Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, May 24, 2021

4:00-5:30p

*Present:* Melissa Anderson, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Brook Colley, 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, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Michael Stanfill, Chad Thatcher, Precious Yamaguchi, Kemble Yates

*Guests:*  Bret Anderson, Lee Ayers, Enrique Chacón, Anne Connor, Sherry Ettlich, Bonnie Holmes, Bill Hughes, Cherstin Lyon, Joan McBee, Erik Palmer, Scott Rex, Alena Ruggerio, Linda Schott, Matt Stillman, Karen Stone, Sue Walsh, Jody Waters, Chance White Eyes

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm.

1. **Approval of Minutes from 5/10**

[video timestamp - 1:12 min]

**Motion & Vote:**

Kurutz moved to approve the minutes, and Stanfill seconded. **Motion passed** with 2 abstentions (Belcastro, Parker).

1. **President’s Report – Linda Schott**

[video timestamp - 2:10]

Native Land Acknowledgement

* + The acknowledgement, protocols for its use, and additional resources will be made available at the beginning of Fall term for campus use.
  + It is important to use this acknowledgement honorably and respectfully.

Revenue Forecasts for the State of Oregon

* + Oregon will receive more than was anticipated, and the [Public University Support Fund](https://www.oregon.gov/highered/institutions-programs/postsecondary-finance-capital/Pages/public-university-funding.aspx) (PUSF) will likely receive $900 million, as was originally hoped.
  + However, SOU may lose funds, and the losses are not yet clear. For example:
    - The sports lottery currently supports the TRUs. If the big universities are given a portion of it, the amount SOU receives (about $500k) would be reduced by $250-$300k.
    - The PUSF dollars are distributed through the Student Success and Completion Model, which is based on mission, activity, and outcomes. SOU gained some in mission this year but will likely lose some in enrollment, as enrollment is down significantly.
  + More certainty will likely come in June or July.

Bill: Professional Doctorates

* + A bill has been passed that allows SOU, EOU, WOU to grant professional doctorates. This was initiated by WOU, which has a professional doctorate in physical therapy.
  + New SOU proposals would need to undergo a hard financial analysis (demand, ROI, etc).

Hybrid Workplace in Fall

* + SOU will have increased hybrid operations in Fall. This will allow for greater workplace flexibility, enable a greater work-life balance, and reduce emissions (transportation, etc.)
  + This supports 2 of SOU’s strategic directions (employer of choice, sustainability),
  + Managers will use a decision tree to determine whether an employee can complete essential parts of their job remotely.
  + It will be important to keep the best interests of our students in mind and maintain a robust student experience.

1. **Provost’s Report – Sue Walsh**

[video timestamp - 9:43]

End of Year Event

* + This will be streamed from 12:30-1:30 on June 9 and recognize promotion and tenure, sabbaticals, emeritus faculty, outstanding teaching/scholarship/service awards.

Stipends for Gen Ed Course Development

* + Provost Walsh is working with CATL and Kristin Nagy Catz on development opportunities, and stipends will likely range from $1000-$3000.
  + Examples include the revision of an existing University Studies course, revision of an existing non-University Studies course, creation of a new course, collaborative work, incorporation of new pedagogy, etc.

1. **Advisory Council Report – Chair-elect Melissa Anderson**

[video timestamp - 13:45]

* + Advisory Council discussed items on the agenda.
  + General Education
    - Some faculty may have had technological issues when completing the recent GE poll.
    - Documents emailed by Gay on transfer articulation, etc., are very informative.
  + All-Faculty Email
    - As a result of a discussion about this at AC, Yates (in consultation with Kylan de Vries) composed an email encouraging a climate of inclusiveness and sent it to all faculty.
  + New Senate Leadership
    - This will be decided at the last Senate meeting.
    - Candidates for Chair-elect and Senate Secretary are still needed.

Discussion:

*Senate Leadership*. The Chair-elect position might be best for a faculty member with tenure or a 3-year contract. This position comes with 1 course release per quarter. Suggestion: Reach out to the faculty member or AC to obtain their permission before nominating them.

*Presidential Search Committee*. An announcement about the membership of the committee will be coming soon.

1. **ASSOU President’s Report**

[video timestamp - 21:50]

* + The ASSOU president has stepped down.
  + Elections for new ASSOU leadership were held but the results may still need ratification.

1. **Faculty Development Committee recommendations**

[video timestamp - 23:03]

Professional Development Grants (Discussion)

* + Applicants requested a total of close to $115k. With $95k available in funds, all applicants received an award close to their requested amount.
  + Actual amounts were determined using an analysis of the ratings individual FDC members had given each application.

**Motion & Vote to waive 2-week rule:**

Stanfill moved, and Levin seconded. **Motion passed** with 4 abstentions (Belcastro, Gay, Golding, Kurutz).

**Motion & Vote to approve the recommendations:**

Siem moved, and Stanfill seconded. **Motion passed** with 4 abstentions (Belcastro, Gay, Golding, Kurutz).

Edits to criteria and procedures for Distinguished Faculty Awards (Action)

* + With these edits, faculty would be eligible to receive an award after completing at least 5 years of employment at SOU and if they have not received the award within 10 years. The edits also improve the alignment of the timeline for each award.

Discussion:

*Reference to an Outdated Bylaw.* Page 3 of the Distinguished Teaching Award document refers to a bylaw about teaching effectiveness that no longer exists (5.261). Anderson recommended removing this portion of the text and, if so desired, replacing it with different criteria in the future.

**Motion & Vote:**

Gay moved to approve the edits with the removal of the bylaw language, and Kurutz seconded. **Motion passed** with 2 abstentions (Levin, Morey).

1. **Curriculum Committee proposals (Discussion)**

[video timestamp - 38:25]

New Special Ed (SPED) Minor and New Courses (Action)

**Motion & Vote to approve the new curriculum :**

Motion & Vote:

Belcastro moved, and Oliveri seconded. **Motion passed** unanimously.

Music and Theater New Courses (Discussion)

* + Music: The proposed course is connected to attendance at a music education conference.
  + Theater: Several pre-existing courses have been renumbered to reflect upper-division rigor and sequencing. The courses have also been made more equitable and inclusive.

1. **Possible Bylaws amendments (Action)**

[video timestamp - 45:04]

Preface: The amendments were shared with all faculty 1 week ago.

FPAR Task Force Recommendations

Discussion:

*Due Date.* The due date for the FPAR is June 1 because faculty are not on contract after June 15. However, faculty can submit after the deadline and through June 30 if they would like to incorporate a reflection based on the SLES.

*Invisible Work.* Many faculty believe the FPAR is a way to share work that is otherwise unseen with their chair and/or director. Should this work be captured in a bylaw?

*Self Ranking.* The bylaws state that *faculty seeking promotion are encouraged* to rank themselves and that *faculty not seeking promotion are not required* to rank themselves. Some faculty would like to see the self-ranking removed. An argument for keeping self-ranking is that faculty members would have the opportunity to see whether they rank themselves at the same level as their chair or director.

*Annual Review after Tenure and Promotion.* This could lead to excess clerical work.

**Motion & Vote:**

Fedorek moved to approve the amendments to the bylaws, and Stanfill seconded. **Motion passed** with 2 abstentions (Levin, Siem).

Graduate Studies Committee

* + A revision to the language reads: “We encourage representation from all graduate programs.”

Discussion:

*Name.* A past vote in Senate approved a name change for the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) to the Graduate Council in the bylaws. However, the committee would like to remain the GSC. By voting on bylaws that continue using the name GSC, Senate effectively reverts the name change to the GSC.

1. **Academic Policies Committee proposal re Foreign Languages (Discussion)**

[video timestamp - 1:00:40]

Proposal re Foreign Languages (Action)

**Motion & Vote:**

Gay moved to approve the minutes, and Belcastro seconded. **Motion passed** unanimously.

Proposal re Reserved Graduate Credit (Discussion)

* + Ruggerio benefited from a similar implementation of reserved graduate credit, graduating in 4 years with a bachelor’s degree and a master’s degree.
  + The new policy would allow certain undergraduate students to take graduate courses that would count toward fulfilling their bachelor’s degree and master’s program.
  + Business has developed a promising pilot proposal for their evening MBA program.

Discussion:

*Split-Level Classes*

Though not written into the policy, there would be ways to handle students taking both versions of the course. For example, if a student takes a 400-level course as an undergraduate and the 500-level version of the course as a graduate student, the course would not be counted twice; the 500-level version would be counted.

*Information through Implementation*

Once implemented and students begin moving through the program, the policy may evolve to better meet the needs of students and/or programs.

*Advising*

Students would need clear advising for this. The last statement of the policy would give programs a large degree of autonomy in regards to which students would be able to take courses at the graduate level.

*Undergraduate Rate Tuition / Affordability*

The current policy allows students to take reserved graduate credits at an undergraduate rate. It does, however, state that tuition rules must be delineated in the catalog by participating programs. To address potential revenue loss when students take the 1st year of their graduate courses as in their senior year at the undergraduate tuition rate, individual academic areas would want to design their implementation of the reserved graduate credit based on their needs, finances, etc. For example, Business has intentionally chosen to apply this to the evening MBA program rather than the online MBA program. Likewise, graduate programs would be able to use existing policies or create new policies to address these concerns.

1. **Proposal for Campus Theme 2021-2022 (Discussion)**

[video timestamp - 1:17:38]

* + The Campus Theme Committee (Prakash Chenjeri, Justin Harmon, Jackie Apodaca, Fraser Pierson, and Jeff Monosoff) discussed and solicited feedback from various areas of campus on a number of options.
  + The proposed theme is Disagreement.

**Motion to waive the 2-week rule & Vote:**

Golding moved, and Gay seconded. **Motion passed** with 1 abstention (Harmon).

**Motion to approve & Vote:**

Golding moved, and Gay seconded. **Motion passed** with 1 abstention (Harmon).

1. **Proposed Changes to General Education – Two Models (Discussion)**

[video timestamp - 1:20:57]

Gen Ed Survey (Yates)

*Intent.* The survey was sent to all faculty to get a sense of whether faculty prefer a new model and, if so, which. It was sent as a non-binding poll and not as an all-faculty vote.

*Participation and Responses.* More than 80 faculty began the survey, but general education rankings were only obtained from 54 faculty. However, in the cases for which rankings were not successfully recorded, comments and program affiliations were recorded. Of the 54 rankings, about 2/3 chose one of the new models as their top choice and about 1/2 placed the current gen ed model as their last choice.

*Results.* The results show that it is *not* the case that all faculty are for or against a particular model, including the current gen ed model.

Comments (Gay)

*Consensus.* Some faculty may not have ranked the 3 models because their preference was for a model not captured in any of the options given. Comments from the survey highlight the diverse views faculty have on how the gen ed should change. The FAQ document addresses this and concludes likely impossibility of reaching a total consensus on a new gen ed model.

*Conclusion of Task Force Work.* The task force has worked 2 years and found areas of common ground across many programs, many faculty, and many perspectives. Models A and B2 have emerged as the best options the task force believes it can offer. If Senate does not approve one of the two models, or a derivative of one of them through amendments, the task force will need clear direction in regards to what to develop and bring forward that will be approved.

Discussion:

*Changes to a Model After It Has Been Approved*

Once a model is approved and we begin to implement it, tweaks and clarifications that would improve the model or its use will likely be identified. Any changes made would be based on feedback, and with the goal of making the model better.

*Capacity Language*

The word ‘capacity’ is used in one of SOU's strategic directions (SD1). Capacities are centered on a students' capacity to develop skills that will allow them to pursue their goals. This focuses an advising conversation on developing those skills rather than learning discrete concentrations of knowledge in a traditional discipline. It also sends a clear message to students that the general education has a purpose and is meaningful to them and their goals. The portfolio gives the opportunity to exhibit their capacity development.

*Model Complexity*

Based on feedback from students who have been asked about the models, the current gen ed model is confusing to students while the capacity model is not. The current gen ed model has 10 strands in categories more meaningful to those in academia; the capacity model (A or B2) has 6 capacities in categories more meaningful to students.

*Model Focus*

Some faculty believe that gen ed should focus on the different academic modes of inquiry used in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities, and that students will develop the capacities by studying and learning to use these different modes of inquiry.

As a reminder, Senate overwhelmingly supported moving forward with the use of the capacities, and six subcommittees developed the capacities further.

*Template Reference to E, F, and G Strands*

The sample template (for inquiry & analysis) makes specific reference to the E, F, and G strands of University Studies. Templates for other capacities will also reference University Studies strands for mapping purposes. This will allow students to take courses developed for the new model and use those courses to satisfy their gen ed requirements, regardless of whether, based on their catalog year, they are under the new or old gen ed model.

*Implementation*

*Concern.* Becauses a new model will require the University Studies Committee to review a large number of course proposals, the work will necessarily be staggered. There is some concern about allowing small groups of faculty make 5-year approval recommendations without broader feedback from faculty.

*Suggestion.* We could set a goal for a number of courses to process and approve by a certain date. If that goal is reached, the new gen ed would launch in Fall 2022. Otherwise, the new gen ed would launch at a later date.

*Learning from Data*

Gay will meet with a group well-versed in data analytics to create a projection of the number of courses that would need to be approved in the next academic year for a successful Fall 2022 launch. This will be useful in budget planning. It will also allow the task force to provide course approval progress reports at Senate next year. This data will be made available to Senate.

*Transferability*

Each university in Oregon has its own gen ed model, meaning that no model will completely align with all of the others. SOU has no control over how other institutions treat our courses, and some University Studies courses that students now take do not satisfy gen ed requirements at other universities. Kitty Cable, who is in charge of DegreeWorks, and Matt Stillman have stated that neither model would impose additional challenges for transferring courses in or out of SOU. However, the non-traditional options of Model B2 would be more difficult to transfer, and we will want to make that clear to students in advising.

*Portfolios*

A number of universities use a portfolio model successfully, and the gen ed task force will work on details of the portfolio over the summer. Senate has the option to approve a model, and approve the portfolio contingent on how workable it is in the Fall. If it does not seem workable, it can be removed then.

*Need for Clarity*

*Concern.* There may be a disconnect between how faculty, students, and other institutions understand and interpret a new model.

*A Solution.* Once a model is approved, there will be focus group work with students on the capacity language to ensure that every capacity and proficiency is clear and transparent to both students and faculty. The hope is that when courses are approved, these learning outcomes will be very transparent, available in the catalog, and available on the schedule so that students know exactly what they will be learning when they sign up for a course.

*Cost/Logistical Advantage of Once Model Over Another*

Because Model B2 allows students to take any number of upper- and lower-division gen ed courses, it might reduce the number of upper and lower division courses that must be offered at any given time.

Please be prepared to vote on the gen ed models at the next Senate meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 pm.