Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, February 7, 2022

 4:30-5:30 pm

*Senators Present:*Melissa Anderson, Jackie Apodaca, Edwin Battistella, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Anne Connor, Brian Fedorek, Andrew Gay, Kristin Hocevar, Rachel Jochem, Jesse Longhurst, Christopher Lucas, Merrilyne Lundahl, Matthew Moreali, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker (OCA), Jessica Piekielek, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Chad Thatcher, Lisa Wileman, Kemble Yates

*Senators Absent:* Michael Parker (STEM), Michael Stanfill

*Guests:* Holly Gabriel, Susan Walsh, Sherry Ettlich, Lee Ayers, Daniel DeNeui, E. Jamie Trammell, Dustin Walcher, Alena Ruggerio, Erik Palmer, Rick Bailey, Mark Tveskov

Meeting called to order at 4:02 pm

1. 4:00 pm Approval of Minutes from 01/24/2021

[00:00:06 of recording]

* Motion to Approve Minutes (Ellen Siem) → Seconded (Anne Connor): **Approved**
  1. **19** Vote to Approve: Jackie Apodaca, Edwin Battistella, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Anne Connor, Brian Fedorek, Kristin Hocevar, Rachel Jochem, Jesse Longhurst, Christopher Lucas, Merrilyne Lundahl, Matthew Moreali, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker (OCA), Jessica Piekielek, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Lisa Wileman, Kemble Yates
  2. **1** Abstain (if you were not here): Andrew Gay
  3. **1** Arrived after the vote: Chad Thatcher

1. 4:05 pm President’s Report — **President Richard Bailey**

[00:01:04 of recording]

* Has visited BCE and OCA divisions so far and is looking forward to meeting with the others in the upcoming weeks. Lots of thoughtful questions and dialogue.
* Leaving for Salem early Tuesday morning, and staying till Thursday to meet with legislators and the HECC
* Exciting ideas for additional revenue streams are starting to come his way, but he doesn’t want to announce anything quite yet.

1. 4:100 pm Provost’s Report — **Provost Susan Walsh**

[00:03:31 of recording]

* Sue appreciates the minutes and thinks Anna is doing a superb job summarizing her comments.
* Tuition Advisory Council has started meeting and will continue to into the spring
  1. HB 4141 requires that there are 8 voting members
  2. 2 voting faculty (Erica Knotts and Samuel David)
  3. 4 voting students, one is the student body president
  4. Sue is chair; she and Matt Stillman are the 2 voting administrators
* Kemble Yates asks: Is there a timeline on the Tuition Advisor Council’s need to get a recommendation out? The goal is to give a recommendation to President Bailey within at least 3 weeks of when the Board will meet in April to consider the recommendation.
* Brian Fedorek asks: Are History, Political Science, and Economics joining to become one program, because this is what I have heard? Hasn’t happened yet. That conversation is happening, and an announcement will come with some bigger movements and structural changes. This is a soft announcement, but they do expect this to happen. They will still be distinct programs with an administration merger.

1. 4:15 pm  Advisory Council Report — **Chair-Elect Brian Fedorek**

[00:09:26 of recording]

* Promotion and Tenure Program Personnel Committee workflow (see larger discussion below)
* Curriculum Committee Proposal (see vote below)
* Textbook Affordability Plan and OERs at SOU (see larger discussion below)
* Students are not attending classes because of exposure/quarantining.
* Rick Bailey comments: The AC is thoughtful in discussions and he gives us kudos.
* Melissa adds: Incomplete Grades (I and Es) will now impact student’s federal financial aid (Financial Aid will come to talk to us in the future)

1. 4:20 pm ASSOU Report — **Mason Healy-Patterson**

[00:14:04 of recording]

* Not present today.

1. 4:30 pm Textbook Affordability Plan Approval — **Holly Gabriel**

[00:14:43 of recording]

* This is all because there was a house bill/law that was passed that we must comply with.
* They have created an OER advisory group, and their resources can be found on inside.sou.edu under Faculty Resources or at the library under OER Guide
* They have created an affordability plan with lays out 10 Rules
* They have made 2 FAQ documents for our reference
  1. Course Materials Designation FAQs
  2. Boostoke Textbook Adoption Portal FAQs
* She would like us, as Senate, to officially approve these documents
* Clickers and calculators count as course materials.
* There is a flow chart available to help you decide if your course materials are low cost, no cost, or an OER.
* Jesse Longhurst asks: Why cannot this information be captured in the book store adoptions? Why does this have to go through the schedulers?
* Brian Fedorek asks: The SOU bookstore is owned by Barnes and Nobles and that they set the price for students even though they can find material cheaper online. What about if we find a competitor that sells material cheaper? Students with financial aid or veterans services HAVE to use the bookstore and cannot use that money anywhere else.
* Merrilyn asks: What does 25% mean in rule #10? (SMART Goal #10: By the end of Fall 2024, 25% of courses will have at least one section of the course using no-cost or low-cost open educational resources.)
  1. 25% of sections offered is what was initially ment, but this may not work for every department.
  2. 25% of the department?
  3. 25% of courses across campus?
  4. Holly says that she was hoping that one section of any course could be offered with low cost or OERs, but this is not going to work for some disciplines.
* Senate has asked for some clarification before we, Senate, vote to formally endorse this.

1. 4:40 pm Curriculum Proposals (Vote) — **Anna Oliveri**

[00:40:48 of recording]

* Motion to approve the Certificate in Environmental Communication (Brian Fedorek) → Seconded (Kemble Yates): **Approved Unanimously**
  1. **21** Approve: Jackie Apodaca, Edwin Battistella, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Anne Connor, Brian Fedorek, Andrew Gay, Kristin Hocevar, Rachel Jochem, Jesse Longhurst, Christopher Lucas, Merrilyne Lundahl, Matthew Moreali, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker (OCA), Jessica Piekielek, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Chad Thatcher, Lisa Wileman, Kemble Yates
* Motion to approve new courses (Communication, Emerging Media and Digital Arts, Environmental Science and Policy, and Sociology and Anthropology) as a batch (Brian Fedorek) → Seconded (Jesse Longhurst): **Approved**
  1. Questions and comments about the courses
     + Anne Connor asks if they would ever want a 330 ESP course to go with the 230 and 430. Jamie Trammell says not as of now, but maybe someday. They already have a course that is 330, so that would be an issue.
     + Kemble Yates asked about the role of the 329 data visualization course and the prerequisites. What kind of math ability do you want entering this course? It will be a research methods elective for majors and minors. They don’t want too many prerequisites because it's connected to a micro credential and they want nonmajors in it.
     + Brian Fedorek wants to know if there are other courses on campus that have a 200/400 split. Yes, Andrew Gay says they have a course like this in their program.
     + Amy Belcastro wants to know more about the 230/430 ESP courses and the differences in the learning outcomes (relating to what we are learning in our general education design). They are planning for the rigor of the assignments to separate the 200 vs 400 level course, even though the outcomes are the same. The course changes a lot with location from offering to offering so they are trying to keep it vague and specific at the same time. They are really looking at what they are learning from general education redesign and applying that to the 500 version of this course.
  2. **18** Approve: Edwin Battistella, Jeremy Carlton, Brian Fedorek, Andrew Gay, Kristin Hocevar, Rachel Jochem, Jesse Longhurst, Christopher Lucas, Merrilyne Lundahl, Matthew Moreali, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker (OCA), Jessica Piekielek, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Chad Thatcher, Lisa Wileman, Kemble Yates
  3. **1** Not Approve: Amy Belcastro
  4. **1** Abstain: Jackie Apodaca
  5. **1** Did Not Vote: Anne Connor

1. 4:50 pm Gen Ed Update — **Andrew Gay**

[00:58:14 of recording]

* Andrew sent out an email that covers most of the updates.
* New Deadline set for Feb 18th to do course design map. Mentors need you to submit for them to have time to provide feedback.
* Institute for e-prfolio team has been working away, focusing on some purposeful learning. They do not anticipate recommending any additional revisions to the general education model.
* Current plan is that purposeful learning will be used as a bridge between general education and program requirements. Possibly related to capstones.
* **If you are doing e-portfolios Andrew wants you to reach out to him.**
* Some capacities (CE and CI) only have 2 mentors instead of the planned 3 - should we add new mentors now, so late in the process? Should we allow just 2 mentors to approve courses? Should Andrew become the 3rd person? He will give opinions/plan at the next meeting.

1. 5:00 pm Bylaws Changes for P&T Workflow — **Melissa Anderson** & **Dan DeNeui**

[01:07:57 of recording]

* Can we streamline the P&T Process?
* Two issues:

1. The hard copy/paper that needs to be signed by the PPC and the FPC, as well as, putting the recommendation in Activity Insight. This is redundant. This topic will go to the constitution committee to address. Anyone doing PPC or FPCs now; they will accept digital signatures.
2. The colleague evaluation and the PPC are usually the same group of people and it's increasingly hard to staff PPCs because of the strict rules. Maybe the PPC could be optional and either the faculty member or the chair can request it be added into the workflow.

* Brian Fedorek says: The bylaws say that the intent of a colleague evaluation is to provide feedback so the faculty member can improve. If that is the intent, then we need to change the timeline. Doing a colleague evaluation in the fall right before they apply doesn’t give them any time to show improvements. Instead of being within 2 years, it should be done the previous academic year.
* Kemble Yates says: If we change this, we should forbid the colleague evaluation from being right before someone goes up for P&T.
* Rachel Jochem says: The reason for the paper copy is that the PPC members would actually get together and talk to one another. She believes this is possibly an artifact of an old system and maybe we don’t want to get rid of all of it.
* Andrew Gay believes that the PPC sets the tone in the workflow process. If there is a colleague eval that says the faculty member needs correction, then there needs to be a PPC to relook at that. If the Colleague eval was glowing, then maybe they don’t need that PPC and the chair can start the P&T evaluation process.
* Jackie Apadaca timing is the issue, because the two evaluations have a different point. This only feels redundant because they are scheduled right on top of each other usually.
* Being evaluated as acceptable/prefered/exceptional for your current position vs getting promoted have different definitions and maybe we need to look into this more (maybe via the Post Tenure Review task force)
* The Constitution committee is tasked with creating a draft.

1. 5:20 pm Announcements/New Business

[01:31:36 of recording]

* None.

12) 5:30 pm Adjourn

Meeting adjourns at 5:30 pm