Faculty Senate APPROVED Minutes

Monday, February 24, 2020

Present: Melissa Anderson, Jeremy Carlton, Prakash Chenjeri, Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Marianne Golding, Justin Harmon, Cynthia Hutton, Dennis Jablonski,

Marc Koyack, Laurie Kurutz, Jesse Longhurst, Matt Moreali, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Michael Stanfill, Chad Thatcher, Kristin Hocevar, Kemble Yates

Absent: None

Guests: Jody Waters, Sarah Guenther, Britney Sharp, Sherry Ettlich, Karen Stone, Alena Ruggerio, Lee Ayers, Ande Durojaiye

Meeting called to order at: 4:01 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from 2/10
   * Kurutz moved to approve the minutes; Thatcher seconded. Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Kurutz, Longhurst, Moreali, Morey, Oliveri, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, Hocevar, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Anderson, Gay, Koyack, and Phillips abstained. [Jablonski arrived after the vote]. **Motion passed.**
2. President’s Report – Linda Schott
   * Schott introduced Ande Durojaiye, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academic Affairs at Northern Kentucky University. He is shadowing Schott this week, and she is mentoring him all year. They are headed up to Salem where the Republicans have been staging walkouts.
   * Schott stated that she wanted to answer questions faculty have about the HECC report and the subsequent article in the *Oregonian*.
   * Yates asked about the metrics used to evaluate SOU, since they do not seem like the ones we use to evaluate ourselves. Schott replied that we use the metrics that were used by OUS; The HECC started using different ones, and then Jim Pinkard adjusted them a bit more. We can decide how we want to evaluate ourselves, but we continue to be subject to the HECC’s review.
   * Gay asked how the interaction with Jim Pinkard went; Schott thought that he was a bit tone deaf and emotionally insensitive to what he was walking into. She was glad faculty got to hear Pinkard talk about why the model values STEM. Schott said she knows some people were quite angry; the whole idea of a funding model is sort of repulsive, since it implies we are motivated purely by the financial reward we can get, and that is not why any of us are working in higher ed; we’re here to help students, and we don’t value students based on their major and their monetary value to the institution.
   * Schott said that we are strategizing and figuring out how to attack this problem short term, medium term, and long term. She herself has “moved on to productive anger.” She said we are going to be more assertive about making our case and is hoping this will go better for us. There is a lot to consider, and it is important to keep our eyes on the prize. Hopefully we will get more funding through a revision of mission differentiation at the June meeting. That’s our primary goal right now.
   * Ayers said that she has sent articles from the *Chronicle of Higher Ed* including the Trends 2020 piece to the HECC commissioners; these are about other models, and other ways to evaluate used in other states. Duncan Wise wrote back to her asking more about it and saying it was interesting. One article is called “The Odds Maker of the College Death Watch”; it is about industry experts and how they decide about the health of institutions. It was in the *Chronicle* February 21st. The *Oregonian* article is an example of this, taking a number out of context. It was very unfortunate but she thinks we handled it well.
   * Schott mentioned a new company called Edmit that is making prediction a business. The HECC’s role in this may exceed statutory authority; we need to be careful but these are issues that are out there
   * We were advised by communication experts not to respond publicly to the article; we were advised it was better to let the story die. We do have media outlets interested in doing something on the funding model and we plan to do that, but not until this story dies down.
   * Schott wanted faculty to reassure their colleagues that we’re fine and are proceeding deliberately. We have challenges like everyone else and we’re working through them.
3. Provost’s Report – Sue Walsh
   * Sue noted that the reports for Eastern and Western and Southern were not dissimilar, but Southern unfortunately got singled out; the timing was unfortunate with the closing of Concordia also. She reiterated that faculty should reassure their colleagues, nothing has changed. It was upsetting that the HECC was so insensitive about this; they put a link to the *Oregonian* story in their newsletter.
4. ASSOU President’s Report – Britney Sharp
   * The meeting with Pinkard on Thursday did have heightened emotions. We need to be strategic. She would like faculty to speak up and be more educated about the funding model but without getting too upset. Sharp said “we still have a game to play.” The next task force meeting on the model is about affordability, but she is going to advocate against it since it would reward schools that don’t have to raise tuition above 5%, which doesn’t make sense because if you don’t get funding then you have to raise tuition.
   * The task force on the model has two more meetings, then they will go to HECC with a report in May or June
   * Sharp noted that every school is playing for their own interest now
   * The STEM discussion came up in the task force meeting; the model rewards a lot of STEM; U of O is also saying STEM is not the only thing we should be rewarding
   * Oliveri asked if there are STEM people in the room; Sharp said that most people in the room are in Finance, but OIT and OSU heavily advocate for STEM
   * It sounds like each school is going to be able to write their own take on the model; they are going to provide the minutes also which could help because some issues get brought up and then get hushed
   * The bright side to this is that the HECC report shows that SOU needs something to change
   * Hocevar thanked Sharp and asked about the timeline. Sharp replied that the official report will suggest what needs to be fixed; Jim Pinkard will discuss it with other HECC members; some schools want to run numbers, then they will look at the options and what they could look like
   * Ayers said that in August the HECC will meet and put forward priorities; that would be a good time to put changing the model forward as a priority and to figure out how much it would cost to fund schools more appropriately with a new model
   * Sharp then said that on Feb. 12th the committee that allocates funds from student fees had a 5 hour meeting, 36 line items were cut, and three programs defunded
   * Feb 18th there was a public hearing about cuts and defunding; they heard from the Siskiyou, EPIC, all resources centers, Cheer, ICC, National Student Exchange, Outdoor Program, etc.
   * The funding model affects this too; with the appeals, there is about $76,000 at stake, this is hard work; someone is getting hurt
   * Cutting 300K was hard for the committee; it would be helpful for faculty to help explain this to students; ASSOU is elected to do this
   * This Tuesday the committee will review appeals and decide what to do; the people who are new to ASSOU feel like they are the “bad guys”
   * March 13th there is a Town Hall with Senator Golden and Pam Marsh. The more people we let know how we are doing, the better, it’s not like the HECC and legislators don’t talk
   * Sharp can be emailed at [assoupresident@sou.edu](mailto:assoupresident@sou.edu) or sharpb1@sou.edu
5. Advisory Council Report – Chair-Elect Kemble Yates
   * Most of the meeting was just setting the agenda
   * Elections are in progress, we are staggering some terms on FPC to try to get a better spread
6. New Undergraduate Curriculum (Discussion, but STEM will ask for a waiver of the two-week rule to approve the proposed course, SC 120/120L, in conjunction with the Senate’s vote on the course’s addition to University Studies.)
   * Oliveri didn’t have her laptop, but asked if anyone had questions.
   * Gay asked Oliveri to explain the difference between the undergraduate and graduate certificate in the music industry. Oliveri said the courses are the same, just with different numbers
   * Waters explained that the certificate itself is not “graduate” or “undergraduate,” but that there were undergraduate and graduate numbers for the courses. Undergrads are unlikely to take grad courses and grads are unlikely to take undergrad courses. However, “a certificate is a certificate.” Because there are grad and undergraduate courses, it goes to both bodies for approval but they are the same.
   * Yates moved to waive the 2 week rule, Kurutz seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Golding, Harmon, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Longhurst, Moreali, Morey, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
   * Oliveri moved to approve SC 120/120L, Kurutz seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Golding, Harmon, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Longhurst, Moreali, Morey, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
   * No one had questions about the new curriculum. Gay instructed anyone with questions to email them to Oliveri; she has all her notes from the committee discussions.
7. New University Studies Courses (Vote)
   * Fedorek moved to approve the courses for University Studies; Kurutz seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Golding, Harmon, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Longhurst, Moreali, Morey, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
8. New Graduate Curriculum: Music Industry Certificate (Vote)
   * A waiver was needed to approve both the grad and undergrad courses for the new music industry certificate. We reviewed it all two weeks ago, but technically the undergrad courses had not come before Senate yet.
   * Oliveri moved to waive the two week rule so the whole package could be approved. Stanfill seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Golding, Harmon, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Longhurst, Moreali, Morey, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
   * Siders moved to approve the entire package. Brian seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Golding, Harmon, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Longhurst, Moreali, Morey, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
9. Proposed Resolution in Support of Trustee Rosenberg
   * Gay noted that we discussed some sort of show of support for Deborah Rosenberg serving another two-year term as a trustee
   * Fedorek asked if anyone else has come forward
   * Gay responded that anyone can apply at any time, but no one has indicated to Senate their intention to do it
   * Gay said that Sabrina Prudhomme told him that the governor would be unlikely to appoint a new person unless the trustee was not doing a good job; it is a high learning curve, and it is only a 2 year term so faculty, student, and staff trustees have less time overall.
   * Anderson noted that this discussion has been in the minutes and so presumably anyone else interested could have spoken up at any time
   * Gay suggested that senators can ask their faculty about it, but that basically this is our way to say that we think Rosenberg is doing a good job
   * Yates noted that AC did shorten the suggested letter of support
   * Chenjeri asked about the language our resolution would use--would it be endorse or support? Gay responded that the draft language is in the drive; the word is “support”
   * Gay said that there does seem to be precedent for this; he believes Senate did vote to support Dennis Slattery’s reappointment
10. Update on Bylaws Works for Professional Track Promotion Standards – Kemble Yates & Karen Stone
    * Stone and Yates are also working with Leslie Eldridge
    * Yates gave the history of this work. The hope and expectation when the bylaws were created was that service for both tracks would be the same; it has become clear that with 44/45 in teaching, this meant that professional track faculty were expected to do more than they had time or were paid to do
    * The task force has been working on the expectations in the bylaws to make it work since the fall
    * It didn’t make sense to do a chart like that used for professorial track faculty for the Service expectations because the CBA makes it clear that if they only have 1 ELU for service, they wouldn’t be able to meet anything but acceptable
    * The task force decided to take a checklist approach; for Service, to meet expectations you would check off what you’ve done depending on how many ELUs you have each year
    * Teaching also would also have a checklist
    * They took the language and the activities directly from the bylaws; there is a little more added on Senior Instructor 2 since it is a higher rank
    * Stone explained that they did not create new language, they just reorganized it; the color coding shows where it came from in the old table; yellow comes from acceptable, green from preferred, blue from exceptional
    * Yates talked about tweaking the language for “Mentoring” also
    * They are looking to get feedback before passing it along to the constitution committee
    * Stone also noted that the language about student evaluations is also sort of a place holder; they just took what was there in the bylaws now
    * Stone explained how the service expectations work in accordance with the number of ELUs the person has been allocated for service and if someone is doing a lot of service it could offset slightly lower performance in teaching (even if they are getting release for the service)
    * Each year in the FPAR the professional track faculty would be reporting on what model (44/1 or 43/2) they were working on in order keep track of it
    * Siders noted that some people don’t know what they are; Stone explained that this is all new this year after planning had happened and it will take a bit of time to iron it all out, and if you look at actual loading not everyone fits these two models
    * In the FPAR faculty can document how many ELU they devoted to different activities
    * Gay asked about bylaws language about deadlines for determining when faculty inform their chairs which model they wanted to use; since the faculty member gets to decide this will have to happen earlier for planning purposes
    * Stone noted that Fedorek reached out to her about the committees and course planning. We are going to have to work on our processes; it’s a big cultural change. The point is to not overload our professional track faculty
    * Fedorek asked about the preferred and acceptable categories, and Stone explained that for professional track faculty they are gone. There are two different rubrics for professional and professorial faculty. We are just setting a bar for professional track faculty
    * Jablonski asked about the different ELUs for committees. Stone said that they have an ELU allocation table and it’s posted on the provost’s website.
    * Siders asked how faculty teaching all 4 ELU courses would manage this; Stone said they could bank the overload until they could get a full course release; but really there are very few who teach 11 4 ELU courses
    * Moreali asked if they were just trying to meet the bar, instead of using the old table with the acceptable, preferred, exceptional categories. Stone confirmed this. It’s cumulative, but the tricky part is each year might be different, so you have to document it through time. It’s more complex.
    * Siem asked if this was averaged over years; Stone noted that promotion is 5 to 6 years; Siem noted that years would be weighted unevenly.
    * Yates asked for comments/feedback on this.
    * Gay asked senators to take it back to their faculty, they can send comments to him and he can pass them on anonymously if needed
11. Announcements/New Business
    * Gay had some new business. He is on a colleague evaluation committee; bylaws 5.363c talks about each distinct class being visited 2 times by committee members; this could be excessive; could this be tweaked; custom is each person visits one class each. Anderson noted that there is no language about online courses either. Gay noted that online class observation has come up for term by term evaluations also.
    * Longhurst said that Thursday in the Rogue River Room from 4:30-6:30 is the School of Education Mentor Night. Alumni come back to give best advice to brand new teachers; stop by and say hello, they'd love to see you
    * Fedorek said that Friday would be the CCJ Lock-in, 12-6; there will be an increased police presence on campus. There is also an alumni panel in Meese 3:30-6:30pm
    * Siders said that Basketball playoffs for both men and women are Tuesday and Wednesday
    * Gay said that Digital Cinema is doing a crowdfunding campaignn on Indiegogo; it is going through the Foundation; Gay is getting a pie in the face; Chris Lucas and Brandon Givens will get pies in face also if they raise enough
    * Condon said he is collaborating with CATL to offer a Meditation workshop on Saturday 9-4:30, it’s free and they already have 90 signed up. There is a link to register on Inside SOU

Meeting adjourned at: 5:23