

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, August 31, 2018

Present in Alva: Dr. Earnest, Dr. James, Mr. Kelsey, Dr. Maharry, Dr. Mahieu, Dr. Mead, Dr. Oswald, Dr. Place, Dr. Riegel

Present in Enid: Dr. Hawkins (Absent: Dr. Mackie)

Dr. Riegel welcomes the group, particularly the new people in the Faculty Senate (Drs. James & Hawkins)

OLD/CONTINUING BUSINESS

Minutes: Minutes from the March 28, 2018 meeting were approved via email.

The Teach-In: As the candidates are now known, it is agreed that planning should begin in earnest. There is general consensus that student groups should assist the project, particularly CORE and SOEA. As members of the Faculty Senate are also the Faculty Advisors of these groups, communication should go smoothly. Dr. Oswald has available money and has spoken with NEA officials to confirm the use of this money for refreshments. Dr. Place says CORE can help with expenses. Dr. Oswald points out that her \$250 should cover costs (refreshments), and that we must reserve a sufficiently large ITV room. There is a discussion of possibilities, primarily focusing on Alva rooms IE 129 & 130, as well as a large room in Enid (per Dr. Hawkins). Dr. Riegel will speak with Assoc. Vice President Valencia and Dr. Pecha. The date is Thursday, Oct. 11th, and the time of day is yet to be determined. Dr. Oswald points out that the actual date and time may depend upon the availability of the invited speakers. Dr. Riegel will look into the issues with the help of Valencia & Pecha and then get back to us. As for a panel, there is general agreement that it should include administration, faculty, & students, and that Dr. Mackie should be the moderator. Dr. Earnest suggests the SGA might participate as greeters. Other suggestions mention Political Science majors and Service-Learning Committee members. Dr. Oswald points out the need for involving the community and suggests that a community representative be on the panel; Dr. Maharry suggests the Superintendent of Alva Public Schools, Tim Argo. In his absence, Dr. Mackie sent a number of “ideas/thoughts” that include a fuller list of people to involve. Dr. Riegel notes the need for advertising (Valencia) & for a listing on the student calendar (V. Case). Dr. Earnest points out that our choices should reflect ethics & balanced representation. Dr. Riegel closes this section of the meeting and will follow up with the senate as the event develops.

NEW BUSINESS

2019-2020 Academic Calendar

Dr. Riegel canvasses the group’s reaction to the preliminary Academic Calendar for 2019-2020, pointing out that Dr. Hannaford is waiting for our response. We note positively, the requested four-week winter break and the problematic, but acceptable, one-week of class after Thanksgiving Break – Mr. Kelsey moves to accept the calendar, and Dr. Place seconds. The motion passes.

Faculty Handbook Wording regarding MFA

Next topic of business is the proposed change to the Faculty Handbook wording regarding acceptance of the MFA as a terminal degree. There is a good deal of discussion. Dr. Place asks why we don’t stay with what the discipline requires and specify that the designation of terminal degree apply only to visual arts and theater. Dr. Riegel notes the problem of hiring a person to teach in one discipline and then allowing that person to teach in another. Dr. Earnest points to problems of inconsistency with awarding the rank of assistant professor prior to completion of the doctorate (or MFA) and also notes that such changes can effect tenure. In addition, the question is asked, “How can an MFA receive an assistant professorship and people on route to PhDs remain at a lower rank?” Drs. Earnest, Maharry, and Mead point out that faculty working on their doctorates cannot get a higher position-designation until the end of that process, and that this lack of reward negatively affects people’s commitment and loyalty,

especially when new hires are given these designations. Dr. Maharry asks how much of this policy is under our control, and whether or not the regents have some overall guidelines regarding this issue. Our understanding is that many of our sister institutions have much different tenure track requirements. All agree there must be greater clarification.

Dr. Riegel sums up: Unanimous recommendation that any such change include specific language as to when the MFA is terminal (such as “NWOSU recognizes the MFA as a terminal degree within Visual Arts and Theater”).

Questions/issues arising from the discussion:

We would like more discussion/explanation regarding the hiring of ABD candidates with the title of assistant professor while current instructors working toward a degree do not receive the same consideration. We would like administration to consider the balance between more recognition/support for existing faculty compared to new hires when both are working toward doctorates.

The Senate would appreciate more information regarding extent to which regent guidelines affects hiring and tenure policies. Much of the language of tenure and hiring at NWOSU seem out of date with the current educational system and/or confusing to faculty. How much authority for change does Northwestern have with regards those policies?

Questions for Administration

Facility Issues: In terms of facility issues, there are general questions or procedure and priority. Dr. Mead pointed out that chairs meet with administration and voice input, but administration prioritizes. Drs. Maharry and Earnest ask how this prioritizing relates to capital campaign plans. In addition, does the department chair become the building representative who is responsible for bringing facility issues (e.g. bathroom repair, leaking windows, crumbling paint, etc.) to administration? Furthermore, we wonder if chairs spend too much time in this capacity? Consensus is that operating costs are not to be used for repairs, however this does happen for small expenses (as has a faculty member using personal funds). Dr. Place says we should also be aware that donors give money to specific projects, such as a clock tower, and that this money cannot be used for other purposes. Dr. Mead agrees that this is the case for development – they can designate how monies will be spent. Dr. Hawkins states that Dean McMillan does this planning in Enid and that there have been several facility issues in the last year. There is general agreement that we need much more communication about facility issues and their funding, particularly since these can become serious health/safety issues. Dr. Oswald points out that people from administration were on campus helping to bail water during the recent flooding in the Education Center and thanks them for their willingness to pitch in and help.

Some general questions resulting from the discussion: How are decisions being made about the choice of improvements? Where does money for these improvements come from? When it comes to capital campaign funds do we (the faculty) have any input on how undesignated funds are spent? Can faculty be included more in communications about facility repairs and updates as they are considered and/or scheduled? This would in particular include receiving more information about the capital campaign (what has been planned, what is funded, are there undesignated funds, etc.).

“Can faculty protest a grade change?”: Dr. Maharry explains the process about grade changes & there is general discussion. Dr. Mead clarifies that the appeals process can be initiated by a faculty member as well as by a student. Input from students as well as faculty are considered by the Academic Affairs Appeals Committee. There is general agreement that if a grade is changed by someone other than the instructor that there should be communication to the instructor that an over-ride has occurred as well as an explanation.

Pay Raise: There are questions regarding the 2.5 % pay raise. Is it a permanent change? Is this considered a rate change or a bonus? Is it for faculty or staff? There is further discussion regarding base pay. Will our salaries rise in relation to the increase in teachers’ pay in Oklahoma? With so much

turnover, will negotiations above the pay salary mean new hires regularly make more than existing faculty?

Campus Hours: Dr. Earnest, Mr. Kelsey, and others call attention to a recurring topic of discussion: the issue of the number of hours that faculty are expected to spend on campus. Dr. Earnest points out that the handbook mentions only ten office hours; however, there is the expectation that faculty will be on campus for a complete “work week.”

The issue of campus hours has also raised a question for chairs who have been given minimal guidance but are expected to hold their department members accountable. A chair asked for clarification about when a faculty member is required to fill out leave of absence forms when off campus? (any half day? Missing a single office hour? Missing a class for a campus or committee event? Etc.) Other questions we have, “should chairs be forced to police their faculty?” and “why do some people get special or adjusted hours, and others don’t?”

Dr. Mead points out that if a faculty member does not fill out the leave for, and the faculty member is injured off campus, there may be an issue with insurance. Both Drs. Mead and Maharry point out that the administration supports flexibility in allowing the chairs to make case-by-case decisions. Dr. Mead shares his methods for dealing with expectations – both the chair and the faculty member must agree to a written statement/contract outlining department expectations.

The question is asked, “What do other universities do?” Dr. Riegel responds that our earlier investigations of sister institutions (2015) focused specifically on office hours, not campus hours, work insurance, or leave of absence forms.

Related to the issue of campus hours is time for research. For many faculty members research happens off-campus to avoid interruption. If the policy requires faculty to be on campus for a standard work week, how can we expect faculty to also pursue scholarly research? This is particularly worrying to some faculty in light of the new push to report and record faculty research (referencing the recent “Tracking Faculty Research” email from Dr. Holliday). Do faculty members need to communicate when/where they are off-campus but working on research?

Dr. Hawkins highlights another aspect of the issue of time commitments by pointing out that a faculty member may satisfy the number of hours (if the goal is a 40-hour week) well before the number of days. This is especially common for faculty who teach evening classes or labs. He also reiterated another important aspect of this issue, that of virtual instruction and the time invested in communicating with students throughout the day.

Dr. Earnest points out the importance of faculty involvement in community and campus events, which also requires time.

All agree that communication between chairs and faculty is pivotal as is communication between chairs and the administration. We agree that flexibility is necessary, however it also seems that there may be less flexibility in practice than is actually desired by the faculty. The question of how to achieve the desired flexibility while also maintaining fairness across the institution is an issue that needs further exploration.

Hearing no other new business, Dr. Riegel accepts Dr. Oswald move to adjourn; Dr. Mead seconds; and the meeting closes.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, October 5, 2018

- Present in Alva (FA229): Dr. Earnest, Dr. James, Mr. Kelsey, Dr. Maharry, Dr. Mahieu, Dr. Mead, Dr. Oswald, Dr. Place, Dr. Riegel – the group is joined by Assoc. Vice President Steven Valencia.
- Present in Enid (Enid Conf Rm): Dr. Hawkins, Dr. Mackie.

Dr. Riegel welcomes the group in Alva at 11 am; Enid is unable to fully connect. Dr. Steven Palmer, who is scheduled to join the group for the Athletic Advisory Board discussions, is not present. As Mr. Valencia is present, Dr. Riegel opens the meeting and moves to the second point on the agenda, the Teach-In.

OLD/CONTINUING BUSINESS

The Teach-In

Dr. Riegel poses the question of a date for the Teach-In. Mr. Valencia points out that since Legislative sessions begin Monday, Feb. 4th, the Teach-In should probably be in January, and in the evening. Dr. Earnest suggests we correlate with the Chamber of Commerce's schedule, and Dr. Oswald notes that we will be back in Alva on Jan. 14th when classes resume. At this point, Enid connects – without sound. The discussion continues regarding the choice of a date; Mr. Valencia emphasizes the value of having a specific date, rather than a range of possibilities. Once again, the Enid connection falters, but is secure by 11:23 am with Drs. Hawkins and Mackie joining the group. January 21st (MLK Day) seems possible, but Dr. Mackie points out that Edmondson participates in an OKC event on that day. Mr. Valencia states that getting a newly elected governor to visit will be difficult on that day and asks if we would be better served going for local officials? Dr. Riegel confirms that we would like to include the governor. Following general discussion, the choice of a possible date settles on Friday January 25th. In order to make it possible for more students to attend, the time is set at noon to 2 pm. Dr. Mackie mentions a similar Teach-In at UCO. Mr. Valencia comments that ours will focus on higher education and related policy, and not on general legislation and platforms. There is group agreement. As invitations will depend on the election, Dr. Riegel asks the group to nail down the format. Dr. Place suggests we make it like a previous state question 777 event in which each panelist talks a few minutes and then there are questions. Dr. Mackie agrees that this format has been used with success by CORE in the past. He indicated that members of the audience could write out questions (indicating to whom the question be directed), which the moderator would pose to the panelists. There would be a Legislative Panel and a Northwestern one with a schedule something like the following:

- 20-30 minutes for Legislative Panelist Presentations,
- 20-30 minutes for Northwestern Concerns,
- 20-30 minutes for Q & A.

Mr. Valencia asks what our focus will be, and Dr. Mackie responds that it will definitely be on Higher Education. Dr. Riegel says the invitation should state that the focus of the Teach-In will be on a) Higher Education Policy & its future and b) Funding. Dr. Earnest adds Needs of the

Future, and Dr. Riegel asks if there are any other points. Dr. Mackie responds that our questions and focus will likely depend on who wins the various elections. Mr. Valencia makes it clear the Administration will not be willing to venture past policy discussions. Dr. Riegel asks if we are all comfortable with the focus on Higher Education, re-caps the discussion, and asks Mr. Valencia if this is sufficient information to go forward with the invitations. He responds positively and says that he will write up preliminary draft of the invitation to show to the Faculty Senate. He also reminds us to include local groups, the Regents office, and RUSO members. Dr. Mackie asks if the Teach-In will be on ITV, and Dr. Riegel responds that earlier discussion agreed that an in-person meeting in Herod Hall would be preferable. Mr. Valencia suggests that since Herod can be cavernous for a smaller crowd, we keep EC109 as an alternative; all agree. As there is no more discussion, this section of business closes and Mr. Valencia leaves.

Athletic Advisory Board

Dr. Riegel discusses the need to appoint three Faculty members to the Athletic Advisory Board and sums up who is eligible and interested. "We will need to appoint 3 Faculty members to the board. One for School of Arts & Sciences, one for Professional Studies/Education, and one at-large member.

- The School of Arts & Sciences seat was held by Matt Adair. As Matt has served two consecutive terms, he is NOT eligible for reappointment.
- The School of Professional Studies/School of Education seat was held by W. David Hawkins. David has not served two consecutive terms and is eligible for reappointment.
- The at-large seat was held by Jennifer Mahieu. Jennifer is eligible for reappointment as she was filling an unexpired term of a faculty member who left last year.
- The following faculty members will be entering the second year of their term on the advisory board: Mary Riegel, Chandler Mead and Shane Hansen.
- "Ralph Bourret has expressed interest in serving on the board. (PS/Ed or at-large)" [quote from Dr. Riegel's email of 9/25/18 2:53 PM]

In response, Dr. Maharry moves that Jennifer Mahieu be reappointed to the At-Large seat; Dr. James seconds; and the motion carries. Discussion moves to the Arts & Sciences seat. Dr. Place suggests Dr. Richmond Adams, and Dr. Riegel names Dr. Dena Walker as a supporter of Ranger Athletics. Dr. Maharry moves that Dr. Walker be appointed; the motion is seconded by Dr. Mackie. After receiving acceptance from Dr. Walker, the motion passes. As Dr. Bourret expressed interest in a seat, Dr. Mackie moves that he be appointed; this is seconded by Dr. Place; and the motion carries.

Minutes from the 8/31/2018 meeting. Dr. Riegel asks for input on the minutes which were distributed via email after the last meeting. Dr. Mahieu moves we accept; Dr. James seconds; and the motion carries.

Administrative Update

Dr. Riegel states that she and Dr. Place met with Drs. Cunningham and Hannaford and that the following points were covered.

- ✓ The 2019-2020 Academic Calendar has been finalized.

- ✓ The Administration has agreed to the changes in language regarding the MFA, which will now apply specifically to the areas of Visual Arts and Theater.
- ✓ In regard to Northwestern's Tenure Policy, the Administration indicated that it is almost entirely determined by RUSO and the Regents and that we only have minor input into wording the in the handbook.
- ✓ Administration appreciated our questions about capital funding versus the Capital Campaign, and indicated that more communication regarding project funding would be a positive addition. As of the meeting they indicated \$25.5 million on the books with 3 million pending.
- ✓ Dr. Riegel has spoken with Mr. 'Skeeter' Bird, who will discuss the specifics of projects with the Faculty Senate at our November meeting.
- ✓ The salary increases mentioned at the all campus meeting will begin this fall. Dr. Cunningham indicated that this permanent increase will apply to both faculty and staff in recognition of their efforts.
- ✓ Dr. Cunningham pointed out that several legislators are looking at raises for Higher Education, and that this will be a topic for the Legislature in the coming year. The outlook is positive.
- ✓ Returning from a recent meeting with other university vice-presidents, Dr. Hannaford stated that he wanted to focus on better communication and would soon be talking with Chairs about creating a set of Best Practices for campus hours. He cautioned all to not push so hard that we find ourselves regulated by inflexible rules. Dr. Maharry points out that the next All-Chairs meeting is October 24.
- ✓ Dr. Riegel states that the Administration would entertain changes to handbook language if there are specific issues we would like to address at future meetings. There is no further discussion of this topic.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Earnest notes that the wording for her area's course descriptions had not been changed in the latest catalog, despite recent re-editing, and asked if any other areas had experienced this. Dr. Mead points out that such catalog revisions should happen regularly. It is suggested that such editing may be on hold due to the transition to new Ellucian software and services system. The discussion leads on to include the topic of Program Modifications, and Dr. Maharry points out that modification of program requirements also requires Regents approval, all other changes are open to us. Drs. Maharry and Mead share the general process for making catalog changes and conclude that the issue may be in not being afforded the opportunity to perform one last digital check after the hard-copy edits are submitted. It was determined that Dr. Riegel would pass a request on to administration that this final digital check be offered to the chairs prior to the catalog going to print.

With no further new business the meeting adjourned after a motion by Dr. Mahieu and a second from Dr. Mead.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Monday, November 19, 2018

- Present in Alva (EC201): Dr. Earnest, Dr. James, Mr. Kelsey, Dr. Maharry, Dr. Mahieu, Dr. Mead, Dr. Oswald, Dr. Place, and Dr. Riegel.
 - The group is joined by Dr. Steven Palmer, Chair of the Athletic Advisory Board and NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative, and Mr. Skeeter Bird, Chief Executive Officer of the Northwestern Foundation and Alumni Association, and later, by Dr. Kay Decker, Chair of the Department of Social Sciences.
- Present in Enid (Enid Conf Rm): Dr. Hawkins, Dr. Mackie.

Dr. Riegel opens the meeting by connecting to Enid, welcoming the group, and moving to the first item on the agenda.

Items Involving Invited Guests

Athletic Advisory Board and the Athletics Department with Dr. Steven Palmer

Dr. Palmer takes the floor to update the group regarding his activities as NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative. He explains that at the end of each competitive season student-athletes of all varsity sports fill out exit surveys, and that over 80% stated that their experience in the program was positive, and that 35% “strongly agreed” to its worth. He tells the group that he recently attended the Faculty Athletic Association meeting and shares the following information.

- There was discussion about adding mental health questions to the exit surveys.
- A Spring 2018 Faculty Survey regarding student-athletes was presented and he can share this as a PowerPoint.
- The GPA of student-athletes was a mean 3.0 overall, with lowest team average of a 2.7 for football players.
- The 6-year graduation rate was higher for student-athletes than regular students, and the student-athletes graduated in less time.

Dr. Palmer asks if the group has questions or issues. Dr. Place states that he would like responses from coaches when he indicates this on the student-athletes’ academic progress checks. Dr. Palmer says he will help make better connections. Dr. Mead points out that an effort needs to be made to tell advisors to put athletes in ‘classes with labs’ only in off-season semesters. Dr. Earnest adds that when student-athletes are ‘released’ from the team, they often go on to miss classes more frequently (or even stop coming to class at all). Drs. Palmer and Mead discuss this and agree that this could be brought to the attention of Brad Franz, Director of Athletics. In closing, Dr. Palmer urges everyone to attend the athletic events.

Capital Campaign with Mr. Skeeter Bird

As Dr. Decker joins the group, Dr. Riegel opens the floor to Mr. Bird, who passes out “Imagine Campaign” folders of information to all. Mr. Bird speaks about the University’s

mission, pointing out that his office works to match donors' passions with Northwestern's needs, an effort that can happen quickly, or long term. He points out that this is our first capital campaign, and that development meetings, involving all senior staff along with the foundation, happen weekly. The campaign has evolved over time; the goal has grown from \$20 to 28 million (we are currently at just under \$26 million in pledges, planned gifts, etc.). As an example of how this process happens, Skeeter points out that certain projects were added as the interest developed. Projects added after the initial phases of the campaign include the robotic lab, education labs, and the nursing program. The majority of the moneys already pledged/collected will be spent in the next 6-9 months on projects either currently underway or in the bidding phase. Undesignated funds go in to endowments or buildings – not operations.

Dr. Mackie asks about gifts with matches from the state. Is the state still committed to the match? Skeeter discusses the rules regarding matches and states that the money will eventually be matched, but that there is a back-log. Mr. Kelsey points out that the un-met matching funds for the Citizenship Institute in the Social Sciences Department are an example. Drs. Decker and Earnest comment further.

Mr. Bird points out that we are currently raising money for the Mall Project, which has been broken up into smaller 'bites' in order to more easily connect with donors. In addition, there is an 'ask' in progress for Herod Hall. The Foundation is definitely open to further proposals for the campaign. Mr. Bird and Dr. Maharry discuss the Robotics Lab and point out that the proposal grew from a one-time support to a more encompassing program that involves taking students to robotics shows. Dr. Maharry shares his positive experience at presenting to the Kiwanis Club and the response of Mr. Buckles. Mr. Bird points out that the process of fund-raising is complex and should involve all of us. For example, we should make an effort to let donors know how important their gifts are. He asks if there are questions or comments. Dr. Earnest asks if it is possible to include heated sidewalks in the mall proposals, and Skeeter replies that he will talk to his funding groups. He shares that the Foundation will be making a video regarding the mall (combining virtual reality renderings with a current walk-through video) and mentions the cost of this production. Dr. Decker suggests contacting Matt Adair in Mass Com for a cheaper bid, and Skeeter responds that the Foundation must work through the architect's office. Dr. Mead asks if connections are being made to the people whose names were on the bricks of the old fountain. Skeeter says yes and points out the importance of making more personal, face-to-face contacts. Dr. Earnest asks about bringing proposals to weekly development meetings, and Skeeter suggests going through Dr. Bell or Dr. Hannaford. Mr. Bird urges us to bring our ideas and proposals. Dr. Riegel asks if there are further questions. Receiving none, Skeeter leaves, and Dr. Riegel turns the floor over to Dr. Decker.

Standing Committees with Dr. Kay Decker

Dr. Decker poses a question for the group. How does committee work really relate to what we say in portfolios? She shares that she has been at NWOSU for some time, serving as a member, or chair, of numerous committees, and that she has noted a change in faculty commitment to committee work. Many faculty members either do not understand their obligation to these committees, or do not, because of location or other duties, have the

ability to carry out these commitments. She points out that there have indeed been many changes during her tenure at the University – people have more obligations (University service, scholarship), the faculty has grown larger, there are different approaches to teaching, etc. Nevertheless, she notes a disengagement from committee work. Dr. Earnest agrees that faculty are often involved in activities, such as recruitment, that absorb a great deal of time. Dr. Decker points out that, yes, there are often so many duties involved in something like accreditation activities that there is no way a faculty person could also chair an institutional committee effectively. She asks if it is time that we, as an institution, review the committee system, perhaps in terms of actual committees or the number of people expected to participate. Dr. Earnest points out that we are adding faculty that are only here virtually. Drs. Mahieu, Mead, and Decker continue the conversation about these changes. It seems that in the many years they have all been at Northwestern there has been not been a change in the evaluation process or expectations to match the changes in the roles of the professorship. There are several questions posed by members of the group: Does the 3-legged stool model still apply? Do we need to rethink how people are assigned to standing committees? Are there restrictions (or unwritten expectations) that faculty members with certain roles will not chair a committee (or sit on committees of higher work load)? For example, some had heard that faculty in accredited programs (education, social work, etc.) are not expected/allowed to chair standing committees? Dr. Decker asks “how can we reach a more authentic expectation of faculty service and engagement?” Dr. Riegel indicates that she will open this conversation with the administration at the next meeting and that this will likely be an issue that we will need to continue discussing in the coming year. With no further discussion Dr. Decker is thanked for bringing the issue to the senate and departs.

Dr. Riegel calls for new business or outstanding questions.

Outstanding questions:

Dr. Earnest asks after parking enforcement and the situation of parking tickets/warnings being issued. Dr. Riegel replies that she was not able to get any sort of formal response involving a policy of patrolling/ticketing but that she can follow up again about the issue. Dr. Earnest would like an update about the status of the discussion on campus hours. If there was any consensus reached at the chairs meeting or if there are any other updates that should be sent on to the faculty as a whole. We understand that administration (and others) are reluctant to have a formal written policy that will eliminate the option for flexibility, but we would still like there to be more communication about the policy or any discussions that were had.

New Business:

Dr. James has questions regarding the course evaluation process and in particular the logistics involved in missing half of a class session to have course evaluations. This is disruptive to the class schedule, and if you have multiple sections who evaluate on different days can lead to problems in aligning sections. Also why must faculty take their students to a separate building if there is a computer lab available in their own building? It also seems problematic that students have access to all of their evaluations at the same time so in

many cases by the end of the evaluation period you may have a class where most of the students have already done the evaluation for the course. Students also don't necessarily understand the importance of the evaluations or how/when they will be used/available to the faculty member. There is also the issue of how different evaluations are that take place at the beginning of the hour (so not time to talk to your class about the evaluation process) vs taking them at the half-hour which allows you to take time before they are sent to talk to them about the process. Several suggestions are made by the group in how to approach the evaluation process:

- Lock the student out of the system after each evaluation for a period time (or at least force a logoff process). This could discourage a student from attempting all evaluations at once.
- Allow/encourage students to do their evaluations independently. (We understand that there are issues with getting a good response group using this technique). Maybe place a registration hold for the next semester until they are completed?
- Discuss course evaluations in Ranger connection so that students would understand the process/use of evaluations before they take place.
- Set a day/time where all students do evaluations. (may be an issue with computer availability with this option).

Hearing no further discussion Dr. Riegel adjourns the meeting thanking the senate for their work during the year.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes **Wednesday, January 23, 2019**

- ✓ **Present in Alva:** Dr. Kathy Earnest, Dr. Dr. Richmond Adams, Dr. Mary Riegel, Dr. Christie Riley, Dr. Roxie James, Dr. Tim Maharry, Dr. Jen Oswald, Dr. Aaron Place
 - ✓ **Present in Enid:** Dr. Steven Mackie, Ms. Jennifer Pribble
- Absent: Dr. Jennifer Mahieu

Dr. Place opens the meeting at 4:00 pm and asks members to address a point of new business first—the election of new officers.

Election of New Officers

- ✓ Dr. Mackie moves that Dr. James serves the 1-year Secretary term. Dr. Maharry seconds. Dr. James accepts, and the motion carries.
- ✓ Dr. Earnest moves that Dr. Riegel serve the 2-year commitment for Vice-President/President-Elect. Dr. James seconds. Dr. Riegel accepts, and the motion carries.

Old/Continuing Business

- ✓ Dr. Place announces that the minutes of the 19 November 2018 meeting were approved via email.
- ✓ Dr. Place announces that the Teach-In has been postponed indefinitely due to lack of interest on the part of the elected officials. There was discussion about holding it in late spring or next fall.
- ✓ Drs. Place and Riegel met with Dr. Cunningham and administration on 17 December 2018, and the following points were covered:
 - The Teach-In
 - Course Catalogue: the administration says that faculty should let their department chairs know if they see anything needing correction in the course catalogue.
 - Standing Committees: The administration agrees that there should be a review of the whole process regarding standing committees. Further, administration acknowledges that non-standing committees are just as important in terms of Faculty responsibilities and they should be reflected in the Faculty Evaluation process.
 - Course Evaluations: There is a plan to provide students with a link to take their course evaluations via their mobile devices. This plan is being piloted this spring with the hope that it can be fully implemented in the fall. Faculty will be asked to proctor for other members of their departments in order to avoid the need to move to a computer lab while maintaining an environment conducive to accurate evaluations.
 - Parking: In terms of the parking issue, it would help if we could succinctly identify handicapped spots, there will be a review and there may be new signs or painting done to clarify those zones.
 - Campus Hours: It was again noted that NWOSU falls within the middle of two extremes. Administration feels that it is more beneficial to have no written policy

regarding the matter, and instead work on having better communication between chairs and faculty.

New Business

- ✓ Dr. Place welcomes new and returning senators: Jennifer Pribble, Richmond Adams, Christie Riley, Jennifer Mahieu, Mary Riegel.
- ✓ Teach-In: Dr. Place questions whether in lieu of the Teach-in might we pen an Op-Ed to be published in a major paper to bring awareness to issues we intended to address with the Teach-in? There is general consensus that we need to call attention to the state of higher education because there is a lot of talk about K-12, but not a lot of talk about us. There is a general thought that perhaps we could use the Op-Ed piece to get people thinking about the issues we wanted to address at the Teach-In. Dr. Earnest questions if there was anything coming out of the Regent's office that might aid us. Dr. Mackie stresses that we need to something. Dr. Earnest notes that Mr. Valencia had a sort of Op-Ed piece in the Alva news. Dr. Place questions if we can retool Valencia's article for our purposes. Dr. Mackie explains exactly why we initially began pushing for the Teach-In and indicates that the timing may have passed for that method to be effective, however there still needs to be some form of outlet for information about this issue. Dr. Riley suggests that we also address the public perception of college professors and what it is we do. There was a general consensus for this. Drs. Place and Riegel will discuss our options regarding such a publication with the administration. As there was no more discussion, this section of business closes with a note that we will readdress it at February meeting.
- ✓ Library Staff: Dr. Place explains that the Library faculty operates in a sort of "no-man's" land in that they are not eligible to serve on faculty senate (because they do not teach a full load), and they are technically not eligible to vote (although this time they did vote as part of the Professional Studies). Dr. Place also explains that the library has four individuals with the title of non-tenure track Assistant Professors. He opens the floor for discussion about where exactly the library faculty belong. Dr. Maharry notes that the Library faculty does not really fit in with the rest of faculty, and there is general agreement with his statement. Several points/suggestions were given:
 - We could change their official title
 - We could change what being a full time faculty member details
 - We could change the wording in the constitution to state "teaching" faculty with a clear definition of hours taught (For this to happen, we would have to propose the change and have faculty vote on it)
 - We could rework/clarify librarian positions in the flow chart
 - We could ask administration their thoughts on where the library faculty would fall, and leave it in their hands
 - It is noted, though, that if we remove them from the purview of faculty senate they will still have representation in the Professional Staff Council under that body's by-laws.
 - Drs. Place and Riegel will discuss the matter with administration for their input on how to proceed.

- ✓ Retirees: Dr. Earnest states that there is a lack in human resources information communicated to retirees—specifically during the option period. She relates the story of a retiree who was contacted by the insurance company just prior to the deadline for enrollment. The retiree was frustrated by the short notice as he had no idea of the changes that came about in the new enrollment period. The insurance company put it back on Northwestern to include all demographics in notifications of insurance changes. Dr. Earnest suggests that perhaps the administration simply needs to be made aware of the issue. There is then a general discussion about how Northwestern handles retired faculty, and several suggestions were put forward. Overall, we felt that there should be some communication mechanism for retirees. Dr. Earnest notes that perhaps that can be allowed to keep their school email, and then receive updates and notification that way. Dr. Mackie suggests that Dr. Earnest bring the issue to ‘Skeeter’ Bird as this may also affect alumni and future donations.
- ✓ Independent Study: Dr. James asks if there is any way for faculty to have independent study be recognized as part of faculty course load. Dr. Place notes that the science department recognized it in the past, but at some point administration stopped this. A general discussion of independent studies follows. It is noted that if we were to recognize it in the faculty course load, and the faculty is then overloaded, then compensation becomes an issue, particularly if faculty are consistently overloading with independent study courses. It is also questioned whether faculty could perhaps “bank” independent study hours to add towards a sabbatical. Dr. Maharry explains that in the math department they have turned independent study into a class by more regularly running a 4180 Special Topics course that has variable hours and that can be substituted in for some courses that may be needed by the student.
- ✓ Hearing no further discussion, Dr. Place adjourns the meeting at 4:50 pm.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes **Thursday, February 14, 2019**

- ✓ **Present in Alva:** Dr. Kathy Earnest, Dr. Dr. Richmond Adams, Dr. Mary Riegel, Dr. Jennifer Mahieu, Dr. Christie Riley, Dr. Roxie James, Dr. Tim Maharry, Dr. Jen Oswald, Dr. Aaron Place
- ✓ **Present in Enid:** Dr. Steven Mackie, Ms. Jennifer Pribble

Old/Continuing Business

- ✓ Dr. Place opens the meeting at 11:04 am and moves to approve the January 23rd minutes as amended via email. Hearing no objections, the minutes are approved.
- ✓ Drs. Place and Riegel met with administration, and the following points were covered:
 - The Teach-In is currently tabled; however, administration is fine with faculty representation at the “Eggs and Issues” event. Administration is also fine with faculty writing an op-ed piece, as long as we go through Mr. Valencia and University Relations.
 - Dr. Hannaford will speak with Mrs. Leaper concerning the library staff, but indicated his belief that library faculty would fit better on Professional Staff Council.
 - Concerning the lack of communication between the University and retirees, it was noted that retirees fall under the purview of the HR department. Dr. Riley stated that retirees do keep their current email addresses. Dr. Riegel clarified that this was only true as long as the employee was retiring and not quitting. She further clarified that the concept of retirees keeping their emails was fairly new. There was general discussion about talking with Craig Ricke about establishing an email listserv for retirees. The discussion concluded with the note that HR is perhaps not as informed as they should be about the retiree issue (possibly due to the high turnover rate of the department). Furthermore, Administration had indicated they will work with staff involved in the retirement process to create a centralized check list.
 - Dr. Hannaford stated that he will be looking into the independent study issue. In particular, that he would look into how much it is being used across campus and the potential budgetary issues involved in some form of compensation.
 - Administration also talked of the piloting of the new student assessment using phones and tablet this spring.
- There was further discussion concerning standing committees. Dr. Hannaford mentioned in the meeting with him and Dr. Cunningham that all of the standing committees were necessary, but they may need to be ranked by how “busy” they are. Further it was noted that serving on an ad-hoc committee still counts as committee work. There was then general discussion amongst senators about how we would go about ranking how “busy” a committee was (Do we look at how often they meet? Do we look at their minimum number of meetings?). Dr. Riegel clarified that there are typically 1-2 standing committees assigned to each faculty member. Dr. Maharry noted that there needed to be a rephrasing of the rubric, and questioned how we would assess participation. Dr. Riegel suggested that perhaps the committee chair could report on

committee member involvement, but also recognized that this would mean more work for committee chairs. It was further suggested that the FEAD committee may need to take on this issue going forward. Dr. Mackie questioned if a faculty could be allowed to serve on one less committee if they are the faculty sponsor of an active student organization (as some organizations take up a lot of time). Dr. Riegel explained that in the past faculty would email Debbie Skinner if they had other extenuating commitments, and the attempt would be made to reflect those commitments in their committee assignments. However, both Drs. Place and Riegel stressed that if faculty did not submit a committee request, then they would get put wherever needed. There was then a general discussion about how committee work affects faculty.

- Dr. Place opened the floor for discussion about writing an Op-Ed piece, and asked for volunteers to help draft the piece. Drs. Mackie, Adams, and Place agreed to help draft the piece. There was then a discussion about Higher Ed. Day and the fact that the house passed school safety bill 2597. A few faculty senators stated that they wanted to speak with administration to see their reaction to the passing of that bill as well as their opinions of how Higher Ed. Day was perceived by the legislature. There was also discussion about brushing up on legislation that affects higher education. Dr. Adams gave an elaboration of some of the logistics of the constitutional carry bill. There was then a brief discussion about safety on campus. The discussion ended with Dr. Mackie asking for a meeting with those who went to Higher Ed. Day, and Dr. Place stating that he will find out who went.

New Business

- ✓ **Eggs and Issues:** Dr. Place announced that “Eggs and Issues with State Legislators” would be held on Friday, February 15 at 8:00 am in the Student Center. Dr. Mackie wanted to know who would be there. Dr. Place stated that it would be Rep. Carl Newton, Senator Casey Murdoch, and a 3rd person (but he was not sure who). Drs. Place, Maharry, and Adams announced that they would be able to attend the meeting. Dr. Mackie stated that he plans to go to the meeting, but it would depend on the weather and driving conditions. Dr. Adams presented a list of questions for the Legislators, and Dr. Place made a call for any other specifics that we may want to present to them. There was then a general discussion about what type of information we could present to the legislators. Senators noted that it is Higher Education’s turn for attention now, and that there is often misinformation about what college professors do. Dr. Earnest suggested that we establish and emphasize a distinction between the Regents for OU and OSU, and the Regents for regional universities. Further, she suggested that we clarify the Regents system and questioned whether it was a safe assumption to believe that our elected officials would know the difference. Several faculty senators were not so sure that they did. Dr. Mackie suggested speaking to the state Chamber of Commerce. Dr. Earnest noted that we are bearing the brunt of all of the attention being put on OU, with people not realizing the difference between research and teaching universities. Dr. Mackie suggested that we should be telling the story of what it means to be a regional university. Dr. Place mentioned that perhaps we could do a sort of “Day in the Life of a Professor,” but he was also worried that that sort of piece may come across as “whiney.” Dr. Place then announced that he had never attended an “Eggs and Issues” event before, and Dr. Earnest then explained what attendees could expect.

- ✓ Side bar issue: Dr. Earnest announced that the Diversity Training on March 12th would focus on financial aid.
- ✓ Parking: Dr. Place announced that he had received another complaint about parking from a faculty member. He did not want to beleaguer the point, but the faculty member did suggest that perhaps the University could allow faculty to pay for a parking sticker that would give them access to a restricted lot (or designated parking space). There was then a general discussion about parking. Many senators noted that parking enforcement needs to be more stringent. Dr. Maharry questioned if campus police could access DMV records—he was not sure if they could. Dr. Place announced that another issue is that when student athletes travel they park in the shared Science/Vinson/Percefull lot leaving their vehicles in place for several days in an already over-use lot. Dr. Earnest noted that faculty are less informed about when things happen on campus that may impact parking than they used to be and requested more communications be sent out about on-campus events.
- ✓ Large Format Displays: The question of more communication lead to our wondering if there are ways to use the LFD's around campus to post such announcements. It was indicated that currently these displays are maintained building by building and there is not much campus wise sharing of information. Would it be possible for there to be regular dissemination of slides pertaining to upcoming events to all buildings?
- ✓ Hearing no further discussion, Dr. Place adjourns the meeting at 11:41 am.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Tuesday, March 26, 2019

- ✓ **Present in Alva:** Dr. Kathy Earnest, Dr. Mary Riegel, Dr. Jennifer Mahieu, Dr. Roxie James, Dr. Tim Maharry, Dr. Jen Oswald, Dr. Aaron Place (Absent: Dr. Adams, Dr. Riley)
- ✓ **Present in Enid:** Dr. Steven Mackie, Ms. Jennifer Pribble

Old/Continuing Business

- ✓ Dr. Place opens the meeting at 11:03 am and moves to approve the February 14th minutes sent via email.
- ✓ Drs. Place and Riegel met with administration. The following points were covered:
 - Op-Ed piece: Administration is fine with senators writing the op-ed piece. Dr. Hannaford provided resources from the RUSO dashboard and other sources.
 - Standing Committees: Administration announced that there will be a change in the wording of the faculty handbook. It will now say “All University Committees” rather than “Standing Committees.”
 - Gun Bill: Dr. Cunningham announced that she does not support the gun bill, but she also is not concerned with its passing as the University will not be affected by the bill.
 - Eggs and Issues: The next “Eggs and Issues” event will be held on April 19th.
 - TV Displays: Administration says that we should speak to Dean Mosburg about better utilization practices for the TV displays around campus.
 - Student Evals: Performing student evaluations by phone seems to be working very well.
 - Retirement: Administration forwarded our concerns about retirement to the HR department. Hopefully, they will address these issues in a timely manner.
 - New Minor: The University will be instituting a library science minor in the fall. The library staff faculty will be teaching these courses—so now they will be represented by Professional Studies in Faculty Senate.
- ✓ The Op-Ed piece is coming along slowly. Dr. Place announced that the writers should have a draft by the end of the week. Administration was concerned that the writers were going to lambast the legislators in the letter, but Dr. Place assured them that this was not the case and that the letter would in no way be offensive. Dr. Mackie added that Caleb M. submitted additional stats that would be useful for the piece.
- ✓ Parking Survey Summary
 - Dr. Cunningham asked Drs. Place and Riegel to first decide if parking was an issue that the faculty would want us to address. To that end, she suggested that we create a survey that was broad and vague. This first survey was just to establish an issue with parking. We now realize that the concern is there, and we recognize that we need to attack these issues in a more than glancing way. Here are some of the highlights taken from the survey results.
 - 141 faculty and staff members responded to the survey. 56.8% of them agreed that parking is a problem. 63.8% believe that parking is a problem in the lot that they want to be parking in.

- Parking is a non-issue at our remote campuses, but the remote campus faculty members are concerned about parking when they come to the Alva campus.
- The parking lots with the biggest issues are the Horseshoe Lot and the Vinson Hall/Percefull Lot; however, there was more concern with the Horseshoe lot.
- Concerning the Vinson Hall Lot—most of the comments were about the students parking in incorrect spots, and about the way traffic flows in the lot. There was also concern about students with dorm stickers commuting to this lot.
- Concerning the Horseshoe Lot—there is concern that it is unsafe because of the perpendicular parking, and there was a question raised as to whether we could turn the lot into diagonal parking. There was also concern because this is the lot we tend to send visitors to but we have to displace our staff to do so. There was also question about whether or not we can have a designated drop off zone in this lot.
- There was general concern that the stall size across campus is too small.
- Drs. Earnest and Mahieu stated that there is also no good solution for how we handle buses when they come to campus. Dr. Earnest questioned whether or not we could have signage for the buses. Dr. Oswald said that there used to be signage, but it is not there anymore.
- Further, there were comments about drivers backing in/pulling in – making it harder for them to leave, and making it harder to see their parking sticker. To that end, only 25% of the Alva faculty and staff who completed the survey believe that parking is enforced.
- Dr. Place stated that there is no incentive for paying tickets.
- Dr. Mackie questioned whether this would provide a chance to start a wellness campaign where we promoted biking and walking rather than driving. Dr. Place explained that the Wellness Center actually has a budget to encourage things like this. Dr. Mackie also noted the lack of bike racks on campus. There was then discussion about bringing back the CORE project/idea for installing bike racks around campus. Dr. Earnest questioned what happened to the project and volunteered to talk to Richard Burdick about potentially using the Wellness Center funding to maybe revisit the project.
- Overall, the senators felt that the results of the parking survey should be shared with administration.

New Business

- ✓ **Library:** There was a question raised about the availability of library research resources for faculty and students. There was a point made that in some instances faculty was willing to pay for resources for their personal research, but the library was not equipped to address this. It was noted and recognized, however, that part of the reasoning for the lack of resources was due to cost.

- ✓ Tenure: Dr. Place explained that it seems as if department chairs get votes if they're tenured, and explained that this may or may not be problematic is the faculty vote is too close. He suggested that it might be better for the department head to abstain from voting for faculty within their department. Dr. Maharry explained that the department head letter is a new step in the tenure process, and that it is a step required by the regents. He further explained that the chair does not have two votes (rather they just speak to the issue), and that Dr. Cunningham has the ultimate vote regarding tenured faculty. Dr. Riegel explained that the only time this would be an issue is in matters of a tie in the faculty vote. This led to senators raising, perhaps, a better question of what is the tenure policy if there is a tie.
- ✓ Faculty Senate: Dr. Place raised the question of the purpose Faculty Senate and whether or not we were serving it. He explained that the Faculty Senate is supposed to initiate positive changes on campus, and questions if we actually do this. He indicated that the process of making changes can often be hampered by budgetary issue, lack of faculty involvement, and a general unwillingness to try new things. He was curious to know if the other senators felt that they were making changes. The suggestion was made that we look over past minutes of the Senate to search for past issues that had been resolved in order to create a list of changes affected by the Senate.
- ✓ Hearing no further discussion, Dr. Place adjourns the meeting at 12:02 p.m.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Tuesday, April 23, 2019

- ✓ **Present in Alva:** Dr. Kathy Earnest, Dr. Mary Riegel, Dr. Christie Riley, Dr. Roxie James, Dr. Tim Maharry, Dr. Jen Oswald, Dr. Aaron Place (Absent: Dr. Adams and Dr. Mahieu)
- ✓ **Present in Enid:** Dr. Steven Mackie, Ms. Jennifer Pribble

Old/Continuing Business

- ✓ Dr. Place opens the meeting at 4:00 p.m.
- ✓ Dr. Place notes that the minutes of March 26th meeting were approved via email.
- ✓ Drs. Place and Riegel met with administration. The following points were covered:
 - Tenure Review: Drs. Riegel and Place reported there is not a plan in place for the event of a tie vote. Dr. Place explained that Dr. Hannaford was part of a VP group with other regional VP's, and that this VP group was discussing passages related to tenured and non-tenured faculty and cleaning up that language. Dr. Earnest asked when was the last time we looked at upgrades/renewals.
 - Parking Survey: Dr. Riegel provided a summary of results taken from the parking survey. Administration seemed intrigued by the results and would look into implementing changes over the summer. Dr. Earnest stated that she appreciated that we did the survey on parking.
 - Faculty Senate Impact: Dr. Place questioned Faculty Senate's impact on our campus community. The conclusion was that Faculty Senate has made many small changes regarding committees, language, etc., but no "big, sweeping changes." Dr. Riegel commented that Dr. Cunningham appreciates that Faculty Senate helps administration get ahead of things before they become a major issue, and that she does appreciate our input.
 - Library Resources: Administration suggested we invite Shannon Leaper to a Faculty Senate meeting in the fall to discuss library resources and/or the lack there of, and perhaps ask if there is something she can do.
- ✓ The Op-Ed piece was distributed by email on April 22nd. Dr. Place asked if there were any further comments before he sent it to admin for approval. There were none.
- ✓ More news on the retirement process. There is now a retirement checklist that everyone will get upon announcing their intent to retire.
 - Dr. Place explained that when he asked about the retirement process, the take-away message was that it is really important to maintain communication with Cheryl Ellis. Dr. Place also asked about perks, benefits, Emeritus status (which has to be requested and granted by president's office), additional game day passes, subscriptions to the Northwestern News, and membership to the wellness center. However, he was unsure about whether or not faculty kept their emails. Dr. Earnest explained that she thinks retired faculty get to keep their email addresses. Dr. Earnest noted that she also asked about tuition and was told by Dr. Pecha that a faculty member may take a course *tuition free* if auditing; however, if the course is taken for credit the faculty has to pay full price. Dr. Earnest also noted that she learned that retired faculty with Emeritus Status may check out two books at a time from the library.
 - Dr. Earnest then presented senators with a document from a colleague that listed the Emeriti faculty benefits at Southwestern Oklahoma State University and Oklahoma State University. Dr. Riegel added that some additional benefits for retired OSU faculty included requesting office space, unlimited library use, discounts on merchandise, and discounts on parking. Dr.

Earnest announced that she would like retired faculty to have more leeway with library resources, and urged Dr. Riegel to show this list to administration. See below:

Southwestern Oklahoma State University:

Emeriti Faculty have the following benefits:

Courtesy Card into all University Events

Access to all library resources

Receive university newspaper

Office space if requested and access to university computer equipment and technical staff/equipment

Invitation to the Bernhardt Dinner (Alumni Association Event)

Invitation to Convocations

Emeriti Listing on university website (if desired)

Emeriti Web page on university website that has direct link to Human Resources so that retirees can stay up to date on benefits

Participation in the ATT Signature Program (provides discounts to Southwestern employees for ATT services and products)

Emeriti Faculty University ID Card and Business Cards if desired

Each year, the SWOSU Alumni Association recognizes all Emeriti Faculty with a luncheon or dinner. New Emeriti faculty are named and recognized at this event. The Alumni Association and Foundation recognizes that value of retired and Emeriti faculty to the university's various functions and to their giving program. They are treated as "ambassadors for the university".

OSU Emeriti Faculty have tons of benefits and a membership organization and Council. OSU also recognizes that Emeriti faculty are university ambassadors, and treats them as such. Go to their website and see what all they can access as benefits.

- Senators concluded that more research needs to be done regarding the retirement procedure, and that this information needs to be more organized and available. Right now, retiring faculty have to go to 3-4 offices just to get information on the various procedures involved in retiring. Dr. Earnest stressed that there should at least be a list somewhere online. Dr. Place noted that there should also probably be a website dedicated to this procedure.
- Finally, it was noted that faculty must work at the University for ten years before the University recognizes your retirement at the reception in the Spring. For example, Ken Kelsey (who is retiring in the Spring 2019) is not recognized on the retirement email because he has not been at Northwestern for ten years.

New Business

- ✓ **Promotion appeals process:** As it stands, if a faculty member is not granted a promotion, and they then decide to appeal the decision, the appeal comes to faculty senate. Dr. Riegel explained that we have no procedures in place for handling such a process.
 - Dr. Maharry noted that faculty senate minutes should be kept and posted, and that this would not be conducive to the discretion needed for an appeals process. Dr. Riegel then went on to say that no one is appealing anything at this time, but that there would be a process in place before such an appeal takes place. Dr. Riegel suggested that perhaps this falls under the purview of the grievance committee. If Administration agrees then Faculty Senate should change the language of the faculty handbook to reflect this. Dr. Riegel then reviewed the role

of the grievance committee and explained why this type of appeal may fit under their purview. Dr. Riegel then suggested that we amend section “3.2.8 Procedures for Granting Promotion” of the Faculty Handbook.

- **Current:** In such cases, the aggrieved faculty member may file a written appeal to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate considers the appeal, and then files its recommendations with the president for consideration. The president then notifies the faculty member of the final determination of his/her petition.
- **Amended:** In such cases, the aggrieved faculty member may file a written appeal to the Grievance Committee within ten days of notification. The Grievance Committee considers the appeal, and then files its recommendations with the president for consideration. The president then notifies the faculty member of the final determination of his/her petition.
 - Dr. Place made a motion to change the language, Drs. Riegel, Earnest, and Maharry seconded. The motion carried.
- ✓ **Concurrent enrollment:** At the local high school, concurrent enrollment is being taught by high school teachers. It was noted that in Enid the concurrent teachers are retired high school teachers and they are considered adjunct. It was also noted that NOC is embedded into Enid High School. Dr. Place questioned what the reasoning was for this decision, and Dr. Earnest noted that she could understand if the schools were remote, but she was not sure of the reasoning for schools with easy access to college campuses. Senate members then discussed this situation, and several questions arose as a result of this discussion:
 - Will Northwestern be listed on the student’s transcript?
 - How do we guarantee rigor?
 - How do we avoid this being seen as the 13th year of high school?
 - Will this dismantle the need for college professors on campus?
 - How will this impact our general education courses and requirements?
 - What are the numbers, do the numbers justify having concurrent courses taught off campus?
 - Who pays for the teacher salaries?
- ✓ **Additional items**
 - **Athlete Grade Checks:** A question was raised as to what to do when an athlete is told not to attend tutoring even though the professor has marked “yes” on their grade check sheet. Dr. Place suggested that the faulty member talk to Brad Franz.
 - **Special Election:** It was noted that there would need to be a special election to replace Dr. Earnest. The position would be an at large position, and the faculty member would serve through December 2019. Dr. Mackie asked if we would open for nominations first, and Dr. Riegel explained that yes, there would be an open call for nominations, and that we would want to have elections during finals week.
 - **Department Representation:** Dr. Earnest noted that there were three people from one department serving on faculty senate. Dr. Riegel noted that there was nothing in writing to address this. The requirement for service guarantee representation for Arts & Sciences (2 members), Professional Studies and Education (2 members) and remote campuses (1 member), but no other restrictions are placed on the distribution of representation.
- ✓ Hearing no further discussion, Dr. Place adjourns the meeting at 4:44 p.m.