

Faculty Senate Minutes DRAFT

Monday, May 20, 2019

SU 313, 4:00-5:30p

Present: Melissa Anderson, Deb Brown, Enrique Chacón, Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Carol Ferguson, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Marianne Golding, Justin Harmon, Cynthia Hutton, Dennis Jablonski, Marc Koyack, Jesse Longhurst, Anna Oliveri, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Chad Thatcher, Kemble Yates, Precious Yamaguchi

Absent: Laurie Kurutz, Tiffany Morey, Charles Lane, Linda Schott

Guests: Sue Walsh, Kristin Hocevar, Britney Sharp, Bret Anderson, Lee Ayers, Jody Waters, Larry Shrewsbury, Dale Vidmar

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm. Gay reminded senators that an at-large Senate election was in progress, and explained a revision to the agenda [see item #6 below].

1. Approval of Minutes from 05/06

- Ferguson moved to approve the minutes; Yamaguchi seconded.
- Gay noted that Belcastro had asked for an amendment to the minutes because she was a co-presenter of the IFS item, not a guest. It was clarified that all non-senators are listed as “guests” in the minutes. Belcastro perhaps should have been listed as a co-presenter on the agenda.
- Brown, Chacón, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Longhurst, Oliveri, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, Yates, and Yamaguchi voted to approve; none opposed; Anderson, Condon, and Gay abstained. **Motion passes.**

2. President’s Report – Linda Schott

- President Schott was absent.

3. Provost’s Report – Sue Walsh

- Walsh noted that the board had approved a range of tuition increases, the final amount of the increase dependent on the funding from PUSF. U of O is also releasing a range of tuition increases dependent on PUSF funding.

- Different numbers are being discussed in Salem--40.5 million (already approved), 80 million, and 120 million ("the presidents ask," the bare minimum to keep current service levels). The HECC recommended 186 million, but we're nowhere near that.
- At the Council of Presidents meeting last week, Tina Kotek and Peter Courtney [from the legislature] spent a half an hour with the presidents. They wouldn't provide a number, but said they would have settled on a number by the week of June 10.
- We need to present to the HECC on the 13th, which doesn't give us a lot of room to pivot and be adaptable. The good news is we have our range and are ahead of the conversation
- Even if we get 120 million for PUSF, we will still have to go before the HECC with an 8.5% tuition increase. We can't get below 5% without more cuts or going below an 8% fund balance. SOU is very committed to keeping the fund balance where the board is comfortable, and is very mindful of what additional cuts beyond what was proposed to the board would do to the institution.
- Ferguson asked if other state institutions have the same rules about the fund balance. Walsh responded that both U of O and OSU have much more in their fund balance. A discussion ensued about what different recommendations are or have been for the fund balance. Walsh stated that SOU has made investments and she believes 8% is realistic for what we are trying to do now.
- Walsh stated that students are showing up in the capitol to lobby legislators; she showed a postcard they have made and signed with a message about support from the state for higher education. Jeanne Stallman will be taking the postcards to Salem.
- Faculty can reach out to legislators; the next week and a half is critical for outreach
- Golding mentioned that cards have also been circulated for faculty to sign; she was given one to sign by Barbara Henson; if faculty want to get one they should contact Henson.

4. AC Report – Marianne Golding

- Most of what was discussed is on agenda
- The call for membership on committees is coming soon; it will be coming from Paul's email address
- We're waiting on equivalencies for ELUs from the administration--the weight and workload of the various committees is being worked out. Ideally we'll know that before the call goes out, if not we can make adjustments later
- Ferguson asked how the equivalencies are being determined; Golding explained that the committee chairs provided information about meetings and workload

- Walsh added that she and Waters had both served on the various committees as well and could confirm the hours suggested by the chairs. Waters was going to meet with chairs also, but this wasn't needed as the estimates from chairs and from the Provost's office aligned
- Golding commented that the work of some committees is changing or has changed. Walsh stated that these numbers are not set in stone, and this work is in progress.
- Golding added that professional track faculty will also need to have a conversation with their chairs about work on committees; the Provost has to approve the ELUs given as well.
- Jablonski mentioned that this process has implications for professorial faculty as well. It is likely these documents will be used in promotion and tenure discussions and by the Faculty Personnel Committee. It will require more development.

5. Request to Waive the Two-Week Rule: Faculty Awards – Faculty Personnel Committee

- B. Anderson stated that there are three things in this agenda item--Professional Development Grants, Distinguished Service awards, and Distinguished Teaching awards.
- For the Distinguished Service Award, two are being recommended: Margaret Perrow and Dennis Slattery
- For the Distinguished Teaching Award, two are being recommended: Precious Yamaguchi and Emily Reeder.
- Gay asked how the committee evaluates PDG applications. B. Anderson stated that they are more well-funded than Carpenter I awards; Carpenter awards are about 20% of requests, whereas PDGs are more like 65-70%. The committee (6 members) review packets a week ahead of time, each member ranks them individually, evaluates their impact or benefit to SOU, and the merits of the proposal in general. How award amounts are divided up is somewhat a factor of who is on the committee. A discussion ensued about the details of how decisions are made about exactly how much is granted.
- It is helpful to know if the grants need full funding to go forward, or what the priorities are within the requests
- Golding asked about Carpenter 1 grants, and about history of the educational focus for them.
- B. Anderson responded saying that Carpenter I has been seen as a grant for "retooling," for terminal degrees, for the acquisition of specific skills, and for new area of scholarship. For this particular committee, these have been priorities.
- Fedorek moved to waive the two week rule and Yates seconded
- Anderson, Brown, Condon, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Longhurst, Oliveri, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, Yates,

Yamaguchi voted to approve; none opposed; Chacón and Gay abstained.

Motion passes.

- Ferguson moved to approve teaching awards. Fedorek seconded.
- Anderson, Brown, Condon, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Longhurst, Oliveri, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, and Yates voted to approve; none opposed; Yamaguchi, Chacón, and Gay abstained. **Motion passes.**
- Ferguson moved to approve service awards. Fedorek seconded. Anderson, Brown, Chacón, Condon, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Longhurst, Oliveri, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, and Yates, and Yamaguchi voted to approve; none opposed; Gay abstained. **Motion passes.**
- Ferguson moved to approve Professional Development Grants; Thatcher seconded. Brown, Condon, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Oliveri, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, and Yates, and Yamaguchi voted to approve; none opposed; Anderson, Chacón, Fedorek, Koyack, Longhurst, and Gay abstained
- Jablonski stated that he has lobbied for a distinguished award for research, and noted that the proposals are outstanding and interesting; it would be nice to see an award for research. Walsh asked if anyone was working on it currently.
- Ferguson noted that she and Hala Schepmann worked on the teaching and service award proposals. Anyone can bring forward a proposal, but it has go through APSOU, Senate, the administration, and the Faculty Professional Development committee, and it takes a while. Discussion ensued about the process to create this kind of award.
- Jablonski asked if the administration funded these awards, and Walsh confirmed that her office funds them, and is supportive, but doesn't create them--faculty propose criteria and go through the process to create them.
- Ferguson suggested that Jablonski talk to Hala Schepmann about the process; she has all the notes from to process to create the other awards.
- Jablonski asked about funding for PDG funds, and Walsh explained that PDG funds, and PDA account amounts, are part of the CBA.

6. Motion: New Graduate Curriculum Proposals (Introduced 05/06)--this was scratched

- This item was deleted from the agenda because these were the same courses approved at the last meeting.

7. Motion: Proposed Changes to Faculty Bylaws: Academic Policies Committee & SSC Involvement (Introduced 05/06)

- Yates moved to approve the changes, and Yamaguchi seconded.

- Fedorek asked if all bylaws changes were included, and Gay answered that they were.
- Anderson, Brown, Chacón, Condon, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Longhurst, Oliveri, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, Yates, Yamaguchi voted to approve; none opposed; Gay abstained. **Motion passes.**

8. New University Studies Course Proposals (Discussion Only)

- These course proposals are final ones for this year
- Vidmar stated that they were well vetted because they did not go through US on the first attempt, but were revised, rewritten, and resubmitted
- Bio 384 was the only one that was not unanimous because the syllabus on paper was not as complete as the explanation given to the US committee.
- Ferguson stated that she still had concerns about affiliate faculty proposing hard numbered courses. Vidmar stated that the committee discussed this but, as Waters also stated, this is not really the purview of committee. Courses sometimes end up taught by others, and not the one who proposed it.
- Fedorek asked if when five year review comes up and no application is made, if the course just stays. Fedorek feels that it does a disservice to students if it's been so long since it was approved that it is no longer delivering the same learning outcomes. Ferguson stated that this was more likely with affiliate faculty.
- Discussion ensued about how the committee handles situations about courses up for renewal.
- Ayers said that every five years the US committee does a review based on the charge from Faculty Senate and tries to clean it up. They we will nudge and ask programs if they don't resubmit, but it's not in their charge to remove them if they don't. Gen Ed is on the table so maybe the committee will wait and see what happens without before making any changes to the process.
- Gay asked about publishing learning outcomes with the catalog descriptions. Waters responded that this is the ideal time to be having these discussions, and there would be additional discussion about it. Waters added that US has oversight from Ayers, from accreditation, and it's a well-governed process. They don't have the mechanism to remove the US designation in the catalog, and that's something that should probably be addressed.

9. New Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal (Discussion Only)

- Shrewsbury was available for questions
- Ferguson asked if the Chemistry proposals were for new courses

- Oliveri explained that Chem 104, 105, and 106 were Chemistry courses for Nursing students that used to exist, and that the program wants to bring back
- Fedorek asked about courses that had already been approved as US courses, but were now up for approval generally
- Ayers explained that sometimes the Curriculum Committee is a little slower to get the course approvals to Senate; the US committee looked at it after it was approved by Curriculum, but got it to Senate from US before Curriculum submitted it to Senate

10. Accessibility Policies (Discussion Only) – Michele Barlow

- Michele Barlow did not attend
- Waters stated that the policies needed to go through various bodies before being open for public comment
- SOU is applying a new set of guidelines to be in compliance; this keeps SOU on track

11. Student Evaluation of Instruction Task Force Report – Melissa Anderson

- Anderson explained the task force process and what is in report
- Task force did a literature review, did primary research with IFS members and SOU faculty and students, and drafted recommendations
- Quantitative student evaluations of teaching have significant bias
- There is a widespread lack of confidence in results on the part of students and faculty
- Links between student learning and evaluations are small
- Methodology currently used for evaluations is not sound
- Current evaluations are not doing what they were designed to do
- U of O is leading the way in Oregon on improvement of student evaluations of teaching and is discussed in report
- Recommendations are in the report; task force does not feel current use of evaluations should be continued
- Task force recommended revision of questions used, with focus on more qualitative questions, and possibly more program-specific questions
- Instructors could use feedback from evaluations to write reflection which incorporates student feedback, which would be used for P & T, in the place of current quantitative use of evaluations
- The task force also had recommendations about instructions given to students
- Other recommendations included the use of mid-term evaluations, peer observations

- Task force did not recommend specific questions, but gave examples. The task force is recommending that another group work on the actual questions used
- Hocevar mentioned that the reflection was recommended because the task force did not want to inhibit experimentation and innovation
- Sharp (the student representative) mentioned that it is hard to represent “the student view,” but that she feels strongly that a student should be on the committee to draft new questions. Students don’t really understand what “effectiveness” really means, and she thinks the reflection and the qualitative questions are a better way to evaluate student experience. She also recommended opening evaluations earlier.
- Fedorek wondered if students would really answer qualitative questions. Anderson suggested that perhaps that is why U of O and other institutions are encouraging the use of class time for evaluations
- Waters suggested the reflection could be part of the FPAR as well. Anderson said that the student evaluation reflection was meant to incorporate student feedback, and the FPAR didn’t necessarily do that, but they could be consolidated.
- Thatcher asked what could be done about courses with more than one instructor. Longhurst mentioned this as well. Waters suggested that this was actually a loading concern, not a question about the evaluations per se.
- Ferguson thanked the task force for their work, and noted that the question about what students did to contribute to their own learning was an important part that has been missing. Oliveri noted that she had been asked that question when she was a student.
- Ferguson asked if in large classes the instructor would have to read a lot of long evaluations. Anderson noted that there is bias against large classes, and that this process would hopefully remediate some of that, but that it was an issue to be considered.
- Golding noted that a lot of students don’t believe the evaluations are used. Anderson said that this factor should be considered in instructions too; student need to understand why evaluations are done and how they are used, and anonymity should be explained better as well.
- Longhurst suggested it might be helpful to separate the teacher from the class format in evaluation questions. Sharp mentioned that the separation of the course and the instructor is important.

12. Draft Task Force Charge: Transforming General Education

- Gay explained the draft charge for the task force and its relation to the PLC report; he explained that Ed Battistella had presented to Advisory Council, and that the timeline for these changes was discussed

- Advisory Council would like this charge to be approved so that it could ask for volunteers, possibly even over the summer. It's going to involve a lot of people, more even than on the task force.
- Ferguson noted that the charge was different from what the PLC did and asked what the problem the task force is trying to address is
- Ayers stated that the PLC was not saying that SOU has a problem, but was looking at Gen Ed across the board and looking at different models and what it could be
- The task force would be looking at rightsizing Gen Ed credits with regards to cost, transferability, etc.
- Ferguson asked about the role of Gen Ed, and wondered if the question was about credits or about liberal arts, and wondered how the specific charge of the task force related to these questions
- Gay noted that AC had talked about the possibility of different pathways, of experiential learning
- A discussion ensued about membership, about the call for volunteers, and about assessment; the language about assessment was amended slightly in the charge
- Comments and suggestions can still be sent to Gay; faculty should also look at the ex officio membership which is large, but includes relevant voices

13. Announcements/New Business

- Thatcher: Students completing Hawaii trip, more are completing San Juan trip, they're doing great
- Golding: IS international film fest tomorrow and Wednesday, let your students know
- Gay: Wednesday the 29th the Digital Media Film Club is hosting an expo, with demonstrations and other things. The 30th is the annual SOU Student Film Festival at the Varsity downtown
- Thatcher: The Theater department has some cool plays out, and faculty get to go for free
- Fedorek: FPAR deadlines are coming up, if you have problems, send them to Oliveri
- Gay: We've had conversations about the task forces and topics, and faculty can forward feedback about these various issues to him to pass along to the task forces
- Walsh: The administration is working on a shared drive for directors to load requests for service ELUs by division, and it's almost done

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.