

**Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes
Spring Semester, Meeting #4
Wednesday, March 13, 2019
Russell 100, 3:00 p.m.**

As approved at the Faculty Senate meeting of March 27, 2019

Attending:

**Stan Alluisi
Dan Althoff
Kathy Boothe
Han-Sheng Chen
Randy Clark
Diane Dixon**

**Steven Emge
William Fridley
Karl Frinkle
Charles Matthews
Chris Moretti
Josh Nannestad**

**Patrick Reardon
Michael Scheuerman
Kate Shannon
Doug Wood**

Not Attending:

**Kay Daigle
Stewart Mayers
Elisabeth Ponce-Garcia
Rhonda Richards**

Guests:

**Carolyn Fridley
Alisha Ridenour**

I. Call to Order and Welcome

Call to order by Chair Althoff at 3:00 p.m.

II. Approval of the [Minutes from February 27, 2019](#)

Motion to approve -- Senator Stan Alluisi

Second – Senator Brandon Burnette

Comments and Corrections: add Doug Wood to attendees; note an abstention on the ECU letter (University Affairs) vote; New Business, D. change *that* to *than*, add a *be*, change Maxim to Maxient.

Yes – 12; No – 0; Abstentions – 3 Motion carries.

Minutes approved as corrected.

III. Treasurer’s Report

No report. A report will be given by the next meeting.

IV. Committee Reports

A. Budget Committee

Did not meet, no report.

B. Committee on Committees

It was noted that Stan Rice informed members of the Campus Sustainability Committee that he was resigning as chair of the committee.

C. Executive Committee

1. Response from Human Resources on Faculty Application Forms

Chair Althoff reported on the email response from Marjorie Robertson, Director of Human Resources concerning our inquiry about the form that is required with the faculty job application process (see [2-27-2019 Minutes, V. New Business A](#)).

The email was sent on March 11, 2019, and cc'ed to Dennis Westman, Vice President for Business Affairs.

Good Morning Dr. Althoff:

I'd be happy to explain.

The application form collects consistent information in a uniform format for every applicant. The position being sought, where they heard about the opening, willingness to travel, and current driver's license. Questions about required travel and current driver's license. Also, the application is where we can legally ask if they are legally eligible for employment in the US. Documentation of identity and employment must be provided upon hire. It asks if the applicant is related to any other University employee. This will allow us to get the required documentation if needed so that we don't have any nepotism problems.

Employment History

We can find out if the applicant has worked for another Oklahoma college/university. (Very important for retirement purposes) And if the applicant has used any other names or been discharged or asked to resign from a job. Helpful with the background check.

And finally the Applicant's statement of certification and agreement. Where the applicant signs saying they attest that the information is accurate, no falsification of information, eligibility of employment and where they agree with the policies, rules and regulations. Fraudulent claims and information on application materials, including fake degrees, exaggerated job descriptions, fake dates of employment, and other falsehoods are increasing. By getting all the history information that an application requires, we are better able to stop some of this from happening. Or at least able to verify if we need too.

Historically, we had stopped getting the application on faculty applicants; however, a couple of years ago, a really significant situation came about where we found out that a faculty member misled the University with information on their vita and if we had the signed application form it would have been a better situation for the University. And we were advised by legal counsel to use the application form. Hence, why it is back.

It has also been very helpful to me when I look at past employment, supervisors, reasons for leaving, etc. The employer is able to compare credentials without regard for formatting, presentation, or overstatements.

While I understand it to be burdensome, it is required for any position. We hopefully are headed towards an applicant tracking system for all applicants in the near future. 😊

Best regards.

Marjorie

D. Personnel Policies Committee

Did not meet, no report

E. Planning Committee

Planning Committee Chair Diane Dixon reported that the committee did not meet. She noted that voting for the Faculty Senate Awards ends today, and also noted that two nominations for the Lifetime Achievement Award had been received and were being reviewed with Human Resources to confirm the requisite years of service.

F. University Affairs Committee

University Affairs Committee (UAC) Chair Josh Nannestad reported that the letter to ECU had been emailed. The Master Plan Task Force (which includes UAC) is working on arranging subcommittee meetings and identifying specific tasks for the subcommittees. He noted that the Clock Tower is now working. It was discovered that four independent motors power the four faces of the clock. Work will continue on getting the motors in synch, and updates will be given.

G. Volunteer Task Force on Standardizing Academic Courses

Chair Althoff reported that the Task Force met on March 6 to discuss and prioritize several issues relating to clarifying the practices, policies, and procedures for offering courses. Three items of agreement from the [Meeting Report](#) (not yet published at the time of the meeting) were noted:

Wide-ranging discussions led to the following votes:

YES 1. Is there a need to standardize the underpinnings for all courses, regardless of delivery method or length of academic term, and include them in the APPM?

YES 4. Is there a need to specify the required use of a Learning Management System for faculty?

YES 5. Is there a need to specify when syllabi are made available to students by the faculty? Currently, the APPM specifically mentions two weeks before the beginning of class for JMSB and EBS, and on the first day of class for A&S. **COMMENTS: We should encourage a common date for syllabus availability, a common date for when courses become open on Blackboard, and when assignments for the first week become available.**

Where do we go from here on these issues? It was recommended that this might be fitting for the Shared Governance Forum scheduled for April 1, 2019, topic chosen by the faculty. Discussion included the following:

- The terms *required, recommended, standardized, and consistent* need to be clarified.
- Is consistency needed, and if so, on what issues? What is required in terms of course delivery and syllabi, and in which cases are requirements an appropriate and reasonable expectation?
- Why are courses offered online? It was noted that there was a working consortium of Oklahoma universities in the early 2000s that contributed to the expansion of online courses.
- The Blackboard “Instructor Guide (revised April 2018)” is an “unwieldy” and lengthy document that attempts to align with Quality Matters (QM) and Academic Partnerships (AP) protocols. The document takes a highly prescriptive or highly suggestive of prescription tone which can lead to these prescriptions being perceived as policy mandates.
- It was noted that there are already some requirements for syllabi: APPM 6.1.1 (syllabi due dates for various schools), APPM 6.7.3 (approval process for distance education courses being offered online for the first time), Teacher Education syllabi, and General Education syllabi. Several compliance statements are required for syllabi, and there were some comments recommending that these requirements be revisited. In addition, the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (NC-SARA) uses certain syllabus information to ensure and facilitate reciprocity agreements for online courses, and the Higher Learning Commission examines a random selection of syllabi in their visits.
- There is clearly a need to untangle these requirements, and the APPM for all modes of course delivery.
- This is a matter of academic freedom and professional competence that should be decided by faculty. Agreed, and that is why the faculty need to take the lead in codifying the APPM in regard to policies and procedures for course delivery.
- A comment was made about the desire to have a one-page maximum syllabus requirement.
- Consistency in terminology needs to be part of a shared conversation, led by faculty, who have the primary responsibility for curricular matters (APPM 3.7.4).
- If faculty do not exercise this responsibility it will be done for/to us.

V. Old Business

- A. Budget priorities survey
Only four responses were received.

B. Other--none

VI. New Business

A. Faculty Senate's Shared Governance Forum topic for Monday, April 1

The topic of faculty relations with the Center for Instructional Development and Technology (CIDT) was suggested, echoing a sentiment expressed at the [February 27 meeting](#) (V. New Business, C.).

Senator Doug Wood made a motion that the topic be faculty relations with CIDT. Second by Senator Randy Clark.

Discussion included the following:

- What are the relevant issues to raise?
- We need to be careful not to frame the forum as pitting faculty against CIDT.
- There were questions about the wording of emails from CIDT. Where are these directives coming from (i.e. what is the source and what were the processes leading to the directives)? The wording of *directives* and *recommendations* lack clarity, which has created some tensions. Examples include the July 2, 2019 email from CIDT requesting that syllabi for all modes of delivery be made available six weeks prior to the start of courses for “preview” purposes. Many viewed this as a requirement. Some viewed the email as an ill-advised attempt to engage students in “course shopping.” For some teaching fall classes, complying with the syllabi recommendation would have involved working over the summer, without compensation. There was a report of at least one adjunct instructor who decided not to teach a scheduled class because of the onerous burden of preparing the syllabus that far in advance. The email noted that “this is a Southeastern initiative, not an AP initiative.” There was no information about where or how this “Southeastern” initiative originated, was decided upon, or by whom it was authorized.
- Other examples mentioned were the recent CIDT emails concerning Term II course availability and adaptive releases. It was noted that there appeared to be some “backing off” of the prescriptive tone of earlier emails.
- Also noted was the March 4, 2019 email from Vice President for Academic Affairs, Bryon Clark, announcing that CIDT would be gathering data from all courses (regardless of mode of delivery) for purposes of accreditation, and for professional development in helping faculty better utilize technology resources.
- Will we need a detailed outline for the forum, or do we want to simply pose some questions for discussion?

- It was noted that many of these issues originated in a time of financial crisis for the university. Now that our situation has improved, we have more “breathing room” to engage in a serious discussion of these issues.

The motion was amended to specify a title for the forum: Balancing Teaching, Instructional Technology, and Distance Education.

Yes – 13; No – 0; Abstentions – 3 Motion carries.

B. Annual Faculty Senate Survey: revising existing questions and/or adding new

Senator Chris Moretti recommended that we strike three questions from the [2018 Survey](#): Number 17 (on how faculty salary raises should be allocated), Number 31 (on the current organizational structure of the university), and Number 39 (on the length of the Faculty Symposium).

It was mentioned that the April 1 Shared Governance Forum would also be a potential source of questions for the 2019 Survey.

C. Announcements from the Floor

Chair Althoff introduced this new feature by asking if there were any announcements or news that senators would like to share.

Senator Charles Matthews reported that a problem with a post-tenure-review (PTR) process was mentioned at a Chairs Meeting. A panel chair did not inform, or offer for review, to the other panel members, the PTR report. There might be a need to amend the PTR policy (perhaps requiring panel members to sign the report) to ensure this doesn't happen again.

VII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn - Senator Dixon

Second - Senator Alluisi

Yes – all; No – ; Abstentions –

Motion carries.

Adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Senator William Fridley