



10-26-2012

October 26, 2012 Approved Minutes

SWOSU Faculty Senate

Abstract

SWOSU Faculty Senate October 26, 2012 Approved Minutes

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

SWOSU Faculty Senate, "October 26, 2012 Approved Minutes" (2012). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 163.
<https://dc.swosu.edu/fsminutes/163>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at SWOSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of SWOSU Digital Commons. An ADA compliant document is available upon request. For more information, please contact phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu.

Southwestern Oklahoma State University
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
October 26, 2012
Faculty Senate Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER: Faculty Senate President David Esjornson called the September meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 2:02 p.m. in Education 201.

II. ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM: The following members were present: Amy Barnett, John Bradshaw, Erin Callen, Dayna Coker, Kevin Collins, Jerry Dunn, Jason Dupree, David Esjornson, Fred Gates, Jeff Walker (for Marci Grant), Andrea Holgado, E.K. Jeong, Sophia Lee, Jim Long, Scott Long, Tom McNamara, Evette Meliza, Warren Moseley, Eric Paul, Les Ramos, Ann Russell, Joel Kendall (for Lisa Schroeder), Amber Sturgeon, Tamra Weimer, Dennis Widen, Curt Woolever, Jessica Young, and Alejandra DeSantiago (SGA)

III. CERTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES:
Jeff Walker for Marci Grant, Joel Kendall for Lisa Schroeder

IV. PRESENTATION OF VISITORS: None

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of September 28, 2012 meeting were approved by voice vote with no changes.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Executive Council meeting of October 15, 2012:
 - a. President Beutler discussed Sequestration; the automatic national budget cuts that may take place January 1. The only immediate concerns are in some Graduate and Justice programs, it is not clear if there are any vulnerabilities. Pell Grants are protected for one year, but other forms of financial aid, including work-study, will be cut. Access to all future Federal grants (NIH, NSF, EPSCOR-INBRE) will likely be reduced.
 - b. Provost Blake Sonobe will be taking a Vice Chancellors position (Academic Affairs) with the Oklahoma Regent's Office effective January 1, 2013. The President will appoint an interim Provost and conduct a national search for a replacement.
2. Administrative Council meeting of October 15, 2012:
 - a. Compensation plan will be presented to the RUSO Board for approval in the November meeting. The percentage increase has not been published yet.
 - b. SWOSU does not have a written social media policy. Dr. Foust is looking to develop a policy.
 - c. Work on the sidewalk between the Stafford Building and the Student Union is done. The lighting portion of the project was not funded.
 - d. Volunteers are needed for the implementation portion of the Strategic Planning. Contact Dr. Foust. Energetic individuals needed to volunteer for this endeavor.

e. SWOSU annual Legislative meeting on Friday, November 30. It is an informational meeting for State Legislators from Western Oklahoma.

f. Proposed changes in dedicated Academic Service Fees (Lab fees, course specific supply fees) are due. Contact your Dean.

g. Dr. Foust has asked the Faculty Senate for an opinion on expansion of the University anti-discrimination policy to include sexual orientation and genetic information.

3. Provost

Update on Funeral Leave. Administration is looking at the idea of faculty having 5 days for personal/funeral leave, 3 of which can be used as personal leave. Provost asks if that would be acceptable to the Faculty Senate. Currently, the faculty have 3 personal days from which a faculty member can take funeral leave. Funeral leave is not often used, but when needed 3 days is often insufficient. Provost would like an opinion on this proposal. The opinion of the Benefits committee is that we should have the same guidelines as the staff.

FS discussion: The administrative employees are entitled to 5 days of funeral leave and 3 personal days. Most of the faculty members have family in other states and hence it would be helpful to have 5 days of funeral leave and the 3 personal days. Another member pointed out that, if one has already used 3 personal days, then one would be left with only two days of funeral leave. Keeping track of the how many personal days we have and then trying to determine how many funeral days we have adds to the stress of losing a loved one. Hence, the opinion of the senate was that faculty members prefer to be treated like everyone else on campus and get 5 days of funeral leave in addition to the personal days.

4. Update on email notification: Faculty are supposed to be notified by email of any student drops during the signature required add/drop period. This semester the signature required period begins on November 4. Necessary coding has not been started; so don't expect any progress until next semester. Faculty will receive Email notification for all registrar initiated W after the first 10 days of classes (5 in Summer) once the testing and coding is complete.

From Daniel Archer

“Based on your email earlier this week, it would appear that the main concern was being notified during the signature only withdrawal period. I understand this concern and agree that it is very valid one. If this is the main concern and there is not something else that was suggested that I missed (because I think there might have been other issues discussed in the Spring when these conversations began occurring after the administrative drop email system was initiated), the system outlined below should likely work:

Mark is fairly confident that he can create a program that will generate an automated email for all withdrawal grades that were not graded by the faculty member (which means the faculty member assigned to a section would receive an email notification anytime the Registrar's Office issues a “W” Grade). The Registrar's Office inputs W Grades during the guaranteed withdrawal period and during the signature only withdrawal period when a student has a signature. The way this system would be set up, the faculty member would not get emails for W Grades

that they submit in Campus Connect because the faculty member would have graded the course.

Mark will have to create this system and test some scenarios before we can be absolutely certain, so I can report that he will be working on creating an email system in the future; however, I also want to point out that there are several projects associated with the phone system implementation, so this may not be possible this semester.

I will be sure to keep you updated on the status of this and the outcome of any future testing. “

5. The SSPO Employee Recognition Reception will be held at 10:00 am on Thursday, November 8 in the Ballroom.

6. Special Homecoming event: 4:00 pm Dedication of Cecil Perkins Football Complex— North Side, Rankin Williams Field House. The parking lot west of the Education Building will be closed off for this ceremony.

B. Secretary/Treasurer Eric Paul

1. **Roll Sheet** – please sign.

2. **Treasurer’s Report:**

a. BancFirst Checking Account:

August Meeting Balance: \$2158.70

Expense for New Faculty Reception: (\$100.05)

CURRENT BALANCE: \$2058.65

b. University Account:

August Meeting balance: \$105.01

CURRENT BALANCE: \$105.01

C. President-Elect Fred Gates: Mind Games will air on 25th Nov at 6pm on KSBI. There has been attrition in the second team and we are looking for participants. Ten slots will be open next semester.

D. Past President Kevin Collins: None

E. Student Government Representative Alejandra De Santiago, VP of SGA: The SGA is looking for members candidates for the SGA.

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES:

A. University Policies Committee

(FS Motion 2012-09-01: It is proposed that faculty be allowed access to all student academic records via Campus Connect.)

Faculty Senate University Policies Committee
Report on Expanded Faculty Access to Student Transcripts

The University Policies Committee has inquired about expansion of direct faculty access to student transcripts, particularly for faculty within a department or a specific

major. Registrar Daniel Archer, Vice President Foust, Provost Sonobe, and ITS Director Mark Engelman have discussed this issue and explain that the current system is designed for access by advisor code, which results in two main possibilities: direct faculty access being restricted to only advisee transcripts, as it is now, or complete access by all faculty, since all faculty have an advisor code. However, the administration is concerned that unrestricted direct access to student transcripts by all faculty or by non-advisor faculty within a department or major raises privacy concerns in respect to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). In addition, it is the intention of the university that only the assigned advisor is involved in making changes to student schedules. Mr. Archer reiterates that, while direct access is limited to the assigned faculty advisor, department chairs and designated administrative assistants in departmental offices have “advise all access” due to working with a wider variety of students and having responsibilities for assisting the university during transitional periods, such as breaks. As a result, department chairs and designated administrative assistants may assist with faculty requests for access to unofficial transcripts if needed for legitimate educational purposes.

Respectfully submitted,
Members of the University Policies Committee

The members that brought the motion have decided to leave things as they stand and not take and further action in response to the above reply from the Registrar Daniel Archer.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: none.

IX. NEW BUSINESS:

Possible Motions:

A. FS Motion 2012-10-01:

It is proposed that the Faculty Senate encourage the Administration to revise the University Anti-Discrimination Policy to include sexual orientation and genetic information.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

The above motion was discussed and it was the general opinion of the FS that in keeping with the policies with other universities, we need to update our Anti-Discrimination Policy to include sexual orientation and genetic information. Dr. Foust is encouraged to make the necessary modifications.

B. FS Motion 2012-10-02:

It is proposed that any course registration for a student requiring the override of a prerequisite be restricted by the system to the chair of the department offering that course.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

Rationale: The chair of the department offering the course has expertise and experience concerning the topics covered. They are in the best position to make an assessment of whether or

not the student requesting registration has the tools needed to pass the course. Currently, the system allows anyone who can override in one department to override in any department. This has led to students being placed in courses they are not prepared for. Naturally, such students wind up struggling.

The above motion was discussed in detail and the FS was unanimous that overwrite of a prerequisite be restricted by the system to the chair of the department offering that course and by the express consent of the instructor. The FS proposes that the Advisement handbook be updated to reflect this proposal. There was also a request to modify the software to prevent overwrite of prerequisite by the chair of other department and administrative assistants.

C. FS Motion 2012-10-03:

That Faculty Senate recommends that, for purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion, and at all levels of evaluation, the university consider Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEF) only on the basis of "positive" or "negative" with an average of 1-3 being classified as good and 4-5 classified as being weak.

The motion was tabled.

Rationale

The current and past practice of evaluating SEF on the basis of average numbers, sometimes taken to the second decimal place, sets important career decisions on a foundation of arbitrary assessments that have never been demonstrated to be objective or part of a fair process. SEF outcomes have long been shown to be strongly influenced by many factors not directly related to the quality of instruction, including gender and age of instructor, various classroom conditions such as lighting, temperature, available space, class size, the time of day an evaluated class is taught, etc, the academic position of the evaluating students themselves, such as whether the evaluated course is part of the student's major, and whether they are upper level lower level students, and how well educated the evaluated student is at the time of the evaluation. Since these and many other factors are out of the control of the instructor, career decisions made on the basis of SEF can only come to biased conclusions as any set of SEF will demonstrate bias towards some classes or instructors and against others. Faculty who teach heavy loads of GE classes are at further disadvantage.

The FS discussed the above motion about Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEF). The proposal as is written uses 1-3 being classified as good and 4-5 classified as being weak. Some members of the FS were concerned about 3 be classified as being good, especially if the departmental average was something like 1.5. Hence the general feeling was to have 1-2 as good, 3 as average and 4-5 as being weak. Some members of the FS did express concerns about using the above grading system as a hard and fast rule. Each T&P binder needs to be looked at subjectively. A motion was passed to revise the grading to reflect 1-2 as good, 3 as average and 4-5 as being weak. The motion was then tabled.

D. FS Motion 2012-10-04:

The Faculty Senate recommends that instructors not vote on the evaluation of tenure track Ph.D.s for purposes of continuance, tenure, or promotion.

The motion was defeated by a voice vote.

Rationale

Out of respect for the work it requires to earn a Ph.D. or other doctorate, we should not have instructors, some of whom have no higher degree in the field of their discipline than bachelor's, or perhaps Masters of Education, evaluating the research of scholars who have obtained the highest possible degree in their research field and have made contributions to their fields of study.

The above motion was denied because the candidate has the option to select a committee member from outside the department on the continuance committee. The departments have a system of selecting the continuance committee and the general feeling of the FS was that everyone's input would be valuable in deciding continuance.

X. ADJOURNMENT: 3:24 pm

Next meeting 2:00 pm
Friday, November 16, 2012

Respectfully Submitted,

David Esjornson, FS President

Eric Paul, FS Secretary