Faculty Senate APPROVED Minutes

Monday, January 27, 2019

Present: Melissa Anderson, Prakash Chenjeri, Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Justin Harmon, Kristin Hocevar, Cynthia Hutton, Dennis Jablonski, Marc Koyack, Laurie Kurutz, Matt Moreali, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Chad Thatcher, Kemble Yates

Absent: Jeremy Carlton, Marianne Golding, Jesse Longhurst, Aprille Phillips, Michael Stanfill

Guests: Dennis Slattery, Neil Woolf, Lee Ayers, Sarah Guenther, Britney Sharp, Kevin Sahr, Sherry Ettlich, Jody Waters

Meeting called to order at: 4:01 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from 1/13
	* Kurutz moved to approve the minutes; Fedorek seconded. Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Morey, Oliveri, Siders, Siem, Thatcher, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Anderson and Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
2. President’s Report – Linda Schott
	* Report on board meeting
	* SOU started recruiting from American Samoa 2-3 years ago
	* Neil Woolf and others in ROTC, Student Life, etc. have been working to make sure the students are being supported, and have gotten community involvement with the cohort.
	* The students and community members presented to the board and did a great job; people were in tears
	* Woolf stated that initially SOU was invited to come there to recruit; about half graduate high school but there is no higher ed there aside from community college
	* Schott said faculty should let Woolf know if there are other things we need to be attentive to
	* Feb 20th will be a Finance committee meeting of Board of Trustees. Jim Pinkard from HECC will be the guest, talking about ratios and formulas and student success and completion model; it is an open invitation for those interested, it will be an opportunity to learn more
	* President’s Athletics Advisory Council just met; they are looking at scholarships, retention, etc. they are looking seriously at adding one or two new sports. Universities often do this to boost enrollment; Schott has asked them to do a really good financial analysis, analyzing fixed cost, marginal contribution, etc. It is being done thoughtfully; SOU will only do it if it contributes to financial health of institution
	* Jablonski asked which sports were being considered. Schott answered that Men’s Lacrosse, and maybe Women’s Lacrosse (last time it was Men’s soccer and Women’s wrestling) were being considered.
	* Jablonski asked how many students we have from American Samoa? Woolf responded that we currently have 38; 58 are admitted for Fall 2020
	* Jablonski asked about Hawaiian students. Schott answered that Pacific Islanders overall are up, but her info does not break out the number for Hawaii in particular
	* Schott noted that our focus for students from American Samoa is an academic focus, to provide them a higher education option, not purely athletics like some other schools
	* Schott mentioned that students from American Samoa get the same rate as WUE students. The poverty rate in American Samoa is high.
3. Provost’s Report – Sue Walsh
	* The GSWS major and Trans Studies certificate was approved at the Academic and Student Affairs meeting, next they will go to Provost Council, then to HECC. The board was blown away by the quality of the proposal and presentation.
	* Gay asked about the Health minor, but Walsh noted that new minors don’t have to go before that group.
4. Advisory Council Report – Chair-Elect Kemble Yates
	* AC didn’t meet, ergo no report
5. ASSOU President’s Report – Britney Sharp
	* Sharp said that the Tuition Advisory Council needs student volunteers; it could be a great resume builder for Economics and Business students in particular
	* ASSOU has lobby dates coming up in Salem; February 13 for University Day; then on February 17 ASSOU is sending eight representatives to talk about housing, underrepresented students, state funding, the Crown Act, and also meetings about the funding model. Sharp will also being going to the HECC to talk about the funding model; there only 3 more meetings about the funding model
	* ASSOU has an ad hoc group working on state funding and tuition
	* Some students are currently lobbying for why they should be considered Oregon residents
	* ASSOU estimated cutting $400,000 from all the requests for funding from student fees
	* Student fee total was raised to $498 (total) per term after increases to avoid even greater cuts, the fees fund a lot of great programs
	* Gay asked what the percentage of the increase is. Discussion ensued about what exactly the fees are,and the exact percentage of the increase (Ettlich suggested 9.45 % later in the meeting). The incidental fee, green tag, and recreation center fees are packaged together for the $498 total. Sharp suggested it is less than 10% total increase.
	* Moreali asked if Pell Grants can go toward fees and was told they can.
	* Schott noted that Woolf is doing an analysis of affordability and how it affects our competitiveness. She supports what the students are doing but is concerned about affordability.
	* Sharp stated that a lot of this has to do with the Rec Center and that sports clubs and groups on campus will be facing a cut.
	* Walsh reinforced that the Tuition Advisory Council requires 4 students, and they are anxious to get it going and meeting. It has 2 ASSOU representatives, but needs 2 more from unrepresented students; faculty can recommend them to the Provost’s office
6. Discussion of Admission Standards – Neil Woolf & Sue Walsh
	* Gay stated that questions were asked by faculty about our admission standards and how students get admitted in different ways. There is documentation is in the Drive
	* Woolf said he wanted to talk about how students are admitted and different categories of students
	* Students apply, and we ask for transcripts and test scores. When we look at eligibility we look first and foremost at GPA. It is more reliable than test scores. Academic profile of the incoming class was increased for Fall 19. The website promotes our “average GPA” profile of our students.
	* We have an admissions appeals committee. Students with a lower GPA are often admitted but with a check in with the committee; if they are in “committee status” they submit essays, letters of recommendation, resumes, and we do a holistic review
	* We are generally uncomfortable with students below 2.5 if they can’t fit into a program like Bridge
	* We do sometimes admit without test scores
	* From OUS days we still need to see 14 core credits, if one is lacking it will be reviewed by the committee. The question was asked if we are admitting more by committee, but Woolf explained that no, the overall percentage is dropping
	* Standards have increased, overall those admitted by committee has decreased
	* Oliveri asked about non-traditional students. It might not reflect where they are now. Woolf said that “they had to graduate somewhere,” so we start with that. We can admit by GED also.
	* Woolf explained that we have two categories, admit by committee and admit by special admit (when they have a subject deficiency). Combined it is an overall reduction, even though the admit by committee category has gone up.
	* Fedorek asked if we have raw numbers for those categories, and Woolf said we did.
	* Roughly 30% are admitted by committee
	* Schott asked if homeschooled students are admitted by committee. Woolf said they likely would be.
	* Gay asked about deficiency in foreign language and asked if that was a special admit and Woolf confirmed that it was; it is left over from OUS.
	* Sahr asked if it is low GPA or test scores for admit by committee. Woolf said that it can be both. Sahr claimed that 10% of our students would not have been admitted 5 or 6 years ago, but Woolf did not have data about that. Sahr suggested this change might be linked to a decline in STEM students. Woolf did not accept the assumptions built into this claim. Ettlich said that STEM has not dropped 10%.
	* Fedorek asked about the DFL (deficient in foreign language) which can be reviewed later after admit. He wondered if we still need it if OUS doesn’t exist anymore. Walsh and Schott said that it is being discussed now
	* Yates asked if we have a minimum GPA. Woolf said that we have an “average GPA,” not a “minimum GPA.” Schott said that is typical at most universities. Walsh said that we look at students holistically.
	* Jablonski asked if we know what the grad rate of these students is. Woolf said that we need further analysis for that.
	* Siem wondered if we were discussing this to determine an action. Gay explained that it came to Advisory Council, and so he invited Woolf to talk about it.
	* Koyack asked if we have considered getting away from SAT/ACT. Woolf said that the conversation is going on with other Oregon institutions and in CA. “Tests optional” can be helpful for students
	* Yates said that he thought we used to have a minimum GPA and would like to know when students go to committee and when they do not if there is no minimum.
	* Woolf noted that the only official academic admissions policy is you have to have an immunizations document.
	* Siem said she found 2.5 on the website. Woolf said that’s what is given to students as a profile, but it’s not technically a minimum.
	* Sahr said that he remembered when the change happened; he claimed it it was changed without Faculty Senate approval; it never went to the Policy committee, and it caused an uproar.
	* Yates said he wanted to get that history. Walsh said she did not remember the change that Sahr was talking about. Sahr claimed she defended it after the fact.
	* Sharp said that from the student perspective not advertising minimum GPA is a good thing; she and the past ASSOU president both had low GPAs in high school.
	* Jablonski said that the average test scores are higher than what is on our home page. Woolf said he believed that was a website issue.
	* Oliveri noted that in STEM they have seen more and more students coming in without math and therefore unable to do Gen Chem. It might lead to more 5 year students
	* Gay asked what is done with a student deficient in math. Walsh explained that we have 3 math courses to help students.
	* Ettlich we use SAT, ACT, or Smarter Balanced Test to place them, it only works for up to Math 243 and are not reliable at higher levels. We also have a new placement system called ALEKS that will point out areas of strength and weakness; nothing makes them do Strand D freshman year, but we want them to do them while they still remember them. Oliveri asked if some do not take placement. Ettlich responded that yes, we blanket them with info and some ignore it. They can take the test 5 times, unproctored the first time for practice before they come in. Andrew Clum is a good contact for placement testing and there is info on the website: <https://inside.sou.edu/stem/math-placement-exam.html>
	* Sahr asked if we are getting some with no math at all, and Ettlich said that if they have no score then either it was too high or too low for reliable placement
	* Woolf said that the ethos in admissions is to admit students who can succeed; we do refuse some, and if we do then we encourage them to join a partner like RCC; we take good care of students when they get here
	* Oliveri asked what the percentage of acceptance is, and was told 95%.
	* Sahr asked if Woolf could bring to Senate the grad rate for those admissions categories
7. Senate Appointment to Presidential Task Force on Financial Sustainability
	* More than one qualified volunteer for task force; they provided statements that are in the Drive
	* Slattery said that Senate talked about GPA last time he was here. He was a provisional admit and this institution has been a wonderful gift in his life.
	* Slattery said that senators have his statement, this is something he would like to do, this is the kind of thing he does, forecasting. Making cuts and treading water is not a growth strategy. He is excited to have the opportunity
	* Siders asked if Slattery had something that he was thinking about that would help us grow. Slattery said, no, you have to look at what’s out there and what we’re best suited for, and have we optimized our programs? What’s the next level you would add? You don’t want to get too far ahead with your own ideas
	* Shapiro said that faculty know her from her work with the union. She is involved in many programs on campus. She just came back from IFS; they are looking at funding models, at different ways of engaging with the state; she likes doing service that she is excited about and this is one of those things.
	* Siders asked Shapiro the same question--if she has any “crazy” ideas. She said that most of her “crazy” ideas have to do with changing the way we look at things; working with other universities in the state to think about other ways to re-envision the way we understand our financial situation and the resources we have available.
	* Schott reminded senators that there will be other opportunities for involvement
	* [Voting slips and a ballot box were passed; votes were counted by Yates and Anderson]
	* Shapiro will be the Senate appointee to the task force.
8. Discussion of TxT First-term Evaluation (Bylaw 5.351)
	* Gay said that we voted on this bylaw last year; we talked about this being a rather informal process; the form provided when he did one of these used was the one circulated for once every three years evaluation. Waters recommended we bring this back and discuss whether we need to use this form; there was some concern about the form being used even in normal evaluation--maybe it is too negative.
	* French noted that there was also some concern about checking a box not being enough. It’s just a box with no feedback
	* Yates said that the “summary” checkbox is vacant but other boxes feel fruitful. One size fits all is hard, we need to look at term by terms, but it looks different for programs with few faculty and lots of adjuncts vs some with plenty of faculty and only a few adjuncts
	* Gay said he remembered those concerns from Education in particular, and we didn’t want to dictate how that evaluation should be done.
	* Jablonski asked what the criteria is. Is it the department expectations used for everyone else? If you have to check a box, what are you using as criteria? He thought that maybe we should remove that checkbox if those criteria are being applied to people who have only taught one term. Siders noted that we do need to know if we want to bring them back or not. Siders wondered how many we have that only teach one term and don’t return, and Walsh said we did not have many like that.
	* Yates wondered if we had specific performance expectations for term by terms, and Jablonski wondered what criteria would be used when you have to check a box.
	* Gay said that the original intent was to give feedback. Gay wondered if we should tell chairs they don’t need to use form, if we should codify it somehow. Oliveri said that face to face feedback should be enough
	* Fedorek asked if we should just call it feedback instead of evaluation.
	* Siem wondered if we need the form to show it happened, and Yates noted that people rotate through, and having history is helpful.
	* Jablonski said that some people who start as one term adjuncts have career aspirations; they want a track record of what they’ve done. Having a system in place of what they are expected to do, it should be clear to them so they have something to meet
	* Gay asked if he could give advice to chairs that they don’t have to use the form but to document the evaluation and also ask the bylaws committee to craft more specific language; Kurutz asked for clarification of what the committee is being asked to do.
	* French noted that we should document good things too, more than just boxes
	* Siders asked where the document would live. Walsh agreed this was a good question. The consensus is that we should discuss it more at AC before sending it to the Constitution Committee.
9. New Academic Policies (Possible Vote)
	* Waters said that the committee adjusted language for p/np date to be 12th week
	* Matt Stillman has some concerns about notifying faculty about who is taking a course p/np
	* A 30 day deadline was discussed, but could cause complications. There was some confusion over the deadline; it will go back on the agenda next time after clarification
	* Yates moved to approve the policy stating that no credit would be granted at entrance for work at non-accredited institutions. Fedorek seconded. Anderson, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Harmon, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Morey, Oliveri, Siders, Siem, Thatcher, and Yates voted to approve. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passes**.
10. New OAL Graduate Curriculum (Possible Vote)
	* Kurutz moved to approve the new OAL curriculum. Oliveri seconded. Anderson, Chenjeri, Condon, Fedorek, French, Harmon, Hocevar, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Moreali, Morey, Oliveri, Siders, Siem, and Yates voted to approve. None opposed. Gay and Thatcher abstained. **Motion passes**.
11. Announcements/New Business
	* Morey said that the 19th annual lock-in would be February 28; they have low enrollment, so she asked senators to announce it. Students can get 1 credit for it, or pay 10 dollars.
	* Chenjeri said a Campus Theme event was happening Wednesday. Golding will be in the Meese Room of the library at 7pm talking about stories of survival in WWII France. On February 5th, Schott will talk about uncertainty in education.
	* Anderson said that LNAP is coming up on February 12, the same day SOAR applications open. Fedorek asked who is in charge; Walsh and Anderson answered that there is a committee.

Meeting adjourned at: 5:32 pm.