more about FPARs. Lots of potential for more training around what you are communicating on the FPAR, who the audience is, etc.. about what you are communicating, who the audience is, etc.
- Ettlich noted that the FPARs create a useful repository of information about who is doing what, who is on what committee, etc.; Humphrey also noted that the FPARs are useful to him and help him to recognize faculty accomplishments
- Fedorek stated that it seems like there are a few separate issues: What is the FPAR and how can we do it better; Brian: 3 issues at same time; what is FPAR; how can we do it better; post-tenure review; should there be post-tenure expectations
- A discussion about the timeliness of colleague evaluations ensued. Stone and Ettlich both explained that there is a faculty tracking document that notes who has had an evaluation when. This information is uploaded to Activity Insight and chairs have access to it. Ferguson noted that it be complicated when there are not enough senior people in a program to do a colleague evaluation. Rex noted that these situations are the ones that can sometimes lead to people refraining from noting deficiencies on evaluations.
- King noted that review and evaluation do not have to be the same thing; there is a richer way of doing this, review can be more than just evaluation.
- Walsh noted that one issue that emerged from the discussion was whether or not there should be a different set of expectations for post-tenure faculty. The current set of expectations is for promoting faculty. Schott said she really appreciated the discussion and she recommended discretion in how we talk about this topic.
- Jablonski stated that when the discussion started it was not about FPAR accountability, but about what the post-promotion, post-tenure expectations

should be. He and Yates thought that there might be a lot of different ways post-tenure, post-promotion faculty could be contributing

- Directors then left for the articulation meeting
- Ferguson asked for next steps. Gay responded that the Faculty Personnel Committee will come to present their own discussion; our previous discussion was summarized for them and they will respond to it. Gay is going to put the document he sent to them in the Senate drive. Ferguson asked if we should share this ongoing conversation with our programs, and Gay said yes.
- A discussion about the training/lack thereof for filling out the FPAR ensued. Oliveri mentioned the gap between training for FPAR and time they are due. Ferguson said that junior faculty are all getting different information and it sets them up to fail. Chacón wondered if chairs were trained on how to give feedback. Fedorek said that if anyone needs guidance about how to navigate promotion and tenure, FPARs, etc. he is their huckleberry. He would have a symposium on these topics. Whitman said that we need to clarify the language around evaluation and promotion and tenure; the FPAR is one piece of a larger evaluation; it would be helpful if this process was formalized and explained to people.
- Gay asked if people share FPARs in retreats; consensus was no, although Kurutz said once several years ago Theater shared FPARs in a retreat.

10. Bylaws Review of Committee on Committees: Marianne Golding

- This topic was bumped due to time and will be discussed next time. There are documents about this in the drive. Look at them and think about if the bylaws reflect what this committee is/should be doing.

11. Announcements/New Business

- Kurutz: *Elektra* sold out, even after an extended run; a new show is opening Thursday and will run for two weekends. It's Noel Coward's *Hay Fever*, a rollicking comedy.
- Golding: The French dinner sold out

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.