Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, April 12, 2021

4:00-5:30p

*Present:* Melissa Anderson, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Marianne Golding, Justin Harmon, Laurie Kurutz, Eric Levin (repl. Brendan McMahon), Jesse Longhurst, Merrilyne Lundahl, Matt Moreali, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Michael Stanfill, Chad Thatcher, Precious Yamaguchi, Kemble Yates

*Absent:* Tiffany Morey

*Guests:*  Violet Crain, Sherry Ettlich, Donna Lane, Erik Palmer, Alena Ruggerio, Linda Schott, Dustin Walcher, Rebecca (Becs) Walker, Sue Walsh, Jody Waters

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm.

1. **4:00p Approval of Minutes from 3/8**

**Motion & Vote:**

Oliveri moved to approve the minutes with one correction and Stanfill seconded. **Motion passed** with 2 abstentions (Golding & Lundahl).

1. **4:05p President’s Report – Linda Schott**

Report:

Retirement

* + President Schott welcomed everyone to Spring term and shared that she announced her upcoming retirement in the State of the University Address.
  + She stated that a leadership transition presents an opportunity yet can be a source of concern and anxiety. For that reason, she opened the floor to questions that she would be able to answer or take to the Board.

Discussion:

**Fedorek** expressed appreciation and congratulations. **Schott** stated that she has enjoyed her time as president at SOU; the decision was both difficult and personal. She believes SOU is in a much better position than it could have been and that it will be an attractive opportunity. SOU has two important assets, in addition to its other attractive features: 1. It has a very functional board. Board members work well together, care about the campus, and take their work seriously. This Friday, they will discuss the search. They will likely hire a search firm that will work with campus to identify the qualities we value and seek in a candidate. 2. Campus has a strong sense of “we’re all in this together” – a sense of unity and direction.

**Golding** expressed concerns about the timing and cost of the search. **Schott** replied that she believes SOU is in a good place, financially and with the vaccine distribution. She added that she will remain at SOU through December and has told the Board that if the new president is unable to begin in December, she will make the transition work. The Board does not want to hire an interim president.

**Yates** expressed appreciation for Schott’s service as president and for giving SOU enough lead time to transition to a full (rather than interim) campus. **Schott** said that she will continue working hard for the institution and will help reach the Board’s vision of a coordinated hand-off, such that she will work with the new president to bring them up to speed and then remain as a resource. Because searches are inevitable, the Board includes the expense in the budget as the cost of doing business. The Board will bring in a wide variety of candidates, and Schott has encouraged Paul Nicholson (Board Chair) to look to ASCUU, our professional association, as a place to look for candidates. ASCUU has a Millennium Leadership Initiative (MLI) that prepares diverse candidates for the presidency. President Schott served as a mentor last year. The MLI prepares about 30-49 candidates each year, many of whom do become presidents or vice presidents in higher education.

**Belcastro** served as a member of the presidential search committee that hired President Schott, adding that they did a great job. She stated that the Board was brand new at that point, and that she anticipates this search to go more smoothly having had prior experience. The search was extensive and expensive, and she was very impressed by the quality and numbers of the candidates. She encouraged faculty to participate. **Schott** believes the Board expects some expenses to be lower, as we can now do some things virtually. She added that based on the conversations she’s had with the Board at this point, also believes they will want to bring finalists to campus. This would be in line with our campus culture and values of openness, transparency, and feedback.

**Schott** welcomes questions from faculty – please reach out to her if you have any.

1. **4:10p Provost’s Report – Sue Walsh**

Report:

Search

* + Rest assured that she and members of Cabinet will help Schott with the transition and will do everything they can to support her and other faculty, staff, and students.

1. **4:15p  Advisory Council Report – Chair-elect Melissa Anderson**

Report:

Briefly

* + Anna Oliveri has a new barbecue.
  + There are only 5 senate meetings left, and we have a number of things from Fall and Winter that still need to be discussed.
  + On today’s agenda:
    - Rebecca Walker will discuss the Sustainable Purchasing Policy.
    - We will discuss some curricular proposals from Education. More proposals have been added since the AC meeting.
    - Walcher, Fedorek, and Yates met over the break to discuss the FPAR and Post-Tenure Review task forces. They will discuss their reports today.
  + On a future agenda:
    - The EDI group will give a presentation of their work.
    - We will discuss a proposed revision to the faculty awards process.
    - The General Education Task Force will present the work they’ve been doing.

Senate Elections

* + These include elections for senators as well as members of the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) and program chairs.
  + Elections are being held in a different order this year because of possible changes to division structure.
  + We will need to re-run some of the Senate elections again because there were no or too few nominees.
  + Look for notifications about at-large elections. The FPC and program chair elections will take place after these.

Pass / No Pass Policy

* + Student government has approached us about the P/NP issue, and AC discussed how best to engage with students about this.
  + The Academic Policy Committee will look at this again, and it is possible that a modified version of the policy will come back to Senate for a vote this term.

Open Educational Resources (OERs)

* + Student government has also reached out to Senate about OERs and would like to meet with someone from Senate to rekindle the effort to use more OERs on campus.
  + There is the possibility of putting together an OER task force or identifying OER champions on campus to help with this.
  + The Library has hired a new faculty librarian who will be working on OERs. She will begin in May and will be such an OER champion, working with faculty who would like to use OERs.

Identifying Low-Cost Courses

* + There is a challenge when it comes to using one book for multiple terms.

How to Hold Senate Meetings Next Year

* + There are advantages and disadvantages to holding in-person, fully remote, and hybrid meetings next year.
  + Please begin thinking about this for further discussion (and a decision) at a later meeting.

Discussion:

**Yates** stated that the Staff Assembly is on track to be functional by Fall. It will give non-faculty employees at SOU a voice and the ability to provide input on policies and procedures of the University, working alongside ASSOU (for students) and Faculty Senate (for faculty).

**Golding** asked: (1) if it is necessary to obtain the permission of a faculty member before nominating them for a seat on Faculty Senate, and (2) for the name of the new faculty librarian who will work with OERs. **Anderson** replied that a nominator does not need to obtain the permission of their nominee, but the Elections Committee does need to obtain the permission of all nominees before putting their names on the ballot. She added that she does not usually tell nominees who nominated them. She said that she would send the name of the new librarian to Golding.

1. **4:20p ASSOU President’s Report – Violet Crain (ASSOU President)**

Report:

Transition

* + Crain, Andrew Zucker, and others are working to make the transition to new leadership in ASSOU as smooth as possible.

Pass / No Pass

* + ASSOU appreciates that faculty have heard the voice of the students and are reopening the P/NP conversation.

Restructure

* + ASSOU’s biggest focus at the moment is a restructure.
  + Crain, Zucker, and ASSOU Chief Justice Jana Baker presented this recently.
  + If it does not pass, they will request a lower budget.

Student Fee

* + ASSOU is finishing the Student Fee process and will present its Student Fee recommendations to the Board of Trustees on Friday.

Communication

* + ASSOU is currently working to improve communication between its branches.
  + This past week, directors have been collaborating with ASSOU senators, which has not been the case this year. Crain is optimistic about the direction ASSOU is taking.

Discussion:

**Yates** stated that Senate has voted to revert to the normal P/NP policy this Spring, but students have asked that we consider extending the P/NP policy we have been using during the pandemic for another quarter. AC had a deep discussion about revisiting the P/NP policy, and Yates had a long conversation with Alena Ruggerio (Chair of the Academic Policy Committee) and another with Matt Stillman, both of whom attended a meeting with students during finals week of Winter quarter about the request. As it turns out, there are things we can do and things we cannot do at this point. Functionally, we cannot allow students to take the following as P/NP: (1) courses required for a grade in their majors or (2) courses never designed to be P/NP. However, if recommended by the APC, we could allow students to take more than one course as P/NP. Fedorek added, in the chat:

*WE can also drop the fee for course P/NP change.*

**Yates** confirmed that we could advise that the fee be dropped, and that the ultimate decision on this would be made by Cabinet and the President. APC will meet this week, and if they do make a recommendation, we may revisit this issue as early as the next Senate meeting.

**Golding** asked if students would be harmed by having too many P/NP grades on their transcripts. **Yates** replied that people have looked into this but that he is not certain as to whether there is a definitive answer. He added that many institutions nationwide have used P/NP for the entire year and that SOU is somewhere in the middle.

1. **4:25p IFS Report – Donna Lane**

Preface:

IFS met last Friday. Senator Dembrow, Ben Cannon (ED of the HECC), and Legislative Action Team members from across the state were present at the meeting.

Report:

Senate Bill 233: Common Course Numbering System

* + This is the proposed, statewide common course numbering system.
  + One of the greatest concerns from faculty is that there was not enough faculty representation in deciding what the common course numbers would be.
  + IFS asked Senator Dembrow to consider faculty input, perhaps through inclusion in subcommittees, when it comes to deciding learning outcomes and common course numbers.
  + Senator Dembrow is walking the bill to the House today. He said that, though this inclusion of faculty input is not in the bill, it would be on the record.
  + IFS has been meeting with Senator Dembrow regularly and believes it has made some progress when it comes to ensuring faculty input in decisions for learning outcomes and common course numbering.

Discussion:

**Yates** thanked Lane and Devora Shapiro (not present) for pushing hard to include faculty voice in making decisions that affect our courses and their content. He stated that we do not want legislators or board members writing our curriculum or making policies for us.

**Walsh** added, in the chat:

*To clarify, this is common course numbering for general education.*

1. **4:30p Graduate Council Proposals for Education (Discussion)**

**MS Ed Concentrations (online)**

**Belcastro** suggested that senators refer to the document that provides an overview of the new MS Ed concentrations.

Education currently has 3 fully online concentrations – Adult Education, Leadership in Early Childhood Education, and Curriculum and Instruction in STEM – and is proposing 5 more. The 5 proposed concentrations originated from conversations with current students and local partners as well as research in the business field. Four of the proposed concentrations are new: Adult Education, English as a Second Language; Curriculum and Instruction; Leadership in Higher Education; Public Health Education. The 5th, Reading and Literacy, was lost due to sustainability issues, but it is being brought and has a license embedded and an add-on license for K12 teachers.

All 8 concentrations utilize the same common core courses, and some concentrations share other courses.

Discussion:

**Yates** asked if the MS Ed degree is similar to SOU’s online MBA in that it is completely online, recruited for by our partners, etc. **Belcastro** responded that the proposed new concentrations are part of SOU’s fully online partnership focus. Like the MBA, Education still has concentrations that are not part of the online 7-week model, but the new proposed concentrations are.

**Belcastro** reiterated that the overview document is the best document to refer to, as it serves as cliff notes for each of the concentrations.

**Education Leadership Programs**

**Phillips** suggested that senators refer to the document that provides an overview of modifications to the Education Leadership Program.

Education is proposing updates to 2 administrator licensure programs. Some of the changes are in response to changes in state-level rule and regulation that oversees administrator licensure in the state of Oregon. The Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission outlines requirements for what education preparation programs must include in order to qualify individuals who complete their programs for a principal’s license or an administrator license at the district level.

The proposal changes the Initial Administrative Licensure Program (IAL) to the Principal Licensure Program and the Continuing Administrative Licensure Program (CAL) to the Professional Administrator Licensure Program.

To meet the new or updated requirements from the State, Education has been required to expand and deepen the work they do to prepare principals and to focus the professional administrator licensure program on preparing district-level leaders – shifting focus from the building-level to the system-level.

Most of the courses listed in the proposal have been updated, and Education is proposing 2 additional programs that would help expand or deepen the work that happens in the Professional Administrator Licensure Program. One course is Systems Leadership in K-12 Schools, which helps meet State requirements by focusing on the system level. The other is Seminar in Education Leadership, which is intended to allow Education to be more nimble, respond to needs in the region, and partner with local school districts in co-creating courses with topics aligned to needs in the field.

Discussion:

**Fedorek** commented that the proposal includes increasing the number of credits for some courses from 1 to 3. He asked how that would affect faculty loading in Education. **Phillips** responded that Education anticipated that these changes were coming, and because programs in education leadership have been growing, Education has already hired another faculty member in education leadership, Dr. Renee Owen. Her hire was intended to help Education in completing this transition and teach in the program moving forward.

**Fedorek** noted that the proposal includes several suspended courses. He asked if the courses were no longer state requirements or if the content of those courses would be integrated into some of the now larger 3-credit courses. **Phillips** replied that the suspended courses are no longer required by the state – the programs set forth meet those requirements – but Education would like to keep the courses available in the event that they need them again.

**Longhurst** acknowledged the work that Phillips, Belcastro, and Owens did to accommodate the new state requirements, adding that this iteration of changes required a particularly large amount of work to incorporate. Longhurst acknowledged Phillips for doing the bulk of the work, Belcastro for fitting the new content seamlessly into the MS Ed programs, and Owens for her work on the project.

**Yates** reminded everyone that this will be an action item at the next meeting.

1. **4:40p  Curriculum Committee Council proposals for Digital Cinema (Discussion)**

Summary:

**Stanfill** (Chair of the Curriculum Committee) shared that the committee recommends the proposed Documentary Production Certificate, Screenwriting minor, and new courses in Communication and Digital Cinema.

**Gay** provided context:

*Documentary Production Certificate*

The certificate has been under development for a couple of years but was sidelined when attention shifted to pushing through the new major first. The certificate uses current curriculum and is interdisciplinary – students choose a documentary concentration that is based in another program. Gay noted that programs not in the list of options that would like to participate are welcome to join – just let him or another faculty member in DCIN know.

*Screenwriting Minor:*

The screenwriting minor was developed to create an opportunity for the large number of creative writing, EMDA, and theater majors who take screenwriting classes in DCIN.

*DCIN Major:*

The number of credits required for the Digital Cinema major has increased, primarily after taking what were a series of prerequisite courses and making them courses required for the major. This change helps eliminate inequities that occur when prerequisites are waived on an ad hoc basis. Digital Cinema is instead building a system that gives credit for prior learning, where students can use a portfolio to demonstrate when they have needed skills and meet specific requirements.

Discussion:

**Belcastro** said she is happy to see the inclusion of credit for prior learning (CPL). She then asked how Digital Cinema would account for the time faculty needed to review portfolios. **Gay** responded that there is a system in place in which a student pays an application fee, which goes directly to the instructor who does the reviewing. Students who want to obtain CPL in Digital Cinema, however, will also be required to do a hands-on demonstration in front of the instructor along with a multiple choice exam, as the skills needed cannot be assessed from the portfolio, alone. For this reason, Digital Cinema will have application periods – dedicated days for this purpose. This will make the process more structured and clear for students who would like to obtain CPL.

**Belcastro** asked whether faculty will have additional ELU for this or a stipend for the additional work. **Waters** replied that there does not seem to be a consistent answer and that she would refer to others in her office for what has been done in the past. This is one of the earliest adoptions of CPL, and there is still a lot to work out. Because there is not a lot of institutional data on CPL credit awarded, the sense has been that reviewing portfolios and awarding credit could be handled on a case-by-case basis with a stipend. However, there is the potential of an incoming class needing assessment. The policy gives each program the ability to designate a class as being eligible for CPL, which does not preclude it from appearing in the catalog. If the expectation is that there will be a large number of students in the class assessed for CPL, then it may become part of the instructional assignment. Waters has discussed this with Moreali in regards to a UGS class. It may be possible to load faculty as the CPL assessor. However, the application fee, which is applied as a stipend, is used because designating learning outcomes and assessing artifacts to match them to learning outcomes may fall outside of the scope of regular duties. **Belcastro** responded that she believes CPL is the way of the future and thanked those involved for including it. She added, in the chat:

*I encourage anyone interested in CPL to refer to the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) - we have an institutional membership. They have been researching and working with CPL or PLA for years and have great resources.*

**Yates** encouraged senators to send questions to those involved so that the questions can be considered and responses considered before the next meeting’s vote.

1. **4:50p  FPAR Task Force and Post-Tenure/Promotion Task Force reports (Discussion)**

Preface:

**Yates** commented that the reports and recommendations in this presentation are the result of work that commenced at least 2 years ago. Senate created the FPAR Task Force to review aspects of FPARs and the Post-Tenure/Promotion (PTP) Task Force to consider the question of evaluation, rewards, etc. for faculty no longer seeking promotion or tenure.

When the FPAR Task Force presented their report last year, it became apparent that some of their recommendations would need Senate faculty approval and would be affected by the PTP Task Force.

The report from the FPAR Task Force recommends specific bylaw changes, accompanied by an analysis. The report from the PTP Task Force is more like a classic report, making indirect comments about possible bylaws changes.

FPAR Task Force Report – Fedorek, Oliveri

**Fedorek** stated that the task force has data from interviewing all division directors (collected in Summer 2019) and surveying faculty (collected a few years ago). The data indicate that post-tenure faculty generally find the FPARs moderately important, with those who have been here 20+ years finding them unimportant or kind of important, and those looking for tenure or promotion find them very important.

*Feedback on FPARs*

Based on the analysis, the task force believes FPARs should serve as a tool for self-reflection but that, for those seeking promotion or tenure, it is important to receive feedback from their chairs. Currently, the bylaws do not require the directors to provide feedback, but about 60% of those surveyed would like feedback from their director and about 70% would like feedback from their chair. Since most chairs have summer duty, feedback from chairs would likely be provided over the summer.

*Due Date*

The due date for the FPAR was a point of contention. A number of years ago, it was due at the beginning of Fall term (September or October 31), and it had 2 parts, the FPAR and the FPAP. It now has only 1 part and is due June 1. The majority of faculty supported the June 1 due date, so the recommendation is to keep that due date but allow a later date of June 30 for those faculty who would like to include information from their Spring term Student Learning Experience Survey (SLES). This would not oblige a faculty member to include information addressing their Spring SLES, but it would give them the opportunity to do so.

Discussion:

**Yates** stated, as a preview and despite the results from the FPAR survey, that the PTP task force recommends faculty submit self-reports.

**Gay** asked if a reflection on the SLES feedback, since it is a more substantive kind of feedback, should be included in the teaching section of the FPAR. **Fedorek** replied that he believes that would be a wise decision and align with the intent of the SLES. He has found the FPAR to be useful as a yearly self-reflective tool and particularly useful when applying for promotion. The recommendations do not reference the SLES because they were written prior to the launch of the new evaluation system. **Oliveri** added that the current wording on the FPAR might not need to change much, as it asks faculty to discuss their student evaluations. **Fedorek** stated that it still refers to performance levels and will need a slight change. **Gay**, on the Constitution Committee, is working on it.

**Belcastro** said she appreciated the recommendation that the section on professional development funds be pre-populated, intentionally highlighting that recommendation in case there were any concerns. She noted that the administrative goals and achievements portion of the FPAR had been eliminated and asked for more information about that recommendation. **Fedorek** stated that summarizing the service components of an administrative duty would be addressed in the service expectations as opposed to another part of the FPAR. He added that the task force recommended that directors provide feedback; where they were not obligated to do so before, it is now codified in the bylaws that directors, in consultation with the chair of a program, will provide some sort of feedback. This would be most beneficial for those going up for promotion when they self-evaluate as acceptable, preferred, or exceptional, as a check for how well their self-evaluation would line up with how others evaluated their performance.

**Anderson** noted that bylaws that involved student evaluations had been changed to some extent. For example, bylaw 5.343 now asks faculty to address how they responded to feedback in the SLES as one of the questions to answer in the FPAR. The SLES Committee is currently discussing and working on information to give to chairs and directors that would help them evaluate teaching without having a score.

**Yates** commented that the Constitution Committee will need to review the recommendations to verify that they address the most current version of the bylaws, and he asked that faculty and administration review the recommendations to identify any red flags before they are approved and sent to the Constitution Committee for possible amendments to the bylaws.

Post-Tenure/Promotion Task Force Report – Walcher, Yates

**Yates** introduced Walcher as the task force chair, adding that Walcher led the task force through most of the writing.

*Process*

**Walcher** stated that the task force was initially given 5 questions from the Senate and a 3-page document from division directors. The task force polled chairs (promising anonymity) questions about performance standards for post-tenure faculty and met with Provost Walsh to discuss the same questions. She emphasized that the work of the task force should aim to help faculty be as happy and productive as possible.

*Recommendations*

The task force separated the initial 5 questions into two groups. The first group asked about performance standards for post-tenure and promoted faculty, and whether different standards were appropriate. The task force believes that, in the areas of service and teaching, the standards for promotion and tenure are also generally appropriate for evaluating acceptability of ongoing employment at SOU. In the realm of scholarship, the task force recommends that Senate amend the bylaws and require professorial faculty, who are budgeted 9 ELU each year toward service and scholarship, to continue working in both of those areas, even after tenure, provided that the programs have an opportunity to determine a new set of acceptable-for-continuing-with-employment standards for scholarship. The post-tenure standards might be different for a variety of reasons.

The task force was also asked about the review process for post-tenure and promotion. It concluded that existing authorities could and should be utilized in cases where faculty members are deficient in one way or another, with solutions geared toward mentoring in all but the most egregious cases. The task force seeks to highlight the importance of the colleague evaluation process in post-tenure review situations and recommends a modification to the bylaws to give division directors a power that chairs currently have, to initiate a colleague evaluation process out of the usual five-year window when there is substantial evidence that a faculty member is falling short or there is indication that an early colleague evaluation might be needed. With the new bylaw language, the director would be able to direct the chair to initiate a colleague evaluation while advancing evidence of deficiencies along the way.

*Additional Note about Scholarship*

**Yates** thanked Provost Walsh for identifying possibilities for a broader definition of scholarship, which could be something the faculty would like to consider for all levels of promotion and tenure.

The underlying idea is to give a faculty member who has reached the highest point of their career, as senior instructor II or full professor, maximum flexibility in applying themselves in ways in which they excel, are productive, and are helpful to their program and the University. Provost Walsh provided useful information in the event faculty would like to take this further.

One of the key recommendations from the task force is to give programs the opportunity to define a set of standards that would be different from those needed for promotion. At the moment, the bylaws identify a full professor as deficient if they have unacceptable teaching or they are deficient in both scholarship and service. Yates stated that he was unwilling to change that language until or unless programs were given the opportunity to decide, for scholarship, if there is a different level of scholarship that would still be deemed acceptable. If so, a full professor would be deemed deficient if unacceptable in all 3 areas.

**Walcher** added that one of the advantages of tenure is that there is some opportunity to be more experimental in scholarship. Instead of producing fairly traditional items such as a journal article, a faculty member might do something else that is productive, in the discipline, synthesizing and advancing knowledge, and appropriate for ongoing employment purposes.

Discussion:

**Siders** asked if anything in the report addressed how tenured administrators would retain their tenure. **Yates** responded that the question was not in the charge or purview of the task force, so it was not addressed. **Walcher** stated that he was unaware of guidelines from other institutions that would expect those in a full-time administrative role to continue teaching and producing scholarship to maintain tenure and, for that reason, he did not consider the question. **Yates** added that if an administrator returns to the faculty, they would have some transition time and 5 years until their first colleague evaluation, but they would be held to any standards that would exist. **Walcher** commented that their chair or director could call for an earlier evaluation.

**Walsh** commended both groups for their work, adding that the breadth and depth of the work done is both impressive and helpful. She asked that her appreciation be sent to former and present members of both groups.

**Yates** commented that some faculty, particularly junior faculty, might feel inhibited from speaking. He urged anyone with an opinion to share it with the appropriate task force. If there is no other feedback, steps for advising the Constitution Committee to proceed with potential bylaws changes will be discussed at the next AC meeting.

**Belcastro** asked if this was an action item and if senators should solicit feedback from other faculty. **Yates** responded that it is not currently an action item. Gathering and sharing feedback, particularly for any red-flag items or contentious issues in the reports, would be helpful, and the sooner the better. The next step will be to take the recommendations to the Constitution Committee, which would return with proposed bylaws changes reflected in the task force reports. We would have 2 weeks after they are introduced to vote on them, so there would be plenty of time then to stop the train if needed.

**Ettlich** shared appreciation that the post-tenure group incorporated feedback from the directors. She stated that there are ways to leverage the colleague evaluation, and giving directors the opportunity to call for an early evaluation is a very helpful tool. It is a kinder and more supportive way to move for correction of faculty than going through Article 16.

**Anderson** commented that, for scholarship, there would be a category that indicates a faculty member is acceptable for continued employment. She asked if there would be a similar category for service, since service and scholarship flex over the 5-year period. **Yates** responded that the task force is open in that regard, but the task force felt that everyone would have to meet the acceptable level in the current standards for both service and teaching, and they didn’t believe that much needed to change for those areas. The bar for scholarship is often a bit higher and narrower, and the task force is open to suggestions. **Walcher** stated that, as chair of a small program, that a change in the service standards might impact the ability of a small program to function, adding that he believes the acceptable level of service as written for the purposes of promotion and tenure are a reasonable baseline for acceptable levels of ongoing service to the university. **Anderson** responded that she might have misunderstood the way in which service and scholarship would flex over the years, depending on whether someone was working on a large scholarly project. **Walcher** agreed, replied that this could also be true for a faculty member taking on higher levels of service, and gave specific examples of large service commitments that might reduce one’s scholarship output. **Anderson** stated that many faculty who are not yet at the post-tenure or post-promotion level and have higher scholarship requirements are also doing more service because of colleagues who are not doing as much. She added that she is speaking up for the faculty who have talked to her about this.

**Yates** noted the time and asked that faculty share their feedback with each group.

1. **5:10p  Report on Sustainable Purchasing Policy – Rebecca Walker**

Report:

*Background*

In 2010, a green purchasing policy was approved. It was very detailed and its implementation was measured and monitored, but it did not work well across campus. In 2019, Walker began working with staff, faculty, and students across campus to align the policy with SOU’s values of equity and sustainability as well as national sustainability standards.

*Process*

The new policy has been developed with the help of a number of groups – it has been discussed at the Sustainability Council and was developed with students and staff (including staff from facilities, housing, procurement, and IT). It has been taken to the Policy Council, and Walker worked closely with Jason Catz on the policy. The policy has since been shared with the Business Affairs Council and Executive Council. It will next go to Cabinet for approval.

*Policy*

To help with its implementation and keep the specifications current, the policy has been split into 2 parts: a policy and procedure.

Policy Highlights

* *Ambitious yet practical*

Making sustainable purchasing decisions can be complex. We will not be measuring or assessing every purchase, only certain products and materials bought on campus.

* *Best practices*

The policy is tailored to SOU and informed by best practices from other institutions in the United States and elsewhere.

* *Scale approach*

For purchases above $25k, there are greater requirements, as money talks and could influence the supply chain, which could have positive impacts on equity and sustainability that reach beyond campus.

Content

* *Purchases > $25k*

The procedure includes a checklist that can be used as a guide but does not include scoring points or a black-and-white, yes-and-no answer. The checklist must be used for purchases above $25k.

* *All purchases*

There are specific requirements for all products – from vehicles to paper to IT – and the wording is very carefully chosen.

* *Exceptions*

These are built into the policy, as sustainability is complex and we will have to work through situations where there is no clear answer.

* *Purchasing card holders*

All P-card holders are expected to be aware of and understand the policy.

Discussion:

**Yates** commented that some faculty might make purchases greater than $25k, and this might impact certain programs and faculty more than others.

**Longhurst** noted that, in regards to airfare, the policy states that a fee will be paid into a fund to offset some of the carbon cost of airfare. She asked whether this occurs once we reach $25k of airfare as a university or whether, for a faculty member using PDA funds, the fee will come from their PDA. **Walker** indicated that the fee is not associated with the $25k purchase policy but that this part of the policy has been in place for a number of years, and the fund has increased over time. Walker stated that she would find out how the fee is added to the cost. **Longhurst** replied that it sounds like this is not a change, and **Walker** agreed that much of the policy gives greater clarity to existing policy, helping everyone understand how to implement it and be more successful in our sustainable purchasing goals. It is also aligned much more closely with how we report nationally on our sustainability credentials.

**Anderson** asked if programs with questions should email Walker directly, and **Walker** affirmed this and stated that she would welcome detailed feedback, further suggestions, and any questions.

1. **5:25p  Announcements/New Business**

The meeting adjourned at 5:31 pm.