Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, February 21, 2022

 4:30-5:30 pm

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

*Senators Absent:* Kristin Hocevar, Jessica Piekielek, Michael Stanfill,

*Guests:*  Clayton Austin, Lee Ayers, Rick Bailey, Sherry Ettlich, Holly Gabriel, Deborah Rosenberg, Donna Lane, Dustin Walcher, Susan Walsh, SOU ROTC

Meeting called to order at 4:01 pm

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

[00:00:50 of recording]

* Minor additions to the details about the Tuition Advisory Council in the minutes were suggested via email by Sue Walsh
* Motion to Approve (with minor additions) Minutes (Amy Belcastro) → Seconded (Chris Lucas): **Approved Unanimously** (from those who were present)
	1. **16** Vote to Approve: Edwin Battistella, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Anne Connor, Brian Fedorek, Andrew Gay, Rachel Jochem, Jesse Longhurst, Christopher Lucas, Merrilyne Lundahl, Matthew Moreali, Anna Oliveri, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Lisa Wileman, Kemble Yates
	2. **4** Arrived after the vote: Jack Apodace, Michael Parker (OCA), Michael Parker (STEM), Chad Thatcher
1. 4:05 pm President’s Report — **President Richard Bailey**

[00:02:58 of recording]

* He made a video that he put out, and you should have received it as an email. Emphasizing “marketplace of ideas”.
* He went to Salem and met with Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC)’s Terry Cross, the Speaker of the House, and various Legislators.
* Heard from several legislators in his one-on-one meetings that “they were nervous about sending their family members to any higher ed. institution because they thought that they were going to be brainwashed and that we are basically a hippie commune”
	1. He forcefully said that we are a marketplace of ideas and everything is welcome here. He tried to emphasize this is a safe space for discussion across the political spectrum.
	2. He pointed out that there are 6 SOU graduates in the state legislature and 4 of them are republicans.
	3. Not just an issue for SOU, but a larger ivory tower of academic perception issue.
	4. We are battling a misconception.
	5. He knows it is his role to be nonpartisan. He mentioned a book called “Presidencies Derailed” and the main point is that college presidents who share their own political views typically end in disaster.
* Watch the video of this part: Very important discussion about who SOU is and experiences faculty have had with student perception.
	1. General complaints are that higher ed is too liberal. This is being seen in K-12 classrooms as well. There is distrust in education as a whole by our society now.
	2. Perception is coming from stories being told to them, but those stories are not always grounded in reality.
	3. Have heard first generation college students claim I'm not a liberal, so this liberal arts stuff at SOU isn't going to work for me.There is a misconception about liberal arts being a partisan term.
	4. It is true though, some students do not feel comfortable in certain classes. They feel like they are the only one that doesn't agree with the rest of the class (or instructor). Politically, religiously, economically, socially. If you give students a safe space to express themselves, in a one-on-one setting, they will share their discomfort. One student experiencing discomfort can return home to another part of Oregon, or the world, and share their experience. This one experience can then taint a community's opinion about SOU.
	5. Our previous SOU President made political statements in speeches which could have alienated a portion of our students.
	6. However, sometimes the discomfort and the push back is because people don't want to be presented with a different opinion. Growth and learning about other perceptions of the world can be uncomfortable, but that is part of what college is about.
	7. Possibly SOU could rebrand and focus on our nontraditional students. Show how we reshape a student's life, completely unrelated to politics. Working adult decides to make a career change. Veteran returns home and starts college.
1. 4:100 pm Provost’s Report — **Provost Susan Walsh**

[00:18:19 of recording]

* Appreciated the previous conversation, and mentions that there is an article in Inside Higher Ed today about what is going on at UT Austin, and how issues like those in the prior conversation are moving from K-12 to Higher Ed.
* Gov Brown released info about lifting the mask mandate on or before March 31st
	1. Impact on SOU of the change in policy is yet to be determined
	2. New group (unnamed committee) has been formed, similar to the reopening committee from last year, to discuss what this means for us (Faculty, students, administrators, and staff)
		+ Faculty are Melissa Anderson, Brian Fedorek, and Eric Sol
		+ Sherry Ettlich is co-chair
		+ Reach out to one of these people if you have specific questions.
		+ First meeting is Feb 24th
	3. Rachel Jochem asks, will there be a survey of the faculty and students about masks? Not from Sue, but maybe the unnamed committee will decide that. ASSOU will be comfortable moving forward when the state says it is okay.
1. 4:15 pm  Advisory Council Report — **Chair-Elect Brian Fedorek**

[00:22:24 of recording]

* He wants everyone to notice that he only had 1 minute of time scheduled to present last week and this week he has 10 minutes so he will have to talk slowly.
* AC talked about the impact of the governor's plan to end the mask.
* Discussed what Senate meetings in the spring will look like (Zoom or in person?).
* Briefly discussed Financial Aid Meeting but Kristen is not ready to bring this to Senate yet
* As usual, we discussed general education and the fact that some capacities (creativity and innovation and communication and expression) now only have two mentors, not three. They will just continue with only two mentors and if they need a third opinion because they are not in agreement then Andrew or the University Studies Committee will weigh in.
* New Assessment Coordinator will be a 1.0 FT position
* AC discussed low morale among faculty with the provost; president says he hears us.
* Constitution Committee will be putting forth some language about the promotion and tenure process, colleague evaluations, and Program Personnel Committees
1. 4:25 pm ASSOU Report — **Monica Benton**

[00:28:20 of recording]

* Not Present. Time conflicts between student schedules and faculty senate.
1. 4:35 pm Textbook Affordability Plan Approval — **Holly Gabriel**

[00:28:51 of recording]

* Open Educational Resources Guide: <https://libguides.sou.edu/oer/advisory-group>
* Updated SMART Goal #10: By the end of Fall 2024, of the courses which require course materials, 25% of them will be using no-cost or low-cost educational resources.
	1. This change addresses the concerns about it being related to specific sections by making it more general.
* Question: Do we even need goal #10? Why are we setting this specific goal?
	1. Not a good idea to mandate a low cost item for the sake of having a low cost item and compromise the quality of that item
	2. But 25% seems like a reachable and reasonable goal. Seems achievable.
	3. We do not have to necessarily meet all the goals we set.
* Update on bookstore and using financial aid. Turns out that students that receive financial aid and veterans benefits do not have to buy their materials at the bookstore. Its just easier on them if they do.
	1. At the bookstore they do not have to pay out of pocket and be reimbursed. They can just use their student account.
	2. Students can buy stuff other ways (like online used book stores) and get reimbursed. It's just more work on the student because they have to pay for it and then file for a reimbursement.
* Question: Revisiting an old question. What about when a material is purchased for a sequence of courses? All these courses are listed as high cost with the price of that book, when in reality the student is not paying that price multiple times.
	1. They are trying to look at it from a student's perspective. They have a student, Rebecca Kenny, on their advisory group. They would rather students have pleasant surprises.
	2. It would make the bookstore staff look bad to have a $150 book marked as low cost.
* Question: How do we calculate what the price of the book is when determining if it is low cost? There is always more than one price and place to buy a book.
	1. The book store cannot guarantee a used book price to all students so they must list the new book price and that is what low cost will be determined by.
* Comment: Chairs are just asking faculty and then the chair puts this information in the schedule and then it gets populated. There has to be an easier way for all of these pieces to communicate.
	1. Maybe when Banner is replaced it will help with these systems communicating.
* Holly will come back at a later date with another update.
1. 4:40 pm New Curriculum from Grad Council — **Deborah Rosenberg**

[00:50:22 of recording]

* When they started the Masters of Theatre Studies (MoTS) program they had 5 placeholder courses. But they believe it's time to organize the program they are already teaching and advertise the courses accordingly. They have been working closely with the Grad Council on putting this package together. Grad Council is very supportive of this effort. 30 actual classes that they teach in their MoTS program being named and numbered.
* Andrew Gay tried to make a motion to approve, but realized first we had to waive the 2-week rule.
* Motion to waive the 2-Week Rule (Andrew Gay) → Seconded (Anne Connor): **Approved**
	1. **17** Vote to Approve: Jackie Apodaca, Edwin Battistella, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Andrew Gay, Rachel Jochem, Jesse Longhurst, Christopher Lucas, Merrilyne Lundahl, Matthew Moreali, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker (OCA), Michael Parker (STEM), Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Chad Thatcher, Lisa Wileman
	2. **2** Vote Not to approve: Brian Fedorek and Kemble Yates
	3. **1** Abstain: Anne Connor
* Motion to approve MoTS degree (Andrew Gay)→ Seconded (Anne Connor): **Approved**
	1. **17** Yes: Jackie Apodaca, Edwin Battistella, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Brian Fedorek, Andrew Gay, Rachel Jochem, Jesse Longhurst, Christopher Lucas, Merrilyne Lundahl, Matthew Moreali, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker (OCA), Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Chad Thatcher, Lisa Wileman
	2. **3** Abstain: Anne Connor, Michael Parker (STEM), and Kemble Yates
1. 4:50 pm Spring Schedule and Location for Senate — **Melissa Anderson**

[01:00:42 of recording]

* Last senate meeting of spring term would fall on Memorial Day. Pushing it forward one week makes it during finals week. We don't usually meet on finals week, but we propose to meet on June 6th to seat new Senators.
* Are we going to continue on ZOOM?
	1. Yes, we should just continue the way we have been doing it. The Senate works well on Zoom.
	2. But, people miss socializing, so we should have a social event. Possibly the last senate meeting, when the new senators are seated, could be in person for socializing.
1. 5:00 pm Bylaws Changes Update — **Kemble Yates**

[01:07:09 of recording]

* This is the very beginning of the process, ever evolving. Shrinking ranks and increased tasks are making it harder and harder to staff committees around campus and the ones that support the current structure of our promotion and tenure (P&T) process. The goal is to update the bylaws to simplify the process without losing the objectives behind the colleague and program personnel committee (PPC) evaluations.
* One proposed solution would be to require the colleague evaluation to be at least in the spring prior to going up for P&T instead of the fall directly before the applications are due.
	+ In the fall directly before there is no time to show improvements in areas that are addressed in the colleague evaluation.
	+ Sometimes, due to small programs, it's the exact same people on the colleague evaluation and PPC and it feels repetitive when they are right on top of each other.
* Another proposed solution would be to allow for the PPC evaluation in the P&T process to be waived if there was a recent favorable colleague evaluation that could serve in its place.
	+ BUT, the purpose of these two evaluations is different, so should one really be used in substitution for the other?
		- Colleague evaluations say how you are doing in progress towards promotion, but not necessarily that you are there yet. More of a progress report. We would have to redefine the colleague evaluation if we were going to use it for these purposes.
		- PPC evaluates the actual promotion package
	+ The PPC really sets a tone for other groups that review that applications in the P&T process
* It was requested that we make sure there is no “default option” that makes someone look bad if they choose to do the opposite.
* Can Activity Insight handle situations where some people need a PPC, while other people don't? They can probably build it for each person in the workflow, but that would take more work. Maybe everyone has the option step.
* Instead of making it more complicated and making there be options we could move the colleague evaluation much earlier. Like it happens at year 3 and you do actually have time to implement changes to address the feedback received. Either/or flexibility actually leads to confusion. Streamlined clarity is better.
* Note: We also have chair evaluations, but those are a bit different because it's just one colleague instead of the three on the actual colleague evaluation.
	+ Not all new faculty members are getting chair evaluations. If a chair is not doing the required evaluations, new faculty do not know to ask for them and then do not get feedback until a colleague evaluation finally happens.
* These are all good points, and we want the best system possible, but if we don’t have the people to staff these committees we still have a problem. We need a workable system. We still need to rework our system for the reality that we are living in.
1. 5:20 pm Announcements/New Business

[01:31:48 of recording]

* None.

12) 5:30 pm Adjourn

Meeting adjourns at 5:32 pm