Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes
Spring Semester, Meeting #3
Wednesday, March 30, 2022
Virtual Meeting, 3:00-4:30 p.m.
As approved by the Faculty Senate on April 13, 2022

ATTENDING

Laura Atchley	Steve Csaki	Chaehyun Lee
Stan Alluisi	William Fridley	Kate Shannon
Cody Bogard	Amy Gantt	Rob Shauger
Kathy Boothe	Srimal Garusinghe	Matthew Sparacio
Randy Clark	Ashley Hampton	Doug Wood
Meg Cotter-Lynch	Andy Kramer	Mila Zhu

ABSENCES

Laura Atchley	Rob Shauger
Rolando Diaz	Jeri Walker

GUESTS

Aaron Adair	Alisha Ridenour
Karl Frinkle	Christala Smith
Ian Gerg	James Sutton
Sondra Petty	

I.   Call to Order – 3:01 PM CST

II. Minutes from February 23, 2022

    A. **Motion to Approve** – Minutes from February 23, 2022 – Senator Sparacio

        1. **Second** – Senator Csaki

        2. Discussion

            a) Email from Senator Alluisi clarifying Part F of the Treasurer Report' should be changed to the following: "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."

            b) Meeting referred to in Personnel Policies Committee Section 3 occurred *after* originally stated – must clear up chronology.

    B. Vote to approve: Yes – 13; No – 0; Abstain – 0; passes unanimously.

III. DEC LMS Transition Proposal (LMS Transition Committee) (proposal on file)

    A. **Motion to Approve –** Senator Cotter-Lynch

*Southeastern Oklahoma State University adopts **Canvas** with **Yuja** for video, **Yuja Panorama** for accessibility, and **TurnItIn, Similarity + Originality** for plagiarism, and **Inspace** as a built- in collaborative video conferencing piece.*

B. **Second –** Senator Boothe

C. Discussion
   1. Vote conducted on March 11 through March 21 at the end of Spring Break.
     a) About 48% preferred CANVAS, 30% would be happy with either, 20% preferred D2L; Overall comments pointed to the fact that CANVAS is proven and reliable.
     b) Rationale for Add-Ons
       (1) Yuja Video is a video service directly integrated INTO the LMS that can be secured at the same or better price than CANVAS Studio. This is NOT a web conference or recording tool, it is a tool to record and create videos within a course (for example, short information videos or as student feedback). It also offers some editing and analytics available, and we will have the ability to overlay questions within videos as well. Yuja Video importantly provides unlimited storage.
       (2) Yuja Panorama is an accessibility tool for CANVAS. The price is much better than what ALLY (a third-party app that we currently use in Blackboard) can offer. Coupling these tool apps (Yuja Video and Panorama) helps keeps costs down.
       (3) TurnItIn Similarity (Base Package) + Originality will help address academic integrity concerns. SAFEAssign is not a feature in CANVAS, so this is our alternative. Similarity is a more enhanced version SAFEAssign, whereas Originality is way for us to track student writing changes over time, for example, tracking student writing throughout their career, from class to class.
         (a) One senator asked if TurnItIn addresses flagging scaffolded content (for example, using easy assignments as building blocks for longer works later in the semester)? Christala Smith noted there is an option available to mark assignments as "drafts" so they are not flagged later.
         (b) Somewhat related: because RESPONDUS is third-party app, we will keep using it when we transition to CANVAS.
       (4) Inspace is a conference webinar tool that provides a more interactive experience than Zoom or Teams. It is easier to have Break-Out Rooms in Inspace, and could be very useful for virtual Office. Importantly, Inspace would be fully integrated into CANVAS. In other words, this is a tool for the LMS - we will keep Zoom accounts for university wide meetings.
       (5) QUESTION – for FS?
   2. FS Roundtable Discussion
     a) Members of the Faculty Senate thank everyone on the LMS Transition Team for their extraordinary work on this!
   3. Vote to approve: Yes – 15; No – 0; Abstain – 0; passes unanimously.

IV. Committee Reports

A. Budget Committee (BC) (Steve Csaki)

    1. Did not meet with President as originally planned (VP Westman was ill)

    2. Meeting rescheduled for April 8.

B. Committee on Committees (CoC) (Randy Clark) ([report on file](#))

    1. Met, but delivered no action items

    2. The CoC will put together the preference for the Faculty University Committee Appointments and should be ready to vote on them within the next two meetings.

C. Personnel Policies Committee (PPC) (Meg Cotter-Lynch)

    1. Did not meet.

D. Planning Committee (PC) (Kathy Boothe)

    1. An important reminder: the last round of voting will close on Friday at 5 pm.

        a) Everyone should have received 3 Survey Monkey emails to vote.

        b) The PC will then work on printing the certificates and the upcoming Faculty & Staff Awards Celebration to be held late in the semester. Senator Boothe did note that the frames for the awards are going to look differently this year.

E. University Affairs Committee (UAC) (Doug Wood)

    1. Did not meet; the UAC is planning on meeting next Wednesday, April 6 at 4 pm.

    2. The UAC is currently collecting information from adjuncts via email.

F. Treasurer Report – (TR) Stan Alluisi

    1. The FS will be granting $9,000 in awards (the total budget for this year will come about to approximately $10,000). Treasurer Alluisi thanks the business office for their help!

G. Faculty Senate Survey Report (FSSR) (Matthew Sparacio) (minutes on file: [March 1,](#) [March 8,](#) [March 24](#))

    1. Presentation of [First Draft of the New Survey](#)

        a) **Motion to Approve** - draft of the revised 2021-2022 Faculty Senate Survey

            (1) Discussion – Consensus decision to **TABLE** this motion until next meeting.

    2. [Shared Governance Forum (April 19th Faculty Presentation) Simple Agenda](#)

        a) Context and Explanation as to why we are focusing on the "student-ready campus" topic:

(1) Our ad hoc committee's original charge was simply to revise the annual Faculty Senate Survey. We wanted 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). During our meetings, 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). Before asking a question on the FS Survey, we wanted clarification as to what term exactly means to administration and if the university had a specific definition for what a "student ready" vision looked like?

    (a) Our rationale was that if this philosophy 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."

(2) Committee members took it upon themselves to read *Becoming a Student-Ready College*, and easily recognized that is this philosophy is central to the overall strategic plan the administration is crafting, therefore it is only proper in the spirit of shared governance for faculty to be given a chance to shape the agenda. Administration introduced this philosophy, so we are responding. We would like to continue having an open dialogue about the "student-ready campus" initiative.

    (a) In other words, we need to know from administration:

        i)   *What the administration's definition of "student-ready" is?*

        ii) *What role do we as faculty play in this plan? In other words, how do faculty contribute to its successful implementation?*

        iii) *What are the objectives and desired outcomes of embracing a "student-ready" philosophy?*

H. Executive Committee (EC)

    1. Did not meet; will meet April 11 with President Newsom.

V. Old Business

A. Reflections on the recent Shared Governance Forum (Administration) "Strategic Planning: Looking to the Future" from on March 28th, 2pm. (Presentation on file: [Recording,](#) [Presentation Slides](#))

1. At the core of this presentation was the creation and timeline of a Strategic Planning Committee. Many senators asked who will serve on that committee? Some voiced concerns about unpaid labor, as this committee is expected to meet and work over the summer. Because of this representation for the faculty may be skewed.

    a) Regarding the timeline: the need for a coherent strategic plan at this moment in time makes sense because external expectations and accreditation.

2. Two major topics dominated the discussion: the fact that faculty compensation was not mentioned within the larger strategic framework (statements that the Salary Card Working Group's proposal is still being "digested"); and the president's office's stance on recent invited speakers to campus (more on that below – see VI.A.)

3. Whose job is it to make a strategic plan? It is good for faculty to have a say in the process, but is it their job to create the entire strategic vision? And can they when certain plans have already been in enacted?

    a) Senators also voiced frustration due to the fact that previous proposals appear to still be in limbo? Why take on new work?

    b) Following up on this, there was a call to ask *how we push forward for a clearer response on the Salary Card Working Group's proposal*?

        (1) The Executive Committee accepted the recommendation to include this in the agenda with the President when they next meet with him on April 11 at 2 pm. The Budget Committee will also be involved and ask for an update when they meet with the President on April 8; the BC may recommend that RUSO be asked to raise tuition and fees to account for the salary card increases.

            (a) On a related note, appointment letters including salary and assigned credit hours have yet to be sent out (in 2020-2021, appointment letters were emailed in early March, so this is late).

        (2) Some programs – Business, Aviation – have salaries measured by accrediting bodies conducting external reviews that sometimes send notifications that

they are compensating faculty below market value. Not all programs have this.

VI.   New Business

A. Guest Speakers on campus – policy discussion (Randy Clark)

1. As mentioned in Section V.A.2. above, during the Shared Governance Forum the President was asked his stance on inviting speakers to campus. In the days leading up the SGF (and following it), announcements for U.S. Senator James Lankford and OK State Senator Nathan Dahm were issued directly from the Office of the University President. President Newsom said it was mistake that message did not include what student organization exactly invited him as a speaker.

   a) That said, repeated official communications, including some sent by the Southeastern Oklahoma Leadership Development (SOLD) Program continued to omit information as to who was responsible for inviting these speakers to campus.

   b) Faculty are in agreement that student organizations can invite who they want to campus but do wish that balance of speakers – especially for political candidates coming to speak on campus – be struck.

2. Senator Clark asked Liz McCraw if our university has a policy when it comes to inviting speakers and was told that there is no official policy. So, *do we need a policy?*

   a) The charge of determining a policy regarding invited speakers to campus has been taken on by Executive Committee, which decide how to proceed.

B. Shared Governance Forum (Faculty Senate) April 19 at 2 pm – Becoming a Student Ready Campus

VII.   Announcements

A. No announcements shared.

VIII.   Adjournment – 4:31 PM CST

A. **Motion to Adjourn –** Senator Clark

B. **Second –** Senator Sparacio