

Faculty Senate Minutes

September 10, 2015

Present: Kevin Stein, Bruce Howard, Loralyn Felix, Scott Lanning, Amanda Wilford, David Berri, Tyler Stillman, Bruce Haslem, Abigail Larson, Michiko Kobayashi (also serving as proxy for Katy Herbold), Brian Ludlow, Kholoud Al-Qubbaj, Andrew Van Alstyne, Lynn White, David Lunt, Joy Sterrantino, Angela Pool-Funai, Rheana Gardner, Wendy Sanders, Alan Pearson, Derek Hein, Mackay Steffensen, Celesta Lyman (proxy for Chad Gasser), Nasser Tadayon, Matt Weeg, Isabella Borisova, John Murray. Absent: Denise Purvis, Kevin Baker

Action items are in red

1. **Call to Order:** 4:05pm by Kevin Stein
 - a. Approval of Minutes: following the correction of typos in August's minutes, motion to approve: Andrew V second: Bruce H
 - b. Provost Cook took a few minutes to address the "retention raises" that some faculty received at the end of last year. Provost Cook was directed to NOT give a cost of living increase to everyone across the board. Instead, he gave the deans latitude as to how it would be distributed.

2. **Recognition of Guests:** Sarah Homer from the SUU Journal, Brad Cook, Tom McFarland, James Sage

3. **Senate Treasurer's Report:** Kevin S speaking on behalf of Chad G. explained that Chad still has no direct access to the FS account, but it appears that the scholarship fund is looking good.

4. **Senate President Elect's Report**
 - a. Report on Board of Trustees' Meeting: no meeting was held since the last FS meeting – so no report was given
 - b. Committee Vacancies: Kevin S and Bruce H are still working on identifying committee membership and where the vacancies are. Kevin S said we need to fill 2 other committees not already on the list: One is a student-driven committee to address whether SUU should be a tobacco-free campus. Joy S volunteered for this committee. The second Committee is SUU's Parking Appeals committee – Andrew V volunteered to be on this one.

5. **Senate President's Report**

Report on Deans' Council meetings: Marvin Dodge released SUU's Budget Book 2015-16 to ensure transparency in the financial affairs of the University. **Kevin S suggested the senators look at the Budget Book to identify any potential concerns.**

<http://www.suu.edu/ad/budget/pdf/suubudgetbook15-16.pdf>

Danielle Dubrasky has honorarium money for visiting scholars (convocation speakers). Anyone who would like to suggest a speaker should visit with Danielle. Library dean Richard Saunders and his committee reviewed open education resources and open access textbooks. They are encouraging faculty to use these resources instead of requiring students to pay exorbitant textbook prices. FS agreed that this is fine as long as faculty are not forced to do this. Scott Lanning will provide links to these sites in case anyone is interested (see Appendix A). Jason Ramirez (dean of students) stressed that academic issues require faculty involvement. It appears that this is not always the case. James Sage encouraged everyone to ask the question “Is there already a policy for that?” before we ask for a change.

- a. **Update on Summer Compensation Committee:** this item was tabled for the next deans’ council meeting as Kevin S had to leave this deans’ council meeting early
- b. **Non-Cost of Living Raises concerns:** see 1b. above – Kevin S will get additional clarification
- c. **Evaluation of Academic Officers:** Lynn W summarized the proposed changes to policy 6.1 that address the evaluation of academic officers. James Sage has concerns that the deans will not endorse an annual review of their performance. However, the proposed changes do not include an annual “review” or “evaluation”. Rather, eligible faculty and staff would complete an annual survey as a means to provide anonymous feedback, suggestions and comments to academic officers. Once this is clarified, it is hoped the deans will endorse the proposal.
- d. **Early tenure policy:** FS is unclear of where the proposed policy is in the chain of command... Kevin will have Aime Uchman find out by reviewing previous deans’ council minutes.
- e. **Tom McFarland-Tool for integrating convocations in the classroom:** Danielle Dubrasky is in charge of convocations. She could not make it to this meeting– so Tom spoke on her behalf. Tom reviewed SUU’s convocation website: what is there, what people can do with it, and, and how faculty can integrate this website into their classes. If faculty have any questions/issues – call IT help desk.

Windows 10 is being evaluated on a small scale on campus. Windows 10 could be out as early as Jan 2016. If you are already using windows 10, and need help – see the IT help desk. SUU employees are advised to turn off any option that will report problems automatically to Microsoft. Windows XP is going to be removed from any and all operating systems using the common network by October 2015. This operating system is

no longer being updated by Microsoft and poses a security risk. The computer lab in ELC 312 is open now... newly renovated. Concerns were expressed that some computers across campus are not being updated. Tom will look into this.

Provost Cook was given the opportunity to speak: **SUU is a leading contender for the Outdoor Nation competition. Please participate.** SUU was just awarded top honors from the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) for altering our arts and humanities courses to highlight their real-world applications. The Provost would like faculty to consider whether policy 6.1 really captures who we are as an institution. There are different interpretations for the role of teaching, scholarship, and service across campus. For example, their relative weights depend on which dept./office is asked. We need a more unified philosophy at SUU. Should we adopt the engaged scholar model? The Boyer model? Policy 6.1 also has internal consistency problems. The Provost offered to bring in nationally recognized experts to help us understand different models of scholarship. This will help us to define the role of scholarship and what type of scholarship is/should be valued at SUU.

Concerns were expressed that universities used to be run by faculty... now, universities are using a business (top down) model. Approval for change needs to come from higher up – from the legislators. If they do not support our philosophy – it will not fly. Cook said we can and should unify our philosophy– but we cannot negotiate certain things e.g. teaching an average 4 courses/semester. However, we can change things like relative weights for teaching, scholarship, and service. The question was asked whether our model will truly be supported across campus by all entities (LRT committees)? Cook said that the Provost office is willing to provide the resources we need to help us make informed decisions.

UG Curricular committee chairs: these positions should be filled by faculty. Title 9: sexual misconduct needs to be reported and victims need support. Deb Hill is in charge of the title 9 office at SUU. The question was asked whether faculty could receive training on this. Provost said this is coming. Faculty are encouraged to invite Deb to their dept. meeting.

- f. **Tuition benefits for married dependents of faculty/staff** (Denise Purvis). Tabled for next meeting.
- g. **Proposal to request new categories for yearly provost awards:** see attached proposal (appendix B). Concerns were expressed that creative endeavors are not treated as scholarship and vs. versa. Need to truly see ourselves as interdisciplinary. Grant writing should be recognized. Maybe have a distinguished faculty member? Provost said we will

meet with very little resistance from his office. Judging scholarship: e.g. how to evaluate 20 articles in one year vs. one phenomenal book? Maybe evaluate only one piece of work per person? Have each dept. pick their own person for each award... then they move on to the next level, filtered, then move on etc? Maybe we need to clarify the difference between an outstanding scholar vs outstanding scholarship? More to come....**Kevin S asked senators to think about these questions and to request input from the faculty they represent.**

h. New Business

- a. Emeritus faculty policy needing adjustment? Departments are supposed to decide who is given emeritus status, but there is concern that this has not always happened.
- b. Salary and merit pay transparency: Is an ad hoc committee needed to address this? Not clear what is meritorious. The deans decide, and faculty are not sure where the money is going and what criteria each dean is using. Concern: merit money is not available every year. Faculty who are “meritorious” in a year when merit money is unavailable are SOL. Unless merit money is available every year, then we should consider getting rid of it. Mackay S. made the motion to take a request to deans’ council that they clarify their merit money policy. Motion to approve: Andrew Van second: Dave B.
- c. Other: the question was asked whether the 15% match required for a Faculty Scholarly Support Fund (FSSF) grant be reduced or eliminated. Some departments simply cannot afford this. **Kevin S will follow up with the deans.**

i. Motion to Adjourn: 5:30 pm motion: Andrew van second: Dave B

Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 13th @4:00 pm in the Charles Hunter Room (HCC)

Senate Executive Committee Meetings (4:00 pm, Leavitt Room, Special Collections, Library)

Fall Semester 2015: August 26, September 9, October 8, November 5, December 3

Spring Semester 2016: January 7, February 4, March 10, April 7

**Faculty Senate (Remaining) Meeting Schedule
2015-2016**

Date	Time	Location
------	------	----------

October 13, 2015	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
November 10, 2015	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
<i>December 8, 2015 This is finals week</i>	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
January 12, 2016	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
February 9, 2016	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
March 15, 2016	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
April 12, 2016	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room

Appendix A open access resources

<https://www.openstaxcollege.org/>

<http://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/>

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1muEDEqzZ1MDKMjIRkxmk1PAYHrTevrIF8lf5fOZ-K3k/edit>

<https://open4us.org/find-oer/> (scroll down to #7)

<http://www.oeconsortium.org/>

Appendix B: Arguments for adjusting the Provost office awards:

1. With only one “Outstanding Scholar” award, which is meant to cover such a wide array of different faculty pursuits, we neglect many scholars who are doing important work in their fields. Some of this work has been nationally recognized, yet ignored by our campus community. Over time, these oversights can exact a high toll on faculty morale.
2. Scholarship, in the traditional sense, is original research disseminated through traditional channels of scholarship: books published by academic presses and/or significant peer-reviewed articles published in leading national journals relevant to the field. Creative activities (such as documentary filmmaking or musical/theatrical performances) also contribute to our knowledge and learning, but are very different from traditional forms of scholarship. We should stop comparing apples to oranges and honor each form of success independently. In fact, most universities have some kind of “Outstanding Book Award,” which demonstrates the importance of separating out traditional forms of scholarship. Additionally, the Faculty Senate committee that currently oversees this award is called the Faculty Publication Award Committee and is charged with “evaluating the annual award for the best scholarly publication” and to arrange for its “binding” if necessary. This seems to imply that the scholarship produced should adhere to a more traditional form.

3. The cost to the university for adding additional awards would be minimal and the faculty are likely to be more concerned about work being appropriately honored than about the money that comes with the award.
4. If we are serious about growing as a university, we must find a way to encourage and recognize the work of our faculty. We tend to assess ourselves endlessly within the LRT process with completed checkboxes and letters for our personal files, but we do not publicly honor faculty who have managed to contribute enormously in their fields in spite of heavy teaching loads.
5. There are currently problems with the “authority” of the evaluating body for the award. There is a perception among faculty on campus that the process is a bit politicized (i.e. it’s a popularity contest). Additionally, those on campus who are more heavily involved in creative/artistic pursuits are not in a position to judge traditional forms of scholarship. The opposite is also true in that traditional scholars should not be asked to judge the artistic merits of certain creative activities. We need to fill these committees with people who understand the processes that lead to noteworthy products in those fields, even if our disciplines might be different.

Suggested Proposals:

1. Add categories for Outstanding Book, Outstanding Creative Activity, Outstanding Peer-Reviewed Journal Article, and perhaps even Outstanding Service.
2. Don’t adjust the main name of the original category, but add three awards for “distinguished” scholar, much like we have in the Outstanding/Distinguished Educator categories.