

## Minutes for the Faculty Senate

### Meeting #6 Spring 2023

Wednesday, April 12, 2023

Hybrid (Russell 100 or Zoom), 3:00-4:30 PM CST

#### Attending

Kathy Boothe  
Brandon Burnette  
Randy Clark  
Ashley Hampton

Andy Kramer  
Chris Moretti  
Kate Shannon  
Rob Shauger

Matthew Sparacio  
Jeri Walker  
Doug Wood

#### Absences

Laura Atchely  
Cody Bogard  
Meg Cotter-Lynch  
Steve Csaki

Amy Gantt  
Srimal Garusnghe  
Frank Xu  
Mila Zhu

#### Guests

Kay Daigle  
Michael Hardy  
Alisha Ridenour

Dena Rymel  
Christala Smith

I. Call to Order – 3:13 PM CST

II. Minutes from March 29, 2023

a) **MOTION TO APPROVE** the Minutes from March 29, 2023 – Senator Shauger

i) **SECOND** – Senator Sparacio

ii) **DISCUSSION** – n/a

iii) **VOTE** – Yea 9; Nay 0; Abstaining 0; passes unanimously.

III. Distance Education Council (DEC) discussion of Course Review Proposal led by Christala Smith, Alisha Ridenour, Jeri Walker, Kay Daigle

i) What is being presented here is **NOT** policy but rather a request for the Senate to vote to proceed with a pilot program designed by the DEC beginning in January of Spring 2025. After the pilot program is completed, then a formal policy will be written, but only after it is tested and vetted. **THIS IS ONLY FOR 100% ONLINE COURSES.**

ii) Currently our operational requirement for QM (Quality Matters) is to get certified during the first semester of teaching. This does not align with the language of QM, which states that training should be completed *before* teaching a course. DEC and CIDT want to make a new timeline: The first semester a faculty teaches online, faculty will take a developmental crash course, then in a second or third semester the

faculty member completes a QM workshop. A second workshop will be geared for improvement. This process ends with a self-review and assumed to be part of an ongoing process. In the following year there will be a formal review of the course.

- (1) There is going to be an attempt to spread out the review process for faculty members based upon online teaching workload. For example, those who teach 1-4 unique courses would be reviewed on a four-year rotation of formal reviews; 5-8 would be a five-year rotation; so on and so forth.
    - (a) The time in between the self-review and formal review is meant for faculty to re-tool courses. This should result from discussions with mentors within departments or across campus with CIDT or peers.
  - (2) If a department has a “master course” each adjunct will **NOT** need to have the course reviewed. But if everyone in a department teaches a unique section of the same course, each instructor will need to have the course reviewed.
  - (3) DEC/CIDT is still trying to figure out the workload and schedule, such as how to stagger the reviews but ensure they are completed in a timely fashion.
- iii) Some explanation about rationale: the ultimate goal is to ensure that all courses online are “Southeastern Certified”, not QM certified. It costs a lot of money to have instructors certified by QM. However, this rubric will still be based on QM metrics, the only difference being that CIDT will be responsible for review.
- (1) This will not connect to yearly faculty evaluations. It is only intended for faculty development.
- iv) General Discussion of the DEC/CIDT Course Review Proposal
- (1) *QUESTION*: what does “formal review” entail?
    - (a) Currently SE does not have a formal review for courses. Initially the partnership with AP required formal reviews with the MBA program. There also was the Post-COVID reviews as well, but this was an informal process. The difference between formal/informal is the existence of a rubric based on eight essential standards. A copy of the rubric will be available for all senators to begin the self-review process.
  - (2) *QUESTION*: are recommendations included in the formal review binding?
    - (a) If it is not related to one of the eight essential QM standards, then it is not binding.
      - (i) *COMMENT*: This does not come through in the current language. If changes are not made, would a Chair then proceed with remediation? It currently reads as applying to anything.
  - (3) *QUESTION*: what does “mentorship” within this framework entail?
    - (a) This is a flexible concept. Perhaps in the form of Mutual Mentoring, at the departmental level, through DEC, or CIDT. The only thing DEC/CIDT suggests is the time frame for assistance.

- (b) A mentor as envisioned would be a faculty member working with CIDT. This mentor is meant to **guide** not **score**. This should be a coordinated effort between CIDT (nuts and bolt) and each faculty member's department (discipline-specific guidance).
  - (i) *COMMENT*: This needs to be made clear "with support from CIDT."
- (4) *QUESTION*: what is the purported value to faculty members who go through this?
  - (a) Commitment to completed the recommended revisions to courses is that the course would receive a badge. If someone chooses not to participate, then that would be handled by department chair.
    - (i) To put this historical context: DEC used to approve every 100% online syllabus. This is an effort to clean up and maintain best teaching standards within these courses.
    - (ii) *FOLLOW-UP QUESTION*: Who "sees" the badges? Will this be information posted for students to see when signing up for courses? Are these badges only for professional development?
      1. Badges will be on the faculty side of it.
      2. *SUGGESTION*: include this in the faculty directory?
- (5) *QUESTION*: Why the alternating self and formal review schedule? Faculty acknowledge that we want to be held accountable, but this seems like a never ending cycle.
  - (a) Every example DEC/CIDT has pulled included formal course reviews every four to six years. QM standards typically are updated every five years. The expectation is that over that period of time changes will be undertaken proactively by faculty. We expect the formal process to be relatively quick because of this structured timeline.
    - (i) There would not be an "expedited review" process available.
- (6) *COMMENT*: faculty have "strong reservations" about fairness in implementation of this policy. Therefore language of the policy is so important. CIDT is classified as a "faculty-support organization." Will adopting this policy require a revision to the APPM? Is this a challenge to academic freedom?
  - (a) *SUGGESTION*: the language should say this plan will "address the underlying mechanics of a successful course"
  - (b) *SUGGESTION*: the language should include periodic feedback to offer opportunities to revise before it is a policy. Perhaps even allow for general comments for faculty.
    - (i) The intention is to have everyone teach at least one class in CANVAS before starting this. A year from now we will be coming back to collect feedback after that first group of reviews. New concerns will emerge after implementation. So we want that all addressed with feedback and experience to actually draft a policy.

(7) *QUESTION/COMMENT*: Please attend DEC meetings, which may be the more appropriate forum for these fruitful conversations. If a policy was drafted it would need to be passed by Faculty Senate. Today is an opportunity to inform all of us for this \*proposal\* . Again, we need to know what the incentive was. To teach online, faculty were told that QM certification was necessary. What other than that is the incentive? Would administrators choose not to have a course listed if it is not certified (citing UCO example)?

(a) To clarify, this policy only concerns modification of course – **NOT** instructor – certification. The goal is to modify what certification at Southeastern means.

v) MOTION TO GRANT APPROVAL TO THE DEC/CIDT Course Review Proposal – Senator Clark

(1) SECOND – Senator Boothe

(2) ANY REMAINING DISCUSSION? – n/a

(3) VOTE – Yea 7; Nay 0; Abstaining 2.

#### IV. Nominations are open for Faculty Senate Chair Elect

a) Please send nominations and acceptance directly to Faculty Senate Chair, Kate Shannon (kshannon@se.edu). Nominations will close on Friday, April 21st at 5 pm.

#### V. Treasurer's Report

a) Purchase of the Faculty Senate Award has been processed, resulted in a withdrawal of a little over \$800.

#### VI. Committee Reports

a) Budget Committee

i) No report; see Treasurer's Report above.

b) Committee on Committees

i) No report. During our final meeting, we will give the Faculty Senate the opportunity to vote to approve the university committees and council appointments. The CoC thanks everyone for their responses. We will meet next week to finalize selections.

c) Executive Committee

i) Did not meet. Chair Shannon met with President Newsom last Thursday. A couple of updates from the President's office:

(1) Meeting with Marjorie Robertson on Monday April 17 to discuss the BC/PPC Salary Card proposal. In its current draft, it appears they have taken the old card and pasted in the new numbers. This will need to be re-tweaked and manually revised \*each year\*

(a) *SUGGESTION*: It will be easier to have two cards: one for new faculty hires and a second simpler one for existing faculty (which will serve as a conversion table). Do we want this to be an HR document, or one that faculty can see to doublecheck?

- (b) *SUGGESTION*: HLC wants transparency between administration, faculty, and staff. There is an advantage in faculty having access to both these documents.
- (c) *QUESTION*: does the first card have a line for market adjustment?
  - (i) The original did not.
  - (ii) This should be in a spreadsheet.
- (2) In total, it would take about \$1.7 million to address faculty compensation. This total does **NOT** include Staff compensation proposal. The President noted this would require us to ask for a significant increase in tuition to accommodate this.
  - (a) Last year, RUSO interrogated sister intuitions for proposed tuition hikes.
- (3) AACSB provided initial feedback from a review, This feedback indicated that the current leadership structure for JMSB would not pass the accreditation process.
  - (a) There are interim and associate dean hires (David Whitlock and Courtney Kernek respectively).
    - (i) How much is this going to cost?
    - (ii) *QUESTION*: are there other accrediting institutions? Especially considering the number of incurred costs with the accreditation review process and appointment of deans.
      - 1. There is at least \$500,000 in new administrator costs.
    - (iii) *COMMENT*: In 2014 the budget fell off the cliff. We gutted mid-level administration in this crash. The result was that day-to-day work was dumped on the chairs and the VPAA and resulted in lot of things not getting done. The recent hires were done to alleviate that workload.
  - (b) President Newsome wants to “phase” deans in over time. It will not end with the JMSB.
- (4) Shelli Key has been promoted to VP of Enrollment Management.
- d) Personnel Policies Committee
  - i) No report.
- e) Planning Committee
  - i) Report posted, which includes the recipients of the Faculty Senate Awards. The PC does not yet have the Outstanding Faculty Member Award voting tabulated.
- f) University Affairs Committee
  - i) Did not meet.
  - ii) Update on the faculty housing situation: **FACULTY MUST BE OUT BY JULY.** Faculty are scrambling. Faculty were encouraged to move on campus during COVID and are now being asked to vacate.
    - (1) Liz McCraw said administration will be evaluating the availability on an ongoing

basis. Even so, notice of non-renewal was given in **LESS THAN 60 DAYS**.

- (2) Andy is creating the housing lib guide. Terri Rogers says there are four houses the university owns that are rented out, listed to faculty first but almost always filled. HR has no listing available for housing in the area.
- (3) There needs to be a change in the faculty housing contract.

**DID NOT DISCUSS REST OF AGENDA, AS FS MOVED TO TABLE REMAINING AGENDA ITEMS.**

VII. Old Business – Did not get to discuss rest of agenda, as FS moved to table remaining agenda items.

- a) Shared Governance Forum (April 11, 2023)
- b) Faculty/Staff Housing (Communication update)
  - i) See UAC notes above.

VIII. New Business

- a) Organized Research Grant Disbursement Concerns
  - i) Organized Research and Program Review Committee (ORPRC) Function: *The responsibilities of this committee are to set and amend policy with regard to disbursement; to review applications twice a year or more depending on special circumstances to make recommendations for funding to the Office for Academic Affairs, and to periodically review and analyze the effectiveness of the Organized Research Grant program* (Section 3.5 Function and Membership of General Faculty Committees APPM-41).
- b) Faculty Survey
- c) Microcredentials and Intellectual Property

IX. Announcements

- a) Faculty & Staff Recognition – April 19th, 3:30 pm at the Visual and Performing Arts Center (VPAC)

X. Adjournment – 4:33 PM CST

- a) **MOTION TO ADJOURN** – Parliamentarian Shauger (REACHED TIME)
- b) **SECOND** – Senator Clark
- c) **VOTE** – No longer have a quorum (Yea 6; Nay 0; Abstaining 0)