Faculty Senate Minutes

May 23, 2011

4:00-5:30 pm

Present: Bill Hughes (chair), Jody Waters (vice chair), Mary Carrabba, Dave Carter, Prakash Chenjeri, Anne Connor, Sherry Ettlich, Emily Miller-Francisco, Donna Mills, Doyne Mraz, Michael Naumes, Pete Nordquist, Chris Oswald (for Kathleen Page), Kay Sagmiller, Ellen Siem, Cynthia White, Elizabeth Whitman, Wilkins-O’Riley Zinn

Absent: Dennis Dunleavy, Paul French, Steven Jessup, John Laughlin, Mark Siders, Dennis Slattery, Robin Strangfeld

Visitors: Natalie Coppedge, Mary Cullinan, Dan DeNeui, Jon Eldridge, Carol Ferguson, Hassan Harris, Dennis Jablonski, Laura Jones, John King, Jim Klein, Donna Lane, Kelly McAllister, Gerry McCain, Mada Morgan, Craig Morris, Laura O’Byron, Dee Perez, Dan Rubenson, Alena Ruggerio, Hala Schepmann, Mark Shibley, John Sollinger, Amanda Stucke, Susan Walsh, Erin Wilder, Kemble Yates

Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes from April 25 and May 9, 2011

← Ettlich moved to approve the minutes from April 25 and May 9. Mraz seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with no abstentions.

←

←

2. Announcements

← Mraz: The Committee on Committees still has approximately 6 seats to fill. Please let Mraz or Strangfeld know of any who might be interested.

←

←

3. Comments from President Cullinan

← President Cullinan reported that there is no definite news from the legislative front.

←

← This weekend included a number of important events:

←

• There was a celebration of Presidential Scholars at the President’s home. The celebration was for students and their families and was attended by about 70 people.

• The President’s medal was awarded for the 27th year. The medal is given to strong community members, and this year it was awarded to Jerry and Jeanne Taylor.

• The President delivered the welcoming address at a Native American summit hosted at SOU this weekend.

4. Comments from Provost Klein

← Provost Klein thanked all who participated in this year’s SOAR. He gave special recognition and appreciation (a “shout out”, per Nordquist) to Paul French for bringing globally recognized soloists to perform on campus, wanting to point this one out for being “incredible”.

←

← The task force charged to recommend assessment software is evaluating two products. Sagmiller is task force coordinator.

←

← Sagmiller: The product representatives will return to campus on June 3rd for a presentation that will allow for a fair comparison.

←

← Klein: The software will allow faculty to input information as they prepare classes, program reviews, etc.

←

← The Provost stated that the ongoing discussion of the tenure and promotion (T/P) processes will be addressed later in the meeting.

←

←

5. AC Report (Jody Waters)

← Waters reported that the Advisory Council addressed:

• the ongoing discussion about the T/P process

• brief updates (or lack thereof) from the Legislature

• the scheduling of two information sessions with the Provost

← One of the information sessions was today, and the other is tomorrow at 1:30 (SU313). Hughes is taking questions ahead of time so that information can be gathered beforehand.

←

←

6. Student Senate Report (Kelly McAllister)

← The Student Senate has filled 9 cabinet positions. New members will be sworn in tomorrow night at the Student Senate meeting.

←

← This was McAllister’s last Faculty Senate meeting.

Information Items:

7. Faculty Personnel Committee (Lane)

← Lane addressed the procedure the committee used to evaluate T/P applications. She stated that the review process was careful and approximately 80-85 hours were spent on all applications.

←

← Lane was asked to report percentages of how many people were promoted in the past and whether this year was different. She stated that the percentage would vary depending on the number of applicants and that this year there were more applicants than she had seen in any previous year. She said that the review process was the same as it was last year and suggested that the FPC review is the most consistent due to regular changes in administration.

← Hughes: I don’t think those numbers are irrelevant. I’ve asked for them for a few weeks. I think we need the raw numbers to see if there is any sort of trend in the number who apply, the number who make it and those that don’t.

← Lane: We can get that to you.

←

← Shibley: Want these numbers from all levels?

← Hughes: I’ll take what I can get.

← McCain: Is it the responsibility of the committee?

← Hughes: Just send what you have over past five years. Many people feel, whether appropriately or not, that this is unprecedented. We need to see the data to reach a conclusion.

← Waters: We thought it would be wise, prudent, and diligent to have the information because there is so much discussion on it.

←

← White: It is important to protect the privacy and confidentiality of those involved. I think the data lends clarity and will put people’s minds to rest.

←

← Shibley: Is there a relevant time frame to see trends? I’m sure we have a couple of years worth of data, but I would like to see all of it.

← Hughes: So would I. We will certainly find that the numbers will be different at each level. Ettlich: I recommend that we retrieve at least 5 years.

←

← Whitman: It is important to contextualize the data for each year. The different numbers of applicants each year will be important to consider.

←

← Naumes: There are many rumor mills. I’ve heard that the evaluations were unclear, that the applications were unclear, etc. I’m curious if this year’s applications have been different from those in the past.

← Lane: I expect a huge variance if we look over applications within the past 20 years. Considering the past few years only, it doesn’t seem like this year was much different.

← Shibley: A majority of the cases were quite clear. Some lacked of clarity as to what counts.

←

← Oswald (for Page): Thank you for this discussion. Hughes has asked for the data.

← Klein: I have the last 5 years of provost decisions, and Donna seems to have the last 5 years from the FPC. So we have information from at least two levels.

←

← Oswald: In the review process, did you use the old or new criteria?

← Lane: We used the bylaws and interpreted them the best we could.

← Shibley: My understanding is that the new criteria is still under review.

←

← Oswald: So those evaluated this year were held to the same standards as previous years?

← Shibley: yes

← Chenjeri: If decisions were based exclusively on the FPC, their information would be useful. I think we need information from the FPC, the Dean, and the Provost to make a comparison.

←

← Mraz: Don’t the minutes say that the Face of the Cube is in the bylaws?

← Ettlich: Yes, but not the slices.

←

← Sagmiller: I think we’re looking at a national trend. Increased expectations for promotion from Assistant to Associate to Full is a common discourse. We need to look not just at numbers but quality. My hypothesis is that when we look at service to the University and students, our faculty is above the norm. We need to consider how our scholarship might be related to our service. What aspects of service do we give up to enhance scholarly activity? We need a process that is headed by the administration giving a better understanding of what we need to do. Should we reorganize our time?

←

← Hughes: I need to clarify why the FPC is here. We felt that because there was so much confusion and an institutional crisis of confidence, there was the need for someone from FPC to help clarify. We’d like to have more information. There might be some confusion and inconsistency between the FPC, Dean, and Provost about how to interpret and apply bylaws. Seeing how many were approved at each level will help clarify. Are there any other questions for the FPC?

←

← Ettlich: There has been criticism about FPC write-ups. That they are short and with errors. Did that part of the process become rushed? What can we do so it doesn’t feel so crunched?

← Lane: Extended time to work through the applications would help.

← Shibley: The write-ups have always been terse. The responsibility of the FPC is to use the bylaws in evaluating and to ensure that there is some parity between schools.

← McCain: They are short, brief, and to the point.

← Connor: Is it part of your process to find out what happens to the applications after you make your decisions? There were applications that were approved by the Provost even though they weren’t approved by the FCP.

←

← Klein: Before I make my recommendations, I meet with the FCP. I want to understand their thinking and why they made their decisions.

← McCain: We don’t always agree.

←

← White: Could we have a mechanism that’s more systematic? This cycle involved a great deal of work. I worry that this this could happen again 5 years from now.

← Lane: It wasn’t the number of applications.

← Oswald: A specific format for the data could be important. The vote breakdown would give greater insight.

← Klein: We can do this moving forward. Going back 20 years would likely be impossible.

← Waters: These sorts of reports should be routine, where committees come to report and share the data. When the slices are in place next year, the process will be different. We need to be mindful of how this might be more difficult then.

←

← Shibley: The bylaws are the standard we use. How do we get at the parity issue when we have so many different slices?

← Ettlich: The expectations are expected to conform to the bylaws. The departmental expectation documents have to be approved to ensure they do have parity. The intent is to make the process easier for all.

←

← Shibley: Absorbing so many different slices will likely be difficult.

← Klein: Mary and I both worked in institutions that had these slices. It was easier.

8. Graduate Program Guide/Student Handbook (King)

← We are sharing two resources put together over the last year: a graduate student handbook and a graduate program guide. These are resources for faculty, staff, and the coordinators who create and revise programs.

←

← This is a chance to get feedback. We want to communicate and clarify what we’re all doing.

← These documents are important for:

• knowing what each program is doing (as programs tend to be silo-ed from each other)

• identifying the overlaps / discrepancies between our procedures and other institutions

• capturing institutional memory

• capturing some institutional resources for those involved in the programs

← Our next step is to work with Penny Thorpe in the fall to upload the documents and make links to easily access all of the information.

← Coppedge: The handbook came out of an identified need for our graduate students. It has been through the Graduate Council, program coordinators, etc. It will be a great resource and we will put it on the website for our admits.

←

← King: As you review this, send comments and suggestions to me or Natalie. We have until next fall to update it and make it available online and as a hard copy.

Discussion Items:

10. Applied Mathematics Professional Science Masters (Yates)

← SOU already has a PSM program, and we would be the second institution to have one in this category. There are no Applied Math PSM programs in Oregon that we know of, or that are being proposed. We believe it’s a good niche and that we can create a healthy program with our resources.

←

← We’ve talked to industry about possibly hiring, e.g., statistically seasoned students and have been given letters of support. In addition we have received a grant from the state.

←

← We want the program to begin one year from this fall. The Provost and CAS Dean have been involved and the program would next go to the Provost Council and get an external review.

←

← You have the plans for the intended number of students and costs. We think we can use our current faculty to get the program started for the first 1-2 years, but we will eventually need to hire another.

←

← Connor: How do you anticipate student interest?

← Yates: We get several calls a year about a master’s in mathematics. I can imagine that we will also retain 1-2 of our own students each year.

←

← Naumes; Did this come out of the Graduate Council?

← Yates: Yes.

← Naumes: I see you have some students in Fall 2011.

← Yates: It should read Fall 2012. We hope to admit 6 then. We already offer some courses that would count, and we will have 18 more credits taxed to our department each year. We believe we can handle that by using more adjuncts for our lower division courses. We will also need to show that we can sustain the program before a new faculty hire.

←

← Mraz: How does our Curriculum Committee relate to this?

← King: The Grad Council is the only group that needs to approve this.

←

← White: This is a great idea, but I worry about the impact on the undergraduate students.

← Ettlich: We’ve had history with this, and it has worked reasonably well.

←

← [Acklin: Because of our late materials on the curriculum side, I don’t see the Certificate program on the agenda. It should be a discussion item. John Lang is here to help with that.]

←

←

11. Carpenter II Applications (Ruggerio)

← There’s a disparity between the realistic budget for the research projects, how much we can ask for, and how much can give. We perceive that this is a trend, although we don’t have 20 years of data.

←

← We are also seeing PDG requests for basic teaching equipment (e.g., chalk). We’ve talked to Provost about this. In this way, we not only evaluate for awards, but we also advocate.

←

← In the short term, we bring forward recommendations for Carpenter II grants twice a year. This is the second round. You might decide to suspend the two-week rule and vote.

←

← Mraz moved to suspend the two-week rule. Ettlich seconded the motion. The motion was approved with no abstentions.

←

← Sagmiller moved to approve the Carpenter II recommendations. Waters seconded the motion. The motion was approved with an abstention from Carrabba.

←

←

12. USEM Course Approval (Morgan)

← We have two courses for approval, one an explorations (BA 218) and the other an H-strand integrations (ED 437). These courses have come to us twice. The latter went through a lot of scrutiny. We are happy to approve these two courses.

←

← [Acklin: Perhaps we can waive the 2-week rule and approve the courses presented by Morgan and those from the Curriculum Committee in one fell swoop?]

Action Items:

13. Curriculum from last meeting (Lang)

← The Certificate in Conflict Resolution has been in the works for some time. It’s waiting for your approval and will go on to the Provost Council to begin in Fall 2012.

←

← The core of proposal (pg. 2) shows the number of credits required, the core and elective courses, etc. That objectives, assessment, and budget details are found later. Are there any questions?

←

← Ettlich: Is this an expansion of the minor approved last year?

← Lang: Yes.

←

← White: Is a capstone from the communications department not required?

← Lang: There’s a choice between a capstone, internship, and practicum. These could be in any department as long as that option is relevant and approved by the program coordinator.

← White: So, they won’t be doing a unifying capstone together?

← Lang: It’s unlikely.

←

← Naumes: I’m in support of this.

←

← Hughes: Should we follow the Acklin plan and do a block vote with materials submitted last week, or disaggregate?

←

← Connor moved to waive the 2-week rule, and Mraz seconded the motion. The motion was approved without abstention. Waters moved that we vote on recommendations from the curriculum committee in conjunction with the two recommended courses from University Studies. Mills seconded the motion.

← Naumes: Last time there was a question about the Learning Commons course. Should we have more discussion on that?

← Acklin: We created the Learning Commons as a program to pilot next year. If it’s successful, we will use that as a new course for the following year. It would come back to you as a hard-numbered course instead of a 199.

←

← Ettlich: LC199 is a course. Normally these are approved by departments, but this one has no department.

← Acklin: An iteration of the course was given as USEM 110 but was not approved by a department. The committee believed that it has valid content and, incidentally, will help students on probation.

←

← Ettlich: Who is going to take the role that the department would normally take?

← Klein: There is a Learning Commons steering committee with faculty representation.

← Ettlich: Then the LC steering committee will be taking that role.

←

← White: This new designation of LC will be somewhat problematic.

← Sagmiller: We have Student Affairs stepping in and helping curriculum. We’re moving in right direction for collective handling of our students.

←

← Naumes: We need to discuss why so many of our students need an extra hand.

← Eldridge: Our institution isn’t unlike those across the country.

← Nordquist: I’m not certain that all of our students are qualified. We have many special admits, across the campus.

← Klein: I can certainly get that data for you.

←

← The motion was approved.

Additional information Item:

14. Revision of Bylaws, Scholarship (Ettlich)

← This proposed replacement for the scholarship portion of the bylaws needs input:

1. Clarity. Does this bring clarity that might narrow difference between those who interpret bylaws as a high / low bar?

2. Flexibility. Is this flexible enough so that every department/program can fit in?

3. Content. Is this the appropriate level for SOU?

4. Process. Is the process of vetting is working?

← We’ll have one more meeting, perhaps a small group session with faculty at the faculty breakfast to obtain answers to those questions.

← Miller-Francisco: Will we keep the language about accepting “minor deficiencies” in scholarship or service when there’s otherwise exceptional performance?

← Ettlch: We must decide what is a minimum first.

←

← Sagmiller: Integration lists presentations and publications. Do they carry the same weight?

← Ettlich: It would depend on the presentation and publication.

← Waters: Departments will need to clarify.

←

← Ettlich: I think you’re asking what composes a program of scholarship.

← Sagmiller: I’m trying to figure out what this might look like if someone does an international presentation but no publication. Quality is evaluated by each department?

← Ettlich: We tried to not make these guidelines rigid.

←

← Mraz: And difficulties FCP will run into with these varying definitions?

← Ettlich: The definitions are here. Bylaws don’t have definitions, so terms are being interpreted differently. Departments will decide what meets the criteria.

← Mraz: But if there are discrepancies, FCP will ameliorate, right?

← Ettlich: I think the departments are the best to look at these criteria to determine if met.

← Oswald: Thank you for including scholarship of teaching. There is a specific comment about meaningfulness, to look at how work “is cited or used by other scholars”. I can see running to real problems if it’s such a local problem or small area.

← Ettlich: The next sentence should clarify.

← Page: It seems very soft. How do we access meaningfulness in such a broad way?

←

← Naumes: Conflicts between the applicant, advocating chair, the dean, and the provost?

← Klein: In the application, the individual applicant advocates for these areas. Most of the time we can’t see such advocations in colleague evaluations.

←

← Ettlich: Once this is together, we will add specific questions to ask about these four areas in application packets, including questions like: what type of scholarship? How original was your work? How was it meaningful? How was it reviewed? How was it disseminated?

←

← Miller-Francisco: About going from associate to full, are we measured relative to the bar or with respect to ourselves? It’s not clear.

← Ettlich: The difference is between an established vs. well-established program of scholarship. We need more input about to clarify between the two.

←

← Zinn: The individual is the one who begins advocating.

← Ferguson: The idea of a bar and just needing to get over the bar bothers me. At this institution, we do much more than the bar and that becomes the new norm. We want realistic guidelines are for new faculty to understand what is required.

←

← Sagmiller: I would like examples to see the variance between several different examples for faculty who went from associate to full professor.

← Klein: I think we can give examples, but we will need permission. Workshops will be important for faculty moving through the ranks. We want people to write a short description of their research to put it into context. We will do this in the future.

←

← DeNeui: Will the grandfathering language also apply?

← Ettlich: Hopefully we’ll address that over the summer and bring it to Senate by Christmas for approval.

←

← DeNeui: For promotion to associate and full, you cite the program of scholarship. What do you mean?

← Ettlich: We tried to clarify, but if it’s not clear in the document, it should be cleaned up.

←

← Waters: The application, FPAR, and FPAP should correspond so that there is a constant conversation.

←

← DeNeui: In our department it’s become increasingly evident that the students want to be involved in research. The type I do that can involve students is very different from that I do. It’s difficult to do both.

← Ettlich: Send wording suggestions and ideas. This has been the most difficult piece for us.

←

← Naumes: Seems clearer. We might have to try it first.

←

← Mraz: This document has to be communicated to the faculty, and that faculty has to accept it as what wants. Should there be series of meetings of some kind?

←

← Oswald: Perhaps some of those who have recently passed would share their applications as examples.

←

← Ettlich: (A show of hands indicated that finals week is too soon for a larger discussion.) Is it better to do this during the instructional days in fall?

← Waters: That is probably the earliest we can do this. Homework from departments should be done first.

← Sagmiller: Chairs could bring this to retreats with faculty.

←

← Mills: Is this something we can share?

← Ettlich: Yes. We are moving toward some format of this with definitions. Criteria need to be stable through turnovers in staffing (chairs, deans, provosts, etc.) The bylaws should be clear enough so that fluctuations are reasonably narrow. Further suggestions are welcome. Please send them to me. We will be working on this over the summer. Thanks.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 PM.