Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, December 2, 2019

Present: Melissa Anderson, Jeremy Carlton, Prakash Chenjeri, Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Kristin Hocevar, Cynthia Hutton, Marc Koyack, Laurie Kurutz, Matt Moreali, Jesse Longhurst, Michael Parker, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Michael Stanfill, Chad Thatcher, Kemble Yates

Absent: Enrique Chacon, Justin Harmon, Tiffany Morey

Guests: Karen Stone, Lee Ayers, Charles Weldon, Sherry Ettlich, Clay Austin, Sarah Guenther, Mark Timmons, Britney Sharp, Donna Lane, Susan Walsh, Linda Schott

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from 11/18
	* Kurutz moved to approve the minutes, Fedorek seconded. Carlton, Condon, Fedorek, French, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Longhurst, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. Anderson, Chenjeri, Gay, and Parker abstained.
2. President’s Report – Linda Schott
	* The president has been traveling, and attended the NWCCU annual meeting for first time. Attendees heard from the new director; NWCCU is very serious about student success and closing the achievement gap for underrepresented student groups. In the future they will want us to disaggregate our data down to the program level. There were interesting examples from community colleges, especially in the sciences, about how they are working with underrepresented groups. We will finish up our current cycle but these are the things they will be looking at in the future
	* The president, Jeanne Stallman, and Britney Sharp met with the governor; she says she wants to do better in the 2020-21 session for funding for higher ed. In the short session the focus will be on climate change and preparing for wildfires. Capital construction came up; we have submitted 3 projects. There is a new, more transparent process for scoring with a rubric from the HECC. For 2021, the governor has several priorities including higher education. She is concerned with vulnerable students, supports for struggling students, addressing achievement gaps, financial aid, more career-connected learning experiences, etc. She is trying to build a broad coalition of support and wants to get students involved.
	* Division meetings are going on; OCA’s meeting took place last week and all the rest are this week. Schott wants to encourage everyone to attend; she wants to engage as many people as possible to attend and is happy to have follow-up meetings, get suggestions, etc.
	* The presidential task force on financial sustainability will be mentioned in these meetings; it calls for one faculty member to be appointed by Faculty Senate. The president would like the group to start working early in January, and would like to have people ready. Senate needs to give her a recommendation by the beginning of Winter term. There are people on campus who have some insight into the budget; she also wants people who can think broadly and represent the university as a whole. There will be more opportunities for subcommittee work.
	* The Cabinet/Executive Council-supplied holiday party is Wednesday 3:30-5:30. Be there by 4 for the Ugly Sweater Contest
	* Gay noted that the charge for the task force is in in the Senate drive, and asked about the enrollment targets mentioned in charge. Schott explained that those are bigger picture issues, not program targets
	* Yates asked if Oregon Promise came up in discussion with the governor. Schott responded that it did not, but she might be seeing it as a part of the financial aid issues. The governor at this point is not bringing up policy measures, but just trying to build a broad coalition.
3. Provost’s Report – Sue Walsh
	* Transfer map work around HB 2998 is ongoing. 3 of the 4 original majors have been approved and now next group of majors is going forward. While we are working on Gen Ed at SOU, 2998 asks for 90 credits to be seamlessly transferable; it is possible we might not get to 90 credits. For the first time community colleges are communicating discouragement. Business, English, Education, and Biology programs have been working hard on this, and Walsh will keep us posted
	* Fedorek said that since CCJ is in the next round, he is wondering who their contact is. Walsh said that the program will have to designate someone. Fedorek said that community college people have been already contacting them. Walsh will be reaching out to Fedorek for someone from CCJ to work on this.
4. Advisory Council Report – Chair-Elect Kemble Yates
	* Yates mentioned that AC discussed the searches for directors of BCE and the Library were discussed; this was to make sure we are following correct procedures. AC discussed having students on those search committees. Schott joined this conversation by phone.
	* Gay and Yates both gave brief updates on their task force work; all other issues discussed are on the agenda
5. ASSOU President’s Report – Britney Sharp
	* The student incidental fee was voted on by the student fee committee and will be $364; this was the lowest possible fee, and ASSOU will have to cut 200K from the budget of student fee recipients; tomorrow night senate will be hearing the proposal
	* Executive orders for all-ASSOU issues will be starting in January; these include support for international students, reducing paper usage, and working on tuition and advocacy for funding model changes
	* Sharp went to Salem twice recently, to talk about funding model and then for the governor’s meeting; some things the governor was talking about are things we are already doing, such as cultural competency, which the Gen Ed task force has been working on. She also mentioned needing workplace-ready graduates. Sharp said that she hopes these will be reflected in the new Gen Ed curriculum. All student body presidents were at that meeting; half of them meet with the Oregon Student Association, but others are not members and all agreed to meet more often to talk about these issues. Governor Brown suggested having town hall meetings at the universities. Ours will be in January/February. February 13 is the scheduled lobby day in Salem.
6. Inter-institutional Faculty Senate Report – Donna Lane
	* Met Nov 15 and 16 at OHSU; Provost of OHSU wants OHSU to work with other public universities across the state to help solve state’s health-related issues.
	* IFS has representation on the HECC funding advisory group; the HECC funding model and mission differential was discussed
	* They also talked to Veronica Dujon about 2998, she put out a note about some of the challenges; we need some kind of portal, we need funding for technology
	* Program approval was discussed, EOU is putting out 13 programs with a 3rd party, they have signed a contract but no curriculum is developed yet. They discussed what this means; it is likely going to become more common to develop these kinds of programs.
	* IFS is also represented on the committee for oversight for high schools, and they discussed equity of offerings of classes
	* IFS started a partnership with Traci Hodgson, President of the Oregon Education Association Community College Council. They are talking about dual credits, the transfer map, etc. The community colleges are having trouble getting information from the high schools; it is challenging keeping all this moving. We’re trying to keep a good communication line open with the community colleges.
	* IFS also talked about faculty evaluations. U of O has fully implemented their new model which we have also used somewhat in our work at SOU. The U of O model is called “the student experience,” and it is more narrative and relies more on peer observation and self-reflection. The goal of their model is to focus more on the student’s experience and less on them evaluating faculty as teachers. They have had great success getting their model implemented.
	* Hutton asked about what programs EOU is going to offer. Lane said she has a list and could send it out, but the contract is public. Walsh stated that 1 program was already approved by the Provosts Council but 12 have not been approved yet
	* IT helped bring the IFS website to SOU, and added new things to it. The website is oregonifs.org. There is a document repository and more available there.
7. Approval of New Graduate Curriculum for Computer Science
	* Yates moved to approve; Kurutz seconded; Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Longhurst, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
8. Review of New Graduate Curriculum for Math
	* No questions. Ettlich explained that they cleaned up the descriptions to flesh them out a little and communicate better. No new classes.
	* Siders moved to waive 2 week rule, Fedorek seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Longhurst, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
	* Yates moved to approve the curriculum, Kurutz seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Longhurst, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
9. Review of University Studies Proposals from SOAN
	* 2 SOAN courses. Gay stated that Mark Shibley asked if they could be approved this term so that syllabi could reflect the approval next term; perhaps we could vote on them at the special session next week.
	* Weldon stated that the University Studies committee approved SOAN 211 G strand, it had already been already for S strand. The other is SOAN 339, which is approved for J strand. There are others pending.
	* Siem asked about the approval for G strand for SOAN 211, which is outside STEM. Weldon said that the committee did not think it was appropriate to refuse just because it wasn’t offered by STEM faculty. Siem asked if Weldon remembered which of the goals was primary, but he did not. Ayers said that all the documentation is in the drive that Faculty Senate can access and said she could help answer additional questions about that.
	* Weldon said that the committee does not have anyone from EHL right now.
	* Hocevar asked about access to the shared University Studies drive; it turned out that had not been updated with this year’s senators or this year’s documents. [This was remedied by the end of the meeting]. Questions can be sent directly to Weldon, chair of the committee, as well.
10. Approval of New Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals
	* New courses, proposed GSWS major, Trans Studies certificate, Health Promotion minor.
	* Kurutz moved to approve the new GSWS major. Stanfill seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Longhurst, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
	* Kurutz moved to approve the Trans Studies Certificate. Carlton seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Longhurst, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
	* Kurutz moved to approve the Health Promotion minor and new course. Hocevar seconded. Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Longhurst, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
	* Kurutz moved to approve the new SOAN courses. Phillips seconded.Anderson, Carlton, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Longhurst, Parker, Phillips, Siders, Siem, Stanfill, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
11. FPAR Task Force Report Open Discussion: do faculty wish FPARs to be purely self-reflective, or should they serve as a tool to evaluate faculty performance? If evaluative:
	* Should feedback be required from chairs?
	* Should feedback be required from directors?
	* Should there be any consequence for an insufficiently completed FPAR?
	* Yates stated that he thinks they should be evaluative; he noted that we have a lot of freedom to direct our own time, but with that comes responsibility; wants faculty to take FPARs seriously and do them well, but then would think it’s fair to require feedback.
	* Kurutz stated that the feedback from her faculty colleagues was that self reflective and evaluative don’t have to negate each other; feedback could be faster than for colleague evaluations, FPARs are toothless now, but one colleague suggested that annual reviews, promotion reviews, colleague evals, was enough. All of this takes time, and we are overly evaluated. The focus is on consequences instead of rewards.
	* Siders asked what kind of consequences were suggested. Yates said didn’t have anything in mind at this point but it seems fair to require them to be done properly if chairs/directors have to provide feedback
	* Fedorek said this was started as something that was self-reflective and goal-setting; it was meant to make it easier to give resources for goals. We would have to change bylaws if we require feedback. Feedback could be a meeting, doesn’t have to be written feedback and part of permanent record.
	* Yates talked about the work of the post-tenure review task force, and how they are not united in opinion, but he feels that for seasoned faculty it could be helpful as a sort of “sanity check” before more weighty measures are taken for faculty skirting the minimum expectations
	* Anderson said her program doesn’t discuss them, and at least one person wasn’t particularly interested in doing so. One colleague felt it would be hard to come up with something prescriptive that would fit all programs since they are so different. Anderson said her own opinion is that new faculty have annual review, so the suggestion that this is primarily for newer faculty doesn’t seem accurate--it seems equally important for tenured faculty. For Anderson, the sharing of FPARs is a really valuable part of the process.
	* Thatcher said it may vary widely for different sized programs. After hearing about all this, Thatcher made an appointment with his director to talk about it, and it was a good experience.
	* Gay said that Ettlich shared some materials about filling out FPARs that is used in CS and Math. Gay found those materials really interesting. They are in the drive.
	* Yates said that ideally there would be some flexibility, but with some minimum requirements, and maybe recommendations for templates
	* Parker said that the templates would be helpful for chairs who have to provide feedback also.
	* Ettlich said that they used the guidelines from Math to build the one for CS; they used P&T expectations. Answering questions was easier than just talking about teaching or other issues.
	* Condon said that in his program, people understand that they can share invisible work on their FPAR, but then there should be a reward for it. There is a diversity of ways divisions are using the FPAR and that creates inequities. He said that people in his program suggested they have evaluation fatigue and it needs to be integrated with other processes
	* Jablonski said that everything we do should be public and transparent, and we should be held accountable in some way. However, he hates getting messages from activity insight saying FPARs are late. How did a faculty initiative cross over into digital supervision? As a public employee everything should be public.
	* Longhurst asked if it would it be reasonable to say that you have to meet the basic skeleton of the FPAR and the process, but then the programs themselves say what it looks like, as is done for departmental expectations. Gay agreed that this would probably have to be done this way, like departmental expectations.
	* Fedorek said that time poverty could be an issue for larger programs, and that is something to consider. This could unduly impact chairs of large programs. Yates noted that in theory chairs of larger programs get more release.
	* Yates talked about how mismatch between self evaluation and actual performance could get feedback
	* Parker said that perhaps the program personnel committee could provide the feedback.
	* Hutton said that the word “insufficient” is dangerous because it is hard to define
	* Siders and Walsh talked about why it’s helpful to complete them fully before promotion/tenure
	* Fedorek talked about the dynamics of being a chair evaluating colleagues
	* Walsh said that she sees annual evaluations for probationary faculty, but only sees colleague evaluations when people come up for promotion and tenure
	* Ettlich said that she sees some FPARs with no detail. Chairs could make sure they are complete before they go to the division director.
12. Announcements/New Business
	* University Studies folder is now updated and all current members have access
	* Paul reiterated the need for someone on University Studies, and FDC
	* Gay noted that there is going to be a pancake feed for students and they are looking for faculty to help. Info is in the Drive.
	* Gay also noted that Senate will meet a week from today for a special session; there will be no materials before late Friday for weekend reading. Gay wondered if the usual room is big enough, and consensus was that it is.
	* Thatcher said that the OAL students are doing a presentation on trip to Balkans tomorrow, 6-9 pm, with refreshments, a multimedia presentation, a film, and a Q & A . It will be in the Meese auditorium
	* Gay said that at the same time, in the Meese room in the library, there will be a film slam

Meeting adjourned at: 5:22 pm