

**Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes  
Fall Semester, Meeting #4  
Wednesday, October 20, 2021  
Virtual Meeting, 3:00-4:30 p.m.**

*As approved by the Faculty Senate on November 3, 2021*

**Attending:**

Laura Atchley  
Cody Bogard  
Kathy Boothe  
Randy Clark  
Meg Cotter-Lynch

Steve Csaki  
Kay Daigle  
William Fridley  
Srimal Garusinghe  
Ashley Hampton

Andy Kramer  
Chaehyun Lee  
Kate Shannon  
Rob Shauger  
Matthew Sparacio

**Absences:**

Stan Alluisi  
Rolando Diaz  
Amy Gantt  
Doug Wood  
Mila Zhu  
Jeri Walker

**Guests:**

Dena Rymel  
Courtney Boise  
Kathy McDonald  
Sondra Petty

I. Call to Order: 3:02

II. Minutes from October 6, 2021

A. **Motion to Approve** the Minutes from October 6, 2021 – Senator Shannon

B. Second – Senator Kramer

C. Discussion

1. Senator Cotter-Lynch: on page 3, the AAUP did not file a former grievance, but simply asked questions; On page 4, flu shots are available everyday but technically not around the clock; on page 6 the deadline for the Oklahoma Excellence in Teaching award deadline is always in late November and early December.
2. Chair Elect Shannon: on page 2 (Personnel Policies Committee Point C) clarification is needed. Should read “The Committee wants to finish before shifting their focus...”

D. Vote to approve: Yes – 14; No 0; Abstaining 0 (Unanimous)

### III. Committee Reports

#### A. Budget Committee

1. Did not meet.

#### B. Committee on Committees (Report on File)

1. One information item was discussed and submitted in the report for filing.

#### C. Personnel Policies Committee (Report on File)

1. The minutes are on file. PPC did not develop an action item because they have not finalized the teleworking policy draft. A draft of proposed revisions to the teleworking policy addressing the concerns about what appears to be a reduction in flexibility AND the intrusive nature of OSHA requirements for at-home work was presented. Mike Davis joined the most recent meeting and based on that discussion another round of revisions is needed. A big concern of the University with this policy is addressing liability for workers compensation. During the pandemic there was a dramatic increase in workers comp files. Clarification was received on an earlier revision, namely, that faculty cannot waive their right to workers compensation. This will require further revisions, and the goal is for the committee to have a revised draft to examine by the end of this week. The committee will meet next week.
2. Members of the PPC also received copies of an Excel sheet from VPAA Golden listing information about which faculty are on/off the salary card. The PPC wants to finish the telework policy first before turning our attention to the salary card.

#### D. Planning Committee

1. Did not meet.
2. The Planning Committee does have the faculty and adjunct list on hand, so it will work on getting the survey out for nominations out by Thanksgiving. PC has contacted Riley Coker about the OK Excellence in Teaching Award, and she has all the info she needs. Chair Daigle will submit a letter of the support and President Newsom is also aware that he will have to provide a letter of support. As of now, it is a waiting game.

#### E. University Affairs Committee

1. Did not meet.

#### F. Treasurer Report - Stan Alluisi

1. No report.

G. Executive Committee (Notes on File)

1. October 11, Shared Governance - HLC Quality Initiative Proposal

2. Next meeting with the President - October 25th, 2pm

- a) President Newsom has been in contact with Chair Daigle about salary information – there will be a meeting next Thursday about this.
- b) The EC will ask for more information about the Quality Initiative project in the meeting with the President - members felt they did not have enough time for all of the information it to sink in, so further clarification is desired on some points.
- c) The EC discussed asking the President if there is any institutional statement or response to [SB 1775](#).
- d) The EC wants to follow up on previous discussions about faculty involvement in the budget process. The FS sent a proposal last year (and earlier!) about standardizing the process for faculty hiring. Anecdotally, department chairs are following these guidelines, however, justifications regarding hiring decisions are still not being shared (as requested earlier). More clarification is needed.
- e) The EC discussed the hiring process of adjuncts, and Chair Daigle reached out the VPAA Golden, who says it is being considered. Will follow up as needed on that item.

3. Shared Governance Topics for the November Forum

- a) The EC came up with a list of potential forum topics:
  - (1) What do we see for growth on campus and online and how do we meet the needs of this?
  - (2) What are the organizational structural changes that need to occur with the hiring of an undergraduate dean?
- b) The EC also wants to open this up to the floor for wider suggestions and discussion – are there any pressing issues faculty want to see addressed with this forum?
  - (1) Senator Cotter-Lynch: Given the questions around QI proposal, do we want to go into more detail? Or do we think that that has been basically covered? We

can focus on quality of online instruction OR the topic of advisement OR both.

- (2) Senator Fridley: How will we handle growth? We have banded about certain numbers (as we've discussed in AAUP) but something that is not addressed – philosophically – is why? Why do we want to grow to 10k students? And how about the prior question of how \*HAVE \*we handled growth in the past? We have 1500 more students enrolled than we did in 2016 and have 5 fewer faculty. We can subtitle this: “Stories from the Field!”
- (a) Chair Daigle suggest “Stories from the Trenches!” She suggests using the comments from the faculty senate survey to highlight this issue.
- (b) Senator Fridley observes we can link this to the QI if we focus on quality instruction, especially in classes with large enrollments. The tendency has been to push this discussion down the road.
- (c) Senator Csaki: although we had a forum on compensation last year, this still plays into the same question. These concerns are interwoven. Do we revisit this or is that a different discussion, or just one we had that hasn't gone well? Chair Daigle agrees - this is an equity workload issue. There are huge disparities.
- (d) Senator Cotter-Lynch suggested looking at enrollment numbers. Says her gut feeling is that enrollment growth plays out differently in different programs. Senator Fridley: “In some places it plays out differently WITHIN departments!”
- (e) Senator Atchley: One thing I have not heard asked is, “*what's the difference in quality between courses taught by adjuncts and those taught by full time?*” When do we get to a point where we have more adjuncts than full time faculty teaching, and what does that do to quality of instruction and accreditation? We need to stay within a certain metric, and we don't know what it is. The adjunct pool is growing faster than full-time faculty, and the excuse I've heard is, “*If we hire too many tenured faculty, it will be more difficult to fire them if there is a sudden plummet in enrollment.*” A solution is to hire more full-time non-TT faculty. Job postings went up

quickly for additional advisors, so it appears we are moving on with this regardless of our concerns.

- i) Chair Elect Shannon agrees saying there can be different approaches to growth. Says, “We need to be proactive not reactive.” Hiring adjuncts comes across as reactive. So is hiring a bunch of advisors. We need to have a detailed plan. We are still living in the tyranny of the moment. The fear of the moment is a frustrating way to validate the reactive tendencies of the administration.
- ii) Senator Cotter-Lynch suggests asking for the percentage of student credit hours between adjunct vs full-time in different programs. This should be information that is easily pulled. One thing to consider is “*Do we want to set a bar for what we are looking for?*” This will vary greatly between departments. We can then suggest what we think an appropriate balance is. A goal was previously set to have 75% classes taught by full-time faculty.
- iii) Senator Fridley says these numbers were part of the “2020 Vision” Plan from 2015. A goal of 70% of classes would be taught by FT faculty. Admits that he is unaware of what the numbers are now. Notes that the 70% represents the inverse of the national average. Also notes that one other thing needs to be considered: overloads. Overload-centric programs mess with these numbers.
- iv) Senator Cotter-Lynch responds: We need ask the number of courses taught per faculty and compare that to the percentage of faculty teaching overloads. Chair Daigle says this data is likely something that we will get hit hard from HLC (the number of overloads by full-time faculty). Senator Cotter-Lynch continues – this is information we need to know. If our courses are split 50/50 between full-time and adjunct instructors, we need to know (and ask) \*how\* this ratio is being met.
- v) Senator Fridley: “This is a great opportunity to address the overall concept of shared governance: a critique of the overload programs and

several proposals on how to address these issues. It meets the action item purpose of the shared governance forum.”

vi) Senator Boothe asks, “Why are we all teaching overloads? Are people doing overloads because we are being nice or is it because we feel like we \*need\* to?” This is directly related to compensation.

(1) Senator Cotter-Lynch responds: departments are understaffed because they can’t attract faculty because of the poor pay we offer.

(2) Senator Atchley agrees: “All these issues directly impact quality.” If growing the university is our goal, having quality instruction is the biggest attractor to our programs. People are ragged - how can that help make programs attractive? If we want quality, we need to look at that holistically. It’s not about advising, it’s about the quality of instruction.

(3) Chair Daigle says this forum topic appears to have taken root with our conversation and all these points merit a strong look.

#### IV. Old Business

A. Senator Atchley asked a follow-up question regarding the adjunct hiring issue: “Were there any more details provided by VPAA Golden? Are they looking at streamlining this process at all? Or just looking at the identity of what the root of the problem is?”

1. Chair Daigle responds: VPAA Golden did not reveal specific details to me but will follow up with VPAA Golden and ask if they are trying to turn it into an actionable item.

#### V. New Business

#### VI. Announcements

A. Senate to be recognized at the October 30th SE football game, 2PM

#### VII. Adjournment

A. Adjourned at 3:36\_\_ p.m. CST

1. Motion – Senator Clark

2. Second – Senator Kramer

Minutes submitted by Senator Matthew Sparacio, Recorder