

**Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes**  
**Spring Semester, Meeting #3**  
**Wednesday, February 23, 2022**  
**Virtual Meeting, 3:00-4:30 p.m.**

*As approved by the Faculty Senate on March 30, 2022*

**ATTENDENCE**

Laura Atchley	Amy Gantt	Matthew Sparacio
Stan Alluisi	Srimal Garusinghe	Jeri Walker
Kathy Boothe	Andy Kramer	Doug Wood
Randy Clark	Chaehyun Lee	Mila Zhu
Steve Csaki	Kate Shannon	
William Fridley	Rob Shauger	

**ABSENCES**

Cody Bogard	Ashley Hampton
Rolando Diaz	Meg Cotter-Lynch

**GUESTS**

Aaron Adair	Alisha Ridenour
Karl Frinkle	Christala Smith
Jeni Maple	Nirmala Soundararajan
Dena Rymel	

- I. Call to Order – 3:02 pm CST
- II. Minutes from February 9, 2022
  - A. **Motion to Approve** the [Minutes from February 9, 2022](#) – Past Chair Clark
    1. Second – Senator Alluisi
    2. Discussion – n/a
    3. Vote to approve: Yes – 16 ; No - 0; passes unanimously.
- III. [LMS Update from DEC](#) (Kate Shannon representing the LMS selection committee)
  - A. Based off surveys, meetings, use of various sandbox accounts, and vender quotes provided in Fall 2021 and January 2022, the LMS Selection Committee narrowed the potential options down to two platforms for consideration: [CANVAS and D2L/Brightspace](#).
  - B. On Friday, February 18<sup>th</sup>, Faculty and Staff had another opportunity to explore Canvas and D2L/Brightspace and learn more about third party tools that integrate with these platforms. Attendees of the [LMS Information Fair](#) are currently providing input regarding

the final LMS decision. Eighty-two faculty and staff members participated in the LMS Information Fair.

1. During the process of narrowing the LMS selections, the committee was thinking not only about faculty, staff, and students – also wanted to keep an open mind about the ways this platform could be used for training, support, IT, and administration. They were considering a platform from a holistic viewpoint.
2. Obvious recognition needs to be given to Christala Smith for preparing the LMS information fair. InSpace, a platform that gives the user a great degree of active control was used with 82 faculty and staff members attending this fair.
  - a) About half the attendees have responded to a follow-up survey; the survey closes on February 25, so if you attended but have not completed it yet, please do so and spread the word!
3. The LMS Information Fair was divided into three different sessions. It began with a vendor session (CANVAS and D2L) and third-party tools. Session 2 was an open forum to explain the DEC and their work. In session 3, participants could meet with references to pick their brains about the final two platforms (the references were from institutions both in Oklahoma and out of state).
4. Initial feedback regarding preferences between the two platforms: approximately half of the respondents prefer Canvas, 30% have no preference either way. It appears that regardless of choice, either platform will be well received.
  - a) Open response feedback: both are compatible with Ellucian tools.
  - b) Open response feedback regarding CANVAS mentioned a number of themes: respondents have already used canvas and claimed positive experiences; many said it was stable; liked the fully integrated video tool (Studio); respondents classified CANVAS as very user friendly, reliable, and student oriented; the platform boasted an integrated portfolio for each account members (helpful for certification programs); there appears to be very little difference in user experience between mobile and desktop use.
    - (1) Reference Concerns for CANVAS: quizzes are glitchy; “incomplete” grades not possible with CANVAS because the course delivery is time bound and therefore prohibits extended access to a course for a student; peer reviews assignments do not allow a due date to be set; cross listed courses are problematic; can only upload certain file types; simultaneous grading is an issue (i.e. if an instructor and a coach are grading at the same time changes may not be saved); CANVAS community is not always timely or responsive.
  - c) Open response feedback regarding D2L/Lightspace: provides flexibility in structure and layout; platform is the “cutting edge of online learning”; offers extensive

options; instructors can create groups for peer editing; respondents classified platform as user-friendly; mobile app more compatible than CANVAS; the platform can identify student accessibility at the roster level

- (1) Reference Concerns for D2L/Lightspace: server outages can last for a while (15-20 minutes); some browsers don't appear compatible; items are in multiple places; there is a gamification option available, but it will cost additional money; does not have a robust app; some issues with gradebooks.

C. LMS Selection Committee Plans moving forward:

1. The LMS Transition Committee will make a presentation to the Student Government Association (SGA) to share the committee's work, answer questions, and solicit feedback on Thursday, February 24, 2022, at 6 pm (rescheduled due to inclement weather).
2. The LMS Transition Committee will make a presentation to the Academic Council to share the committee's work, answer questions, and solicit feedback on Wednesday, March 2, 2022, at 2 pm.
3. The LMS Transition Committee will decide on their preferred LMS Platform prior to Spring Break and present their proposal for the adoption of an LMS system to the Distance Education Council by March 25, 2022. If approved by the Distance Education Council, LMS Transition Committee will then present their proposal to the Academic Council and Faculty Senate by March 30, 2022.

D. Discussion Points regarding the LMS Transition

1. Karl Frinkle reiterated that although the summaries of the two platform finalists may feel like information overload people should not be concerned because we will meet the needs of faculty, staff, and students regardless of which platform is selected.
2. Aaron Adair explained that even if the university selected Blackboard Ultra, it would require a paradigm shift. The learning curve would remain the same for any choice.
  - a) Christala Smith followed up on this point by addressed the initial feedback that questions why we could not select a "middle ground" Blackboard option. Put simply, we still might be forced to upgrade to Ultra. Noted that the committee did not have a lot of information to work with (few schools in Oklahoma use Blackboard), but the primary concern was that this "middle ground" Blackboard option would only prove temporary, and we are instead looking for a *long-term* solution.
3. Chair Daigle asked about the timeline for transitioning. Christala Smith said that the goal is to sign a contract that begins in December 2022. Faculty will have access to it in January. Pilot courses will begin in March 2023 and grad classes will transition in May and summer. By August 2023 the transition will be complete. CIDT will send out reminder emails regarding the transition.

4. Chair Daigle applauds the committee for their exceptional work thus far.

#### IV. Committee Reports

##### A. Budget Committee (BC)

1. Nothing to report.

##### B. Committee on Committees (CoC) ([Report](#) on file)

1. CoC anticipates fifty-five committee vacancies due to expiring terms and faculty departures with more anticipated because of retiring and unexpected departures of faculty after the Spring/Summer terms.
2. In March 2022, an email will be sent to all full-time faculty requesting their top three preferences for University Committee appointments. In addition, to assist in filling University Committee vacancies, a list of all current full-time faculty (and retiring/departing faculty) will be requested from VPAA Dr. Golden. The Committee will attempt to fill all University Committee vacancies based on faculty preferences. Faculty who do not respond with preferences will be used to fill all remaining vacancies.
3. The CoC chair Clark was invited to speak to the Mutual Mentoring Project group, 2 p.m., Friday, February 25 about faculty participation on University Committees.

##### C. Personnel Policies Committee (PPC) ([Notes on file](#))

1. PPC discussed the potential need to revise APPM to account for the hiring of an Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and a Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The PPC requested job descriptions for the two positions from VPAA Golden, so that the committee can begin considering future revisions (if any) to the APPM for the 2022-23 school year.
2. The PPC discussed the Faculty Senate's past request that all faculty be provided with a workload and compensation form at the beginning of each semester. This has not been put into practice. Faculty on the PPC committee are in agreement that this information should already be readily available to chairs and therefore not an extra burden on them – it is simply a matter of sharing existing information with faculty in a transparent manner.
3. PPC Chair Dr. Cotter-Lynch plans to write Dean Blackwood asking for clarification of the current system for academic coaches, course enrollments, and faculty compensation for the PPC to determine whether compensation discrepancies are due to lack of consistent policy or lack of implementation of existing policy.

##### D. Planning Committee (PC) ([Minutes on file](#))

1. The deadline to submit documents in support of nominations is March 4 at 5 pm.
2. PC Chair Boothe posed a question to the Senate: Currently, we do a second round of voting for teaching. Last year, PC members wondered if we really needed a second choice because we revote anyways. PC committee members thought we didn't, but

upon further review realized this voting procedure is written in policy - *do we want to keep the second-choice option in the first round of teaching?*

- a) Chair Daigle said the spirit of the first and second choice was to make the pool larger but admittedly it does not always work that way.
  - b) PC Chair Boothe said it did not really help the committee to narrow the choices for the second vote for teaching. It did help, however, for service and scholarship.
3. Another question posed to the FS - do we need to have a formal vote if there is only one nomination for an award? It was decided that a statement explaining victory through acclamation can suffice in lieu of a formal election.

E. University Affairs Committee (UAC)

1. The UAC undertook two charges during this meeting:
  - a) First, to open a line of communication with the SGA council. We have reached out to attend the upcoming meeting on Tuesday, March 1 at 8 am. This meeting is an opportunity for SGA to voice any concerns moving forward.
  - b) Second, to create and maintain a line of communication with adjunct faculty. Academic Affairs provided a list of current adjuncts (142 this current semester) and an email was sent out asking for feedback.
    - (1) Replies to this first message revolve around adjunct pay.

F. Treasurer Report - Stan Alluisi

1. After chatting with HR it was determined that deductions for OTRS will not be taken from Faculty Senate awards, but there will still be deductions for Social Security and Medicare.
2. As a reminder, NO deductions at all are made if the award is taken as travel or equipment.

G. Faculty Senate Survey Report (FSSRC) ([February 11 Minutes on file](#))

1. First Meeting Summary (February 11)
  - a) Wanted to compare our survey with other surveys on campus (if the SGA and Staff Senate have their own surveys) as well as in comparison to other universities. There are several third party or vendor-maintained surveys used at other universities to collect this data.
  - b) Developed several recommendations for a revised FS Survey:
    - (1) We should begin the FSS with the [University Mission Statement](#) and follow through logical, easily identifiable, and separated groups of questions.
    - (2) The FS Survey Report should not include neutral or neutral adjacent responses to make claims that a group either agrees or disagrees with statements – they should be kept as a separate group.

- (3) All members of the committee share the opinion that the questions directly focusing on individual administrators (Q37-44 in the 2021 FSSR) do not need to be included.
  - (4) Our discussion came to focus on the overall language throughout the survey, which emphasizes *perception* (for example, Q4 *The morale of the faculty is...?*). It is the committee's opinion that perception is of secondary concern. We want faculty to answer for themselves, about *their own* experiences, **not** others. This is the information that we should be trying to measure.
  - (5) Formatting of questions: suggesting a drop-down menu to have all the questions on one page instead of a survey that needs to be "clicked through."
2. Initial revisions to the 2021 Faculty Senate Survey based on these initial recommendations were sent out to the committee on February 18; the total number of questions was cut from 54 to 36. We are still looking to get the total down to the 25-30 range.
  3. Second Meeting Summary (February 23)
    - a) Discussed revisions and offered the following recommendations that we would like the Faculty Senate to discuss:
      - (1) Upon examination of the responses in the 2020-2021 Survey, there was a call for having Tenure and Promotion and Post-Tenure Review questions be moved to a biennial rotation. The Committee believes that this will allow the FS to continue collecting this data but make the survey not appear redundant year after year.
      - (2) The FSSRC wants to include a question about the "student ready campus" initiative first stated in the [HLC Open Pathway Quality Initiative Proposal](#) signed by President Newsom in October 2021 (this was also mentioned in a Shared Governance Forum last Fall). In the first meeting the committee noted this language was lifted from a work published by the [American Association of Colleges and Universities](#) titled [Becoming a Student-Ready College: A New Culture of Leadership for Student Success](#) (2016). The FSSRC is looking for clarification as to what exactly this means. Does the university have a specific definition for what a "student ready Southeastern" looks like? If this is the strategic vision for the university going forward, it would be a good idea if both faculty AND students knew the definition of "student ready." The FSSRC recognizes that is this approach is central to the overall strategic plan the administration is crafting, it is only proper in the spirit of shared governance for faculty to be given a chance to shape the agenda. In other words, we need to know what role we as faculty play in this plan, what

the objectives and desired outcomes are, and how we can contribute to its success.

(3) This is beyond our charge, but *the FSSRC suggests selecting the faculty's role in building a "student ready campus" as the Shared Governance Forum topic for April 19*. Is this something worth pursuing as by the Senate at large?

b) Discussion regarding the FSSRC Shared Governance Forum proposal

(1) Senator Wood noted that this topic or theme of "student-readiness" for campus has emerged throughout the interview process, but it is incumbent on us to make sure that the same amount energy is directed towards ensuring a campus community that does not neglect faculty and staff.

(2) Chair Daigle approved this suggestion and entrusted the FSSRC with the charge of organizing the Shared Governance Forum around this topic.

(a) Chair-Elect Shannon suggested a reading group for the book – at the very least selections of chapters.

(b) Past Chair Clark wonders if there are options for securing a copy of *Becoming a Student-Ready Campus* for every faculty member – if this is guiding the philosophy of administration, we need to know what this is.

H. Executive Committee (EC) ([Minutes on file](#))

1. Meeting with the President (summary, minutes not yet approved by the President)

a) President Newsom restated his prioritization of faculty and staff compensation. When asked, he outlined the basic budgeting process he follows: first step is determining how much faculty and staff compensation will be, then adding all fixed-cost increases (i.e. insurance). He is committed to ensuring all individuals have full insurance coverage. After these are accounted for, the rest of the budget takes shape.

(1) President Newsom stated all the input flows through the VPs. Says he has no problem if VPAA and Chairs have better ways for input. Also receives input from President's Executive Committee.

b) The President has received the [Salary Card Working Group's Proposal](#); the plan now is to take the recommendations, digest them, and schedule a meeting to discuss them (no time finalized yet for this meeting).

c) President Newsom also stated his satisfaction with the Telework Policy and considers it "very successful." He thanks the FS and Staff Senate for their recommendations. He believes it will serve as a foundation moving forward.

d) President Newsom delivered some updates:

(1) Finalized Spring enrollment numbers: headcount total is 5096 (1.7% up from last Spring) but credit hours down 1.5% from last Spring.

- (2) SE Renewed its Academic Partnerships (AP) contract; AP has agreed to provide \$250,000 this summer that will be invested in Southeastern's "student ready initiative."
- (3) Was excited to examine the first iteration of the Campus Wide Master Plan and hopes we can start vetting it soon. It is a 10- to 15-year plan that encompasses the entire campus (including the Airport and McCurtain Campus).
- (4) The alumni association will no longer be recognizing distinguished former alumni at homecoming. President Newsom wants the university to take this over and develop a program to honor distinguished former alumni, current FS awards, and service to the university. The President would like to have an event this spring to recognize the award recipients.
- (5) Allied Health partnership with Murray State was signed. The overall goal with this agreement is to develop M.S. degrees for healthcare, with an emphasis on non-clinical careers.
- (6) President was also happy to announce that we are in the process of replacing all the classroom furniture in lecture settings; common areas also may receive new furnishings.

## V. Old Business

### A. Faculty Salary Card Update: [Proposal submitted to President Newsom](#) (on file)

- 1. This proposal included a number of guiding principles:
  - a) Acknowledge that market forces in different disciplines should play a role – but that this role should be *uniform* and not applied only for certain departments/disciplines and for certain faculty.
  - b) Consider each faculty member's starting salary as:
    - (1) the sum of a carded salary (an absolute floor provided by rank and degree),
    - (2) a market adjustment (calculated the same way for everyone in a given discipline with roughly comparable job expectations),
    - (3) and an "experience elsewhere/other" category (the latter calculated the same way for everyone).
  - c) By default, each year adjust the on-card portion upward only for inflation (We recommend something simple and predictable like the average of the previous 3 years' CPI), but do not adjust the market value/previous experience. In rare cases of deflation, don't change it at all (decreasing salary is terrible for morale).
  - d) If someone is a department chair, add that as "additional work", but adjust that number by inflation too.
  - e) Other salary adjustments (like one-time raises) should be treated like "previous experience" – not adjusted for inflation.



- f) Reevaluate market adjustments every so often and give that adjustment to everyone in that discipline (assuming it is not a downward trend – new hires should be hired for less, but cutting salaries is terrible for morale).
- 2. Discussion regarding Salary Card Working Group Recommendations:
  - a) Senator Fridley noted this is a well-done recommendation. It appears that annual adjustments will be based on the carded amount only. Posed the question of where the adjustments will be added on the salary card (degree or rank)? Which total is added to?
  - b) Chair Daigle noted that these are only recommendations – these details still need to be figured out.

VI. New Business

- A. Past Chair Clark expressed his gratitude to the Salary Card Working Group for presenting to this proposal to the President. Observed that this document has been in the works for years, so it is good to finally have a set of recommendation for him to make decisions. He would also like to commend the whole FS for staying steadfast on this issue.

VII. Announcements

- A. Shared Governance Forum (Administration) will be on March 28 at 2 pm.
- B. Shared Governance Forum (Faculty Senate) will be on April 19 at 2 pm.
- C. Mutual Mentoring Project will meet on February 25 at 2 pm. CoC chair Clark has been invited to discuss faculty participation on University Committees.

VIII. Adjournment 4:23 pm CST

- A. **Motion to Adjourn** – Senator Alluisi
- B. Second – Senator Walker