

**Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes  
Spring Semester, Meeting #5  
Wednesday, March 27, 2019  
Russell 100, 3:00 p.m.**

**As approved at the Faculty Senate meeting of April 10, 2019**

**Attending:**

**Stan Alluisi  
Daniel Althoff  
Kathy Boothe  
Brandon Burnette  
Kay Daigle  
Han-Sheng Chen**

**Diane Dixon  
Steven Emge  
William Fridley  
Karl Frinkle  
Charles Matthews  
Chris Moretti**

**Joshua Nannestad  
Elisabeth Ponce-Garcia  
Rhonda Richards  
Kate Shannon  
Michael Scheurman  
Doug Wood**

**Not Attending:**

**Randy Clark  
Patrick Reardon  
Stewart Mayers**

**Guests:**

**Carolyn Fridley  
Kathy Garza**

**I. Call to Order and Welcome**

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

Welcome to guests.

**II. Approval of the [Minutes from March 13, 2019](#)**

Motion to approve – Senator Stan Alluisi

Second – Senator Brandon Burnette

Comments and Corrections: On what issues is consistency needed or should anything be consistent? – Question from the floor that maybe this wording should be a little stronger – letter G, top of page 4. Is any standardization needed at all? On what issues are consistencies needed if needed at all? There was no agreement that consistency is needed. Faculty Senate was divided on whether consistency is needed.

“Is consistency needed and if so, on what issues?”

Last page – page 6 – announcements from floor – Senator Charles Matthews “that a problem” change wording. Should be “reported” a problem.

Yes – 17; No – 0; Abstentions – 1

Motion carries. Minutes approved as submitted.

**Information from the floor:**

[Treasurer's report](#) – up to date, no changes

Faculty Staff Awards Banquet– April 22, 2019, 4:00 p.m. – unofficial word that the banquet may be at this date and time

Online class training – need to find how many faculty need training in Quality Matters (QM). Senator Daigle is the official QM coordinator for SOSU and will provide information to those who need the training.

**III. Committee Reports**

**A. University Affairs Committee**

Did not meet. [ECU faculty senate responded and this was shared with SOSU Faculty Senate via email.](#) They are excited to share knowledge and would like to meet with us. We are unsure of the place or nature of this meeting but will follow up.

**B. Planning Committee**

Met 3/27/2019. A decision was made for run-offs on votes. The email will come out Friday, 3/29/2019, and will close the following Friday. Another email will come to vote for adjunct professor and professor of the year. Four nominated for lifetime achievement award. They will get an email for documentation and then another email will go to FS for a vote. Voting on one Survey Monkey for adjuncts and professor of the year.

**C. Personnel Policies Committee**

[Met 3/26/2019--Report](#)

1. Proposed change to annual faculty evaluation process which would allow tenured professors to forego the faculty plan if they received no rating lower than proficient. Some concerns – for example, who decides it may be foregone. The committee would also like feedback from FS after they read the proposal on the website.

2. Proposal forwarded from Academic Council on post-tenure review to address issue that post tenure review reports sent by chair, but panel members had not seen the report. Academic Council suggested a signature by all panel members but did not indicate what the signature signified. A formal motion will come to the April 10<sup>th</sup> meeting to propose a change which would indicate what the signature signifies acknowledging content of the letter.

3. There are two committees – Faculty Grievance and Faculty Appellant committee – the charges for each of these need to be aligned in the APPM. 4.6.6. There is a need for committee wording and charges to be realigned to make sure the right committee is hearing the right grievances/appeals. Personnel Policies Committee will work on that at next committee meeting.

4. Insurance and Benefits committee would like feedback form faculty. Senator Matthews and Senator Frinkle serve on this committee as faculty representatives.

#### **D. Executive Committee**

Did not meet. No report.

#### **E. Committee on Committees**

Did not meet. No report.

#### **F. Budget Committee**

Did not meet. No report.

#### **G. Volunteer Task Force on Common Core Procedures**

Did not meet. No report.

### **IV. Old Business**

A. [Volunteer Task Force Report \(draft\)](#) – is there a format for this group? Balancing teaching, instructional technology and distance education.

B. Issues related to online learning:

SOSU appears to be on separate and nonparallel tracks between classroom and online courses. The Academic Policies and Procedures Manual (APPM) is not in agreement about when the students

get their syllabus. It is different for different schools. Also some questions as to what syllabus formats are required, recommended and how they are different between online and classroom. It was also noted that faculty do not have control over opening Blackboard sites. APPM 6.3.5 – Center for Instructional Design (CIDT) – mission is to provide support. Does not state that they have control over templates. APPM 6.7.2 – all faculty teaching online must demonstrate continuing education, review by chair and DEC. Instructor’s Guide from CIDT is 14 pages. The APPM does not have a definition of the syllabus.

The biggest problem is that people get mixed information. There is some information that 16 week courses are an option with AP.

- Faculty Senate would like answers to these questions: When was QM adopted? Who adopted it?
- Should there be standardization. Where is the history of the policies for related to online learning.
- There are some 7 and some 8 week courses this summer. We had heard that this summer would be all 7 week courses.
- Was there official word that Assessment Day would hold or not hold classes before the semester started. Discussed at chair’s meeting but nothing official was received.
- It was recommended that minimal requirements be established with deviation as needed and an explanation of why that deviation is needed.
- There were questions from the floor why syllabus has disability statements – may be mandated by federal law.
- Suggestion that questions for forum be sent early so that answers are available from CIDT. List what we want – least standardization possible, reasons for deviations. We should start with a proposal. Questions need to go to Academic Affairs, not to CIDT. Questions should be in a positive tone.
- Shared Governance are for action items. Proposals should be put forward. Suggestion – no added rules or regulations should be presented through CIDT. FS should vote on academic calendar. Faculty oversight of CIDT is suggested.
- Faculty oversight of CIDT needed.
- Clearly defined process for policy, procedure, practice changes or new additions.
- Expectation for clear two-way communication and transparency.

Five things that would not be issues if faculty had overseen CIDT:

- 1) Emails about syllabus being six-week advance
- 2) Courses already structured in a specific way
- 3) Not having control to copy and send courses to other faculty
- 4) Gold Orientation – short classes held up for orientation results in low participation

5) Work needs to be focused through faculty lenses. CIDT should not be communicating with faculty.

Not a one faculty oversight – but a group of faculty. CIDT has taken over Distance Education Council (DEC) and that may not be what it was created for and needs to go back to faculty oversight. Reformulate DEC the way it was intended to be.

A list of problems, common thread, solution. Presented at the forum. Send items to Chair Althoff if there are suggestions in addition to this with why it is a problem and a possible solution that fits within this discussion.

## **V. New Business**

## **VI. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn - Senator Alluisi

Yes – all; No – 0; Abstentions – 0

Motion carries by acclamation

Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.