

**Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes
Fall Semester, Meeting #3
Wednesday, October 14, 2020
Virtual Meeting 3:00-4:30 p.m.**

As approved at the Faculty Senate meeting of October 28, 2020

Attending:

Stan Alluisi	Kay Daigle	
Dan Althoff	Rolando Diaz	
Laura Atchley	Carolyn Fridley	Kate Shannon
Kathy Boothe	William Fridley	Doug Wood
Randy Clark	Mike Gaffney	
Meg Cotter-Lynch	Kendra Ingram	
	Chaehyun Lee	

Not Attending:

Diane Dixon	Amy Gantt	Karen Maple
-------------	-----------	-------------

Guests:

Andy Kramer	Alisha Ridenour	Marjorie Robertson
-------------	-----------------	--------------------

I. Call to Order

A. 3:02 pm CST

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of the Minutes ([September 30, 2020](#))

- a. Motion to approve – Senator Carolyn Fridley
- b. Second – Senator Alluisi
- c. Discussion:

Senator Diaz offered the title of his presentation which was blank) – What’s in a name? by Rolando Diaz
10/14/2020 5 pm CST Student Union Meeting ID 975
6807 0089 Passcode: 832045 The Zoom link was sent by Senator Diaz in chat.

Senator Gaffney requested that an invitation to the Faculty Senate through Outlook in order to keep up with meetings.

- d. Vote to approve the minutes: Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstaining – 0.

IV. Treasurer Report – no report

V. Committee Reports

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

- a. The budget committee would like to request updated information from VPBA Westman to allow Dr. Chris Moretti to update financial analysis.
- b. Senator Alluisi stated that the committee is developing three questions for Administration about how faculty are involved in the budgeting process. These questions, upon approval, will be emailed to VPBA Westman and copied to President Newsom, and VPAA Golden.

Motion #1: Question #1

What is the current budget process?

- a. Motion by Senator Alluisi.
- b. Seconded by Senator Daigle.
- c. Discussion – Senator Gaffney asks what are the deadlines for response, so that we can determine how we can address needs? Senator Gaffney offers a friendly amendment to clarify the question.

Amended Motion #1 (Question): *What is the current formal budget process, where is it written or available and what is the functional timeline for budget decision-making?*

Vote: Yes – 14; No – 0, Abstaining – 0, motion carries.

Motion #2: Question #2

Is the current budget process being followed?

- a. Motion Senator Alluisi.
- b. Seconded by Senator Daigle
- c. Discussion
 - i. Senator Alluisi offers the purpose for the question is to address whether or not we are following procedure.
 - ii. Senator Fridley asks “has there been any change with the new administration in budgeting processes?”
 - iii. Senator Cotter-Lynch shares that she would like to know how the process varies from the policy.

- iv. Senator Gaffney offers a friendly amendment to address the practice and policy gap
- v. Senator Althoff offers the following amended motion/question which is accepted by Senator Alluisi

Amended Motion #2 (Question): *In what ways, if any, does current practice vary from documented budget process?*

Vote: Yes-14; NO-1; Abstaining-0, motion carries.

Motion #3: Question #3

What is the current mechanism for faculty participation in budget decisions?

- a. Motion Senator Alluisi
- b. Seconded by Senator Shannon
- c. Discussion – none
- d. Vote: Yes – 14; No – 0; Abstaining – 0.

Senator Alluisi requested a copy of the language used in friendly amendments.

Upon approval, the motions (questions) will be emailed to VPBA Dennis Westman, copied to VPAA Teresa Golden

B. Committee on Committees ([Report submitted](#))

- a. Senator Daigle makes a motion to approve new appointments and changes in membership to university committees.
- b. Seconded by _____
- c. DISCUSSION – Error – Matthew Sparacio name change IRB? Last page – 11. Has a letter been sent to new appointees? Senator Daigle has the template and will send out notification upon approval.
- d. Vote: Yes-14; No-0; Abstaining-0, motion carries.

C. Executive Committee – met on October 12, 2020.

Meeting notes with President on October 5, 2020 have been made available and the motions that have been sent to VPAA. These motions were emailed to VPAA Golden on 10/12/2020.

Questions/Comments/Concerns are discussed on page 1 of the report. Senator Carolyn Fridley was glad to see that President Newsom acknowledged that the budget is a big part of the conversation. She mentioned that this disposition supports the Budget Committee’s work.

The Executive Committee agreed that the information provided from the APPM regarding compensation and load was well received by President Newsom and VPAA Golden.

Concern & Suggestion: The graduate weight calculation for course load is being considered by the President. How shall we frame this to support action moving forward? Senator W. Fridley suggested that 1.333 hours per course for graduate courses and the 12 hour per semester course load, have been subjected to a false story. One way to approach the issue is to make President Newsom and VPAA Golden aware of the opportunity to rectify these issues and that we would like to help.

Shared Governance Forum – The Executive Committee would like to carry the work we endeavor to do forward. We remain concerned about faculty salary compensation. This will be the topic of our shared governance forum on 11/10/2020 at 2 pm: Faculty Salaries: It's the Right Thing to Do.

- This topic decision was well received by Faculty Senate members in attendance.

No formal action items from the Executive Committee

D. Personnel Policies Committee ([Report submitted](#))

Update from Senator W. Fridley: Last meeting we initiated an email to VPAA Golden requesting an update to appendices in APPM. This has been a longstanding request to address archiving. VPAA Golden made a watermarked copy of the 2010-2011 version of the APPM available for review. Progress is being made on a longstanding problem.

Three Motions were put forward by the Personnel Policies Committee

Background on Motion 1: In December 2017 the Faculty Senate passed a resolution regarding new faculty hires. Dates have been added to guide the process. In the past, timelines have been absent. Departments put in requests for hires at different times during the academic year and responses have not always been timely. The committee would also recommend that we keep track of records of requests and resulting hires.

Motion 1: A Resolution for the faculty hiring process

RESOLUTION Regarding Faculty Hiring Process

RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE

On December 6th, 2017, the Faculty Senate approved a resolution urging the Administration to adopt a clearly defined, standardized, and transparent process in its decisions to hire faculty members. An effort towards establishing such a process was begun by administration at that time, but not completed. The Faculty Senate believes that instituting a more visible hiring process will encourage and support shared governance as an ongoing partnership between the faculty and the Administration, and will further serve to strengthen faculty morale and faculty confidence in the Administration's vision for the future of the faculty and the University at large.

To that end, the Faculty Senate now requests that a transparent process for faculty hiring decisions be formally adopted, including the following parameters:

- A standardized faculty hiring request form to be used campus-wide. The standardized request form would describe the faculty position to be filled and would include sufficient space to include the rationale and documentation for the hiring request.
- A standard fall deadline for faculty hiring requests from all departments. We recommend that, beginning in 2021, this deadline be October 15th. Exceptions to this deadline may be made in cases of unexpected faculty departures or unanticipated enrollment growth.
- A standardized response form to the hiring request. The response form would clearly answer either Yes or No. If the response to the hiring request is “No,” a brief explanation would be provided by the Administration. The explanation might include the likelihood or timeline for a future successful request. This response would also be made by a defined date. We recommend that, beginning in 2021, this deadline be November 15th .
- An internal database with a history of all faculty hiring requests and the disposition of each request (Yes or No). The internal database would be available to faculty and departments via an easily accessible, permanent electronic means.

Upon approval, the motion will be emailed to VPAA Teresa Golden and VPBA Dennis Westman

- a. Motion #1 is made by Senator Cotter-Lynch
- b. Seconded by Senator W. Fridley
- c. Discussion:
 - i. Senator Carolyn Fridley offered that the motion seems consistent with the cleanup work the Faculty Senate has sought to do in previous years. These requests have been made previously.
 - ii. This motion represents a follow-up on work the Senate began in 2017.
 - iii. Senator Cotter-Lynch discussed the dates offered (10/15 and 11/15) and asked for feedback. Senators felt this is a reasonable timeline to make the posting available by Christmas.
 - iv. It was pointed out that in 2018, Bryon Clark asked for hiring requests by 10/30.
- d. Vote: Yes-12; No-1; Abstaining-0; motion carries

The motion will be sent to VPAA Golden and VPBA Westman.

Background on Motion #2

Senator William Fridley offered some background. This is an issue that came up in 2015-2016 and concerns an important tool in informing faculty, providing transparency and assuring accountability. We are asking for reliable communication.

Motion 2: On note taking at the chairs’ meetings We recommend that Academic Affairs enlist a designated note-taker for the chairs’ meetings. The Notes will include topics of discussion and information items from the meeting. The Notes will be emailed to all faculty within 48 hours of each chairs’ meeting.

- a. Motion # 2 is made by Senator William Fridley
- b. Seconded by Senator Alluisi
- c. Discussion
 - i. Senator Cotter-Lynch offers, it seems like a good idea. It could simplify the work of the chairs. One person putting together notes for the group and distributing
 - ii. Senator Carolyn Fridley mentions alignment with President Newsom's statement during the Shared Governance Forum that communication is vital for shared governance.
 - iii. Senator Shannon asks, why is this resisted? Senator Gaffney offered that he felt nothing discussed in a chair's meeting could not go back to faculty, and mentioned that having a scribe would be helpful. Senator Gaffney also offered that he has attempted the job and admits that it requires additional work. Senators discussed the option to have someone from VPAA Golden's office take notes that can be reviewed and then sent out.
 - iv. A few Senators remarked that making notes available might reduce the feeling that there is a lack of transparency.
 - v. Chair Clark asked Senators to reflect upon prior practice. Is this something that has been done in the past?
 - vi. Senator William Fridley offered that a past Dean began conducting these meetings beginning in 2012. She seemed to use the meetings as an attempt to circumvent and oppose the work of the Faculty Senate.
 - vii. Chair Clark offered that this motion is part of a larger problem, namely a concern about inconsistency between chairs and how they perform their duties within their departments. This addresses one concern about a failure to communicate with faculty, but it also suggests something to the VPAA about how they should do their job? Is that what we want to do?
 - viii. Senator Carolyn Fridley asserted that this work is a piece of the Shared Governance Process. Shared governance requires it.
 - ix. Senator Shannon offered that this might be viewed as an effort to formalize a process that supports the needs of all constituents within the university.
 - x. Senator Gaffney pointed out that there are differences in the roles and responsibilities of the chairs in different by departments. He would like us to steer away from any implication that the process purposefully lacks transparency. He also pointed out that transparency doesn't seem to be a problem now.
 - xi. Senator Diaz suggested adding "and serve as an official and binding account of the meeting" to the verbiage of the motion.
 - xii. Senator Alluisi offered a perspective, -if it is an informal body, they may use this to say they are an unofficial body
 - xiii. A discussion of membership of the Academic Council and Chairs' Meetings commenced. Membership differs, there are additional members in the

Chairs' Meeting. The new organizational chart makes clear that VPAA Golden has many responsibilities.

d. Vote: Yes – 12; No – 0; Abstaining – 0, motion carries.

The motion will be sent to VPAA Golden and copied to President Newsom.

Motion 3: A response to the Administration (VPAA Golden) on the proposed partnership with Graduation Alliance

Faculty Senate Response to Vice President for Academic Affairs Teresa Golden's response to the recommendations unanimously approved by the Faculty Senate on September 16, 2020 relevant to the use of Graduation Alliance (GA), a third-party vendor.

Faculty Senate recommendation 1: Prepare a detailed plan indicating potential costs, revenue, and benefits to the University.

Costs

Financial projections for costs are not provided. The response acknowledges that, "Additional students will cost in terms of instruction provided by faculty. There will be additional services required by Admissions, Registrar, Advising, Financial Aid, and CIDT." The "additional services" will be at a cost.

Concerning is that the response noted that a Growth Committee has been formed "to examine the additional needs of continued growth" but there is no mention of the intention for this committee to specifically address the known costs of increased enrollment. Before engaging a third-party (for profit) vendor, it would be prudent to:

- Examine the current number of faculty teaching currently enrolled students. Is the current number of faculty adequate to teach the currently enrolled students?
- Examine the current class sizes. Are the current class sizes reasonable for faculty to meet the educational requirements of their courses?
- Calculate how much it will cost to hire the additional faculty required to teach 50 students number of new students projected).

Revenue

Financial projections are provided, and based on those projections, GA may produce revenue.

Concerning is that the projections specify the revenue generated based on faculty rank, making explicit that substantially more revenue is generated by courses taught by adjuncts (\$8,004) than by full professors (\$2,014). Delineating revenue by rank may suggest that decisions about GA favor managing the potential influx of new students by utilizing adjuncts rather than tenured, or tenure-stream faculty.

If a response to increased growth created by GA is to hire additional adjuncts, there are two concerns:

1. An accreditation issue may arise, specifically with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) noted in HLC Policy. 3.C.1. reads, in part, "...oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance, assessment of student learning," and 3.C.3. "Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures." Questions exist about whether current adjuncts receive regular evaluation and oversight. The possibility of adding adjuncts will exacerbate an existing concern.
2. The University's mission statement reads "Southeastern Oklahoma State University provides an environment of academic excellence that enables students to reach their highest potential." Will hiring additional adjuncts contribute to academic excellence?

Benefits

VPAA Golden's response notes that "over the past four years, we have learned that revenue sharing is a model that can have financial benefits to the University."

The revenue sharing model referred to is the University's contract with Academic Partnerships, that was entered into during a time of financial crisis. That is not the case now, made explicit by President Newsom, when he said that "From a revenue and budget standpoint, we are fortunate to be in a good position due to our sustained enrollment growth over the last three years."

While it is prudent to continue expanding enrollment, using GA (revenue sharing, third-party vendor) requires clear and convincing evidence that existing concerns previously noted have been addressed first.

Faculty Senate recommendation 2: Indicate how the program can be assessed as to its effectiveness and success.

Based on a measure of 1st to 2nd and 1st to 3rd semester retention, VPAA Golden notes that "we would expect these students to retain at a higher rate than other adult students because of the additional support [emphasis added]."

Additional support assumes an adequate number of faculty.

The number of full-time faculty is declining. According to information from the Common Data Set, in AY 2018-2019 there were 125 full-time faculty, down from 128 in 2017-2018, down from 133 in 2016-2016.

HLC Policy 3.C.2 reads, in part, "The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty..."

Additional support assumes an adequate number of faculty teaching reasonably-sized classes.

Class size is on the rise. According to information from the Common Data Set, the "all student/full-time faculty ratio" for AY 2018-2019 is 28.46, which is up from 26.71 in 2017-2018, which is up from 23.31 in 2016-2017.

Faculty Senate recommendation 4: Extend the contract signing date until the Faculty Senate deems that concerns are adequately addressed.

VPAA Golden notes that “extending the contract signing date past September 15 had been agreed to.”

What is not known is if an agreement has been reached on a contract signing date. Has a decision already been made to enter into this contract?

Summary Based on the response provided by VPAA Golden, the concerns about a partnership between the University and Graduation Alliance have not been adequately addressed. Therefore, the Faculty Senate does not endorse this partnership.

Existing issues, with current enrollment have not been included in the response:

- Adequate (“sufficient” in the language of HLC Policy) numbers of current faculty teaching currently enrolled students
- Consideration of current class sizes
- Current dependence on adjuncts with the potential for increased dependence
- Current oversight and evaluation of adjuncts, and the responsibility to oversee and evaluate additional adjuncts

It would be reasonable to consider a partnership with this – or other third-party vendors – when it is clear that current enrollment and its attendant concerns are seriously addressed.

- a. Motion by Senator Carolyn Fridley
- b. Seconded by Senator Cotter-Lynch
- c. Discussion
 - i. Senator William Fridley provided background and reminded Senators of his motion to put the Graduation Alliance proposal on hold for 1 year, that motion did not pass. Instead, four items were put forward to VPAA Golden, she responded and Motion #3 includes a response to her response.
 - ii. Senator Carolyn Fridley points out that the response is structured based on VPAA Golden’s response to the Faculty Senate.
 - iii. Discussion by item in response

Revenue

It may be an HLC concern if we look closely at the revenue by rank generated from the Graduation Alliance proposal. This proposal appears to rely more heavily on adjunct faculty for the instruction of students in this program.

Concern – It appears that revenue sharing has become a model for us. We have some experience with revenue sharing partnerships (Academic Partnerships which began in 2016). It

would seem we are in a good place right now with record enrollment and do not need to default partner with third party vendors for recruitment.

Assessment or initiative effectiveness – The expectation of the Graduation Alliance proposal is that we will see a higher retention rate. Additional support for GA students will encumber additional funds. This is not explicit in the proposal. How will faculty and support staff be hired to address the needs that arise from this implementation?

Additionally, how might we consider the needs of our current students and the current number of faculty available to teach current students. We are already experiencing increases in class size. This was not addressed in VPAA Golden's response.

Regarding Faculty Senate Recommendation 2 – The common data set indicates that faculty numbers are on the decline and student enrollment is increasing.

Personnel policies does not have a recommendation regarding #3 about Graduation Alliance access to Blackboard.

Regarding response #4 – What is not clear is whether a contract signing date has been agreed upon at any time, or if a decision has already been made.

In summary, based upon the response from VPAA Golden, concerns have not been adequately addressed. We do not endorse the current proposal. Current enrollment issues have not been addressed. Faculty availability and adjunct dependence remain serious concerns.

- a. Motion to Adjourn is made by Senator Diaz.
- b. Seconded by Senator Althoff.
- c. Vote: Yes – 6; No – 6; Abstaining – 0. Motion is defeated.

Discussion continues...

Senator Cotter-Lynch inquired about Item #3 – Is the concern adequately addressed? Senator Carolyn Fridley agrees it is addressed. Senator Cotter-Lynch offers a suggestion regarding recommendation #4 – has a decision been made? Shall we rephrase it?

Cotter-Lynch friendly amendment: What is the current anticipated timeline for negotiations with GA? (From page 5)

Chair Fridley accepts the amendment.

HLC is concerned when adjuncts are not evaluated, faculty members teaching too many sections. Does HLC care if adjuncts are overloaded? They do not make a distinction – it is about how many classes each person teaches.

- d. Vote on third motion from the Personnel Policies Committee: Yes – 11; No – 0; Abstaining – 1, motion carries.

- E. University Affairs Committee, met but did not have a quorum, they will meet again on Friday, October 16, 2020 at 2 p.m.
- F. Planning Committee – Did not meet.

- VI. Adjournment 4:44 pm
 - a. Motion to adjourn made by Senator Alluisi.
 - b. Seconded by Senator Atchley
 - c. Motion carries

Minutes submitted by Senator Kate Shannon, Recorder