

Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes
Spring Semester, Meeting #2
Wednesday, February 12, 2020
Room 100, Russell Building, 3:00-4:30 p.m.
As approved by the Faculty Senate on February 26, 2020

Attending:

Daniel Althoff
Laura Atchley
Kathy Boothe
Derek Cash
Randy Clark
Rolando Diaz

Diane Dixon
Carolyn Fridley
William Fridley
Elisabeth Ponce-Garcia
Kendra Ingram
Chris Moretti

Josh Nannestad
Rhonda Richards
Kate Shannon
Michael Scheuerman

Not Attending:

Stan Alluisi
Chaehyun Lee
Kay Daigle

Karen Maple
Alicia Wallace

Guests:

Karl Frinkle

I. Call to Order

A. 3:00 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes

A. [Minutes from January 29, 2020](#)

1. Motion to approve minutes – Senator Randy Clark
2. Second – Senator Daniel Althoff
3. Comments and/or Corrections: add time of adjournment – around 3:30
4. Yes - 15; No - 0; Abstaining – 0
5. Motion carries - Minutes approved

III. Committee Reports

A. Budget Committee ([Report filed](#))

1. Met on 2-5-2020. Discussed the potential to add the OTRS contribution to the award, but with research found that the FS budget was not sufficient to cover the 7% contribution and the fee, which makes it closer to 13%. We would need \$10,206 to accommodate the 7% and the fee and that is more than our budget. If the winner chooses the stipend option, we will make clear to the award recipient that the OTRS amount will come out of the stipend.

2. Budget process participation discussion – material from February of 2019 on the budget process/calendar. Suggestion to discuss this with the incoming president, and for the FS to have a place in the process. The budget is submitted July 1st and the incoming president will be here on April 30th. Departmental input typically occurs in February/March. At Executive Committee meetings we are being informed of budget issues. The Faculty Senate is requesting to have a meaningful part in the budget process, budget decisions (especially on academic matters), and having a voice throughout. It was suggested that the Budget Committee gathers information and the Executive Committee discusses with the president.

3. The current budget is being prepared with an anticipated 6% enrollment increase. However, there is belief that enrollment will eventually level out, and therefore faculty hiring is limited. We have not had an increase in tuition in two years. Perhaps there is a need to consider this, especially for the online graduate programs. A recommendation to increase tuition should not come from Faculty Senate, but it does seem that it may be time for the administration to consider it.

4. The [Budget Committee Report](#) included a motion from Senator Moretti:

Motion: The Senate Archivist annually obtain copies of the following electronic documents, and make them available to SE faculty (either via the website or upon request): • The Academic Policies & Procedures Manual (source: Academic Affairs website) • Southeastern’s Budget (source: ?) • Southeastern’s Common Data Set (source: Academic Affairs website) • Southeastern’s Annual Financial Statement and Independent Auditor’s Report (source: Office of Finance website) • Education and General Budgets Summary and Analysis (budget summaries for all Oklahoma state colleges/universities, source: okhighered.org) In addition, the Archivist should if possible obtain copies of said documents going back to 2015 for historical purposes.

Discussion: The cached old website (old.se.edu) is accessible only on campus, and you can move things over via priority request ([Website Feedback form](#)). It was noted that Academic Affairs is responsible for maintaining and archiving the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual (APPM). The Operational Protocols for doing so are included in the APPM Preface, Policy to Modify the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. Developing his policy was a high priority around ten years ago and marked a major cooperative achievement between the FS and Academic Affairs. However, the implementation of these operational protocols has been inconsistent, and in some cases not done at all (e.g. archived APPMs were to be on the Academic Affairs [AA] website). Common Data Sets are found from previous years (back to 2003-2004) on AA website ([Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation](#)). Independent Audit Reports from 2012 on can be found on the [Office of Finance Forms and Reports](#) page. Suggestions included moving documents that are currently available on the old website to the new website or downloading documents to a Google drive or dedicated hard drive for storage and retrieval. The goal is to have access to certain documents. Initially the best way may be to make the online request to move from old website to new website.

Action: Contact Lyndsey Owens (Digital Content Manager, University Marketing) to determine what would be the most efficient way to have the documents moved to the appropriate place. Use the existing protocols. Possibly set up a meeting with Lyndsey to discuss and clarify what is needed. Get all documents in a location that is not on the website. Identify the responsible parties and establish a process to move forward. Some suggestions were made, and it was noted that the Faculty Senate does not have the responsibility or possibly the authority to post some of these documents. A page on the website with links to these documents and sites was suggested, and it was noted that trust would have to be placed with the owner of the documents.

Chair Clark will check on this and report back to Faculty Senate at the next meeting, and if needed he will request a new motion.

B. Committee on Committees (CoC)

1. Did not meet.

C. Executive Committee (EC) [[Report filed](#)]

1. Updated email with the [text of a resolution](#) to reaffirm support of maintaining the current law regarding weapons on campus, approved by the Faculty Senate on 1-29-2020 and sent to Interim-President Clark on 1-31-20, and he will forward it to the appropriate individuals.

2. APPM 4.4.7.8. review of the post-tenure review process. Chair Clark has received several requests regarding this policy and when it would be reviewed. This is at least the 4th year of the policy [the post-tenure review policy was approved by President Burrage in December of 2015, and the first round of reviews were conducted in spring of 2016]. Those who are primarily responsible for the review (Faculty Senate and administration) will need to define when and how this policy-mandated review of post-tenure review is conducted. While a timeline has not been established, this might be a good time to conduct a formal review because we are now into the second three-year cycle of post-tenure reviews. [Rationale and motion is in the EC Report.](#)

3. Motion – Chair Randy Clark - I move that Faculty Senate formally request data from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs on the Post-Tenure Review results from the past three academic years (e.g., 2017-2018, 2018- 2019, & 2019-2020). In addition, as part of this request, Faculty Senate also request an evaluative analysis of the Post-Tenure Review Process with recommendations for possible changes from the appropriate administrators (i.e. the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Department Chairs) on the workings of the Post Tenure Review process.

Second – Senator Ponce-Garcia

Discussion – There have been several faculty requests about when the process would be reviewed. There have been several revisions made to the policy which are reflected in the

APPM. There have also been several questions in the [FS's Annual Survey](#) related to the policy. It was asked whether Department Chairs are administrators?

It was recommended we ask for suggestions and opinions (*observations and concerns*) rather than “recommendations for possible changes” from VP for Academic Affairs and Department Chairs. It was also agreed to remove the term *administrators*.

Updated Motion: I move that Faculty Senate formally request data from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs on the Post-Tenure Review results from the past three academic years (e.g., 2017-2018, 2018- 2019, & 2019-2020). In addition, as part of this request, Faculty Senate also requests an evaluative analysis of the Post-Tenure Review Process with *observations and concerns* from the appropriate *individuals* (i.e. the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Department Chairs) on the workings of the Post Tenure Review process.

Call to Question – Senator Althoff
Second – Senator Kate Shannon
Vote – Yes - 13; No - 1; Abstentions – 1
Motion to call to question carries

Motion Vote – Yes 15; No – 0; Abstentions – 0
Motion carries

4. Motion – Contingent on the first motion – Chair Randy Clark - I move that Faculty Senate upon review of the Post-Tenure Review results and evaluative analysis of administrators create the necessary number of questions to include on the end of the year Faculty Senate Survey to poll faculty on the workings of the Post-Tenure Review Process.

Second – Senator Carolyn Fridley

Discussion: Change from “administrators” to the VPAA and Department Chairs to create the appropriate number of questions for the FS Survey. Make the request after April 1st – to work for next year. Faculty Senate controls the survey so no need for this motion. Rather than “number of,” change to “appropriate”. One reason to keep the motion is for a timely response.

Vote – Yes – 2; No – 13; Abstentions – 0
Motion fails

C. Personnel Policies Committee

1. Did not meet.

D. Planning Committee

1. Did not meet.

2. Nominations for Faculty Senate closed Monday. In several of the nominations no explanation or reasons for the nomination were given. There were several of these, and they were all deleted. There were 242 nominations for *teaching*, 33 for *service*, 12 for *scholarship*, and 42 for *adjuncts*. Nominations for *scholarship* were low, and there were fewer nominations in the *adjunct* category than last year. Senator Dixon emailed the committee and they will send out emails asking nominees to submit supporting documentation by February 26th.

E. University Affairs Committee

1. Did not meet. Had a meeting scheduled, but instead corresponded with Liz McCraw concerning needed updates to the [Student Handbook](#), and she sent a response via email. The email was distributed at the Faculty Senate meeting.

V. Old Business

A. None.

VI. New Business

A. New President Thomas Newsom. Faculty Senate should take an active role in welcoming the new president. Possibly in the Student Union or in the Massey Building downtown. A welcome letter would also be appropriate. Perhaps we could explore and request a community partnership for the reception. Senator Ponce-Garcia will check on a location for the formal welcome. The Executive Committee should meet with President Newsom before the academic year ends.

VII. Announcements

A. None.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. Motion to adjourn – Senator Ponce-Garcia
- B. Second Senator Carolyn Fridley
- C. Yes – all; No – 0; Abstentions - 0
- D. Motion carries
- E. 4:25