Faculty Senate Minutes

April 29, 2013

SU 313 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

**Present:** Deborah Brown, David Carter, Prakash Chenjeri, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Fredna Grimland, Kevin Sahr, Byron Marlowe, Rich May, Mary Russell-Miller, Gerald McCain, Kasey Mohammad, John Richards, Larry Shrewsbury, Ellen Siem, Robin Strangfeld, Jamie Vener, Jody Waters.

**Absent:** Amy Belcastro, Todd Carney, Doug Gentry, John King, Steven Jessup.

**Visitors:** Brian Stonelake, Jennifer Fountain, Sue Walsh, Pat Acklin, Lee Ayers.

**Waters called the meeting to order at 4:04p.m.**

**Approval of minutes from April 15**:

**Discussion:**

* Sahr clarified a question he had asked about ELU loading for faculty across the departments. The words “and others” will be added after “graduate coordinators” in order to clarify this.
* Belcastro and Chenjeri both added that they had understood Sahr to be referring to just the graduate coordinators, not others.
* Richards moved that the April 15 minutes be approved with the corrections mentioned above. Russell-Miller seconded the motion, which passed with all in favor and none opposed.

**Announcements**

There were no announcements.

**Comments from Provost Klein**

* Students for the 2013-4 cohort in the Honors College have been recruited.  Thanks to Chenjeri, Grimland, and Oswald for serving on the committee.  Twenty-five students will be in the first cohort.
* Academic Support Prioritization reports will come out on May 1.  A forum will be held in the afternoon to discuss the reports.

**ASSOU Report**

* No ASSOU representative was present, but Waters gave the following report on their behalf: The students’ trip to Salem last week was a success. They had more students than seats on the bus, so they were happy. ASSOU elections start today and close on Friday. The goal is to solicit more than 1000 votes, the largest in SOU’s history. Please encourage students to vote now.

**Discussion:**

* Ettlich suggested that Waters send out an all-faculty reminder to ask students to vote, and she agreed to do so.

**Advisory Council Report**

AC talked about the agenda items for this meeting as well as the next Senate meeting.

**Information Items:**

None

**Discussion Items:**

**Carpenter II Grants, Faculty Development Committee – Erika Leppmann**

* Leppmann brought forward the FDC’s recommendation for Carpenter II Grant awards. 23 grant applications were submitted, and 17 were funded.
* Ettlich moved that the two-week rule be suspended, and Carter seconded. The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed.
* Carter moved that the FDC’s recommendations be accepted. Russell-Miller seconded, and the motion passed with all in favor, none opposed. Sahr and McCain abstained.

**Curriculum Committee** – **Pat Acklin**

* Acklin discussed the 14-page packet sent out with materials. This includes new courses and a new minor in Communication. Acklin requested that the new Honors College be approved since it has already enrolled students.
* CC has just received proposals for the new House Seminars and are waiting to get a new degree proposal from Jeanne Stallman and Joan McBee from business. Acklin asked that the two-week rule be suspended to put these two programs on the agenda for approval at the next meeting. She clarified that this is not a request from the Curriculum Committee—it is from her. Acklin explained that the House models, which she had thought were pilot programs, are now apparently not being considered pilot programs.
* Acklin would like Senate to consider suspending the two-week rule and put these two important items on the agenda for voting next meeting.

**Discussion:**

* Ettlich and Waters both would like to know if these proposals are controversial. If so, we may need to have the full allotted time to make careful decisions. Ettlich does not want Senate to feel strong-armed into making hasty decisions, and Waters confirmed that due time may be required.
* Ettlich also gave the option that these courses could be listed in the schedule as “pending,” but Acklin did not think this would satisfy Enrollment Services.
* Waters reiterated that we be given appropriate time to read the materials carefully and make informed decisions.
* Acklin clarified that this request is coming through her from Enrollment Services, not through Curriculum Committee.
* Ettlich asked about the Honors College Curriculum. Is there a reason why one course from each of the three areas is not required? Ettlich does not want to allow students to avoid one or more category. She would like to require students to take at least one course in each category.
* Grimland explained that the topic of the course would determine which strand the course would satisfy.
* Ettlich would feel more comfortable approving this with language to require that students would be required to take one course in each category.
* Waters brought up concerns about topics in these courses actually addressing the stated goals as they were originally intended. Discussion ensued.
* Chenjeri agreed to change the language to require this.
* Acklin will return in two weeks, and she will send out any pertinent information for review ahead of time. She did caution that Enrollment Services may voice concern at the Senate’s decision to take the allotted time to consider these issues.

**Ranks Language, Constitution Committee – Sherry Ettlich**

* Ettlich explained that in Promotion and Tenure changes, two new ranks were presented. The first was a librarian rank that is not being pursued. The second is the Professor of Practice.
* Librarian rank is not being brought forward because the Librarians are not advocating for it, and no one else came forward supporting its use at SOU.
* Some institutions have had issues centered around Professor of Practice since it is not a tenure track position. It would be a three-year, extendable contract. It would be possible that a person could be “not renewed” after a year, which would result in a two-year notice of intent to not rehire.
* PSU faculty members oppose adopting Professor of Practice because it is not tenured and would further reduce the number of tenured faculty at PSU.
* SOU has a large number of highly qualified instructors who do not have a terminal degree but have rich experience that would be better acknowledged through this new rank.
* Conversely, we have tenure-track positions that may fall more accurately under this new rank. Concern is that some professorial positions may be replaced with professor of practice positions, particularly those with exceptions to terminal degrees.
* Normally a 36 ELU load and same expectations in teaching that all faculty members must maintain.
* The scholarship expectations would be significantly reduced (application-based).
* Service load would be expanded, including significant professional service, outside of campus obligations (local, regional).
* Constitution Committee needs guidance. Where do we stand on this issue? Should we go forward? Are they going in the right direction?
* Waters explained that since this is a bargaining year, we must move quickly. Ettlich agreed that if we are doing this, we must put it into discussion for bargaining this year. Decisions must be made by June.
* Klein explained that he understands that the scholarship requirements might leave entirely and be replaced with increased community involvement.
* Waters: Would that disallow scholarship? No, it would just not required.
* McCain: What are the benefits? Ettlich explained that in School of Business, several people who fit this category but were on Professorial tracks were moved to Senior Instructor, not by choice. She has a faculty member in Math who would benefit from this new rank. Ettlich acknowledges that this could be tricky in the Educational field. The choice might be appealing for some faculty. Salary would be closer to Professorial rank than Instructor rank.
* Klein: many areas in the campus have applied areas of curriculum where someone in the professional world might be useful and could be compensated.
* May: How would a faculty member move from one track to another? Ettlich explained that a formal reappointment process would need to be implemented, preferably with the agreement of the faculty member. Klein agreed that the intention is not to remove existing rank from current faculty members.
* Marlowe voiced concerned about the possibility of current tenured faculty who qualify for this potentially losing tenure already earned. In the past, no member holding earned tenure had that tenure removed; instead, those on tenure tracks were rerouted.
* Stonelake added that with the new House model, this new rank could prove valuable in gaining interdisciplinary support and knowledge.
* Waters encourages everyone to take this discussion to departments.

**Action Items:**

There were no Action Items.

**University Studies Committee – Lee Ayers**

* Ayers would like to move forward on the materials she presented last Senate meeting about new course proposals (Exploration and Integration courses).
* Carter moved to accept the US Committee’s proposal, and Cleland-Sipfle seconded.

**Discussion:**

* Ettlich wondered how EMDA 205 qualifies as a science strand course. It’s heavily computer based. It met learning objectives for strand G and is a non-lab course. Sahr inquired about objectives, and Ayers clarified.
* Motion passed with all in favor and one opposed. There were no abstentions, and the motion carried.

**HSem:**

* Ayers explained that the Houses want to develop a template to meet and address the foundational goals: Communication, thinking, and information literacy. US Committee has approved the shell, not the specific instructional details. These proposals will not go to USem for approval—they will go straight to Curriculum Committee.
* Art 133 was put forward as an E strand.
* Chem 325—community involvement is key in this new course. Ayers will return when these items are on the agenda as action items.

**Discussion:**

* Ettlich wonders if it will be easier for non-majors to enroll in Art 133. Yes, and it will hit all of the foundational goals. Ettlich clarified that in the past, she had trouble getting her majors enrolled since the courses filled before non-majors could get in.
* Ettlich wonders about the votes on the house models—were they controversial? Is this why the votes were not recorded? Ayers says no---the group of dedicated individuals all worked hard to review all this material quickly. Votes were unanimous, and all members gave each proposal full and thorough consideration.
* Chenjeri wondered about the approval process of the proposals that have already been approved. Ayers explained that it is a multi-layer approval system.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

**Non-Senate members were excused, and the meeting went into executive session.**