

Faculty Senate Meeting
2:00PM February 23, 2007, Education 201
Approved **Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ESTABLISH QUORUM:

The February 23, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 2:03 PM in Education 201 with FS President Joseph Maness presiding. The following members were present: Madeline Baugher, Nancy Buddy Penner, Stephen Burgess, Dayna Coker, Viki Craig, Barry Gales, Terry Goforth, John Hayden, David Hertzell, Robin Jones, Kelley Logan, Shelly Stockton for Scott Long, Amber Sturgeon for Tami Loy, Joseph Maness, Les Ramos, Randall Sharp, Eithel Simpson, James South, Bill Sticka, Karen Travis, Jim Long for Rob Winslow, Kathy Wolff, Jon Woltz, and Patsy Wootton.

II. CERTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES: Shelly Stockton for Scott Long, Amber Sturgeon for Tami Loy, and Jim Long for Robert Winslow

III. PRESENTATION OF VISITORS: VP Tom Fagan will be joining us later in the meeting to answer questions concerning the budget for 2007-2008 and succeeding years and other issues. We will suspend business when VP Fagan arrives.

IV. ADDITIONS / DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of January 26, 2007 meeting

The minutes were corrected and approved.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

A. From FS President Maness:

1. Chairs have been given guidelines for cost-cutting measures in preparation for anticipated budgetary restrictions for 2007-2008 and in the future. Dr. Sonobe indicates that chairs are responsible for implementing these measures and will have to justify any exceptions. He noted that some departments implemented these measures when requested earlier while others did not. He indicated that all departments will be expected to follow these guidelines. **See attached.**
2. The budget situation for 2007-2008 looks tight due the effects of last year's tax cuts being implemented. We will not feel the full effect though until 2008-2009. Complicating the budget outlook are several measures in the legislature that will significantly affect higher education institutions ability to maintain current income levels (e.g. return of tuition authority to the legislature, limitations on fee increases, limitations on dorm residence requirements, additional tax cut measures, etc.).
3. Communications with Legislature; If you wish to write to your senator or representative concerning pending business in the legislature, you may do so as an individual. Remember that communications are not to use university resources (letterhead, computers, telephones, etc.). **Should be done as a private citizen.**

- B. FS Secretary/Treasurer: Dr. Penner:
1. Roll Sheet—please sign.
 2. Treasurer's Report: BancFirst Checking account balance: \$2,010.71
University account balance: \$129.15

Treasurer's report was approved.

- C. President-elect Dr Jones: None
D. FS Past President Logan: None
E. FS Student Government Representative Sam Jennings: None

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES:

- A. Curriculum Committee: Report on University Curriculum Committee proposal –
See attached. Please send any input to Les Ramos.

Regular business meeting was suspended.

Returned to regular business meeting.

- B. Nominating Committee – No report
C. Report from CPGS on Faculty Senate Apportionment: Steve Burgess
The ballots have been received. A count will be sent to President Maness no later than Tuesday, February 27.
D. Other – Planning for the retirement reception is underway.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

IX. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Motion from Math Department

FS Motion 2007-02-01:

It was moved and seconded that effective immediately, any changes in and addition or deletion of courses and/or academic programs must originate in the department most directly affected and then be reviewed by all departments directly affected. Taking into consideration those reviews, the originating department then makes a recommendation to the curriculum committee, which is responsible for recommending approval or disapproval to the Provost.

FS Motion 2007-02-02:

It was moved and seconded that **FS Motion 2006-02-01** be tabled.

The motion passed by voice vote.

- B. Request on Cell Phone Policy from a member of General Business faculty – **See attached**
This request was referred to FS University Policies Committee. Please provide input to Karen Travis.

X. ADJOURNMENT:

Next Faculty Senate meeting: 2:00, 30 March 2007, Location—Education 201.

Cost Reduction Measures (From the Provost's Office)

Course Scheduling

1. Section size: Increase section sizes to the maximum practicable. Large section will have priority over smaller sections in classroom assignments.
2. Multiple sections of the same course: Minimize the number of sections we open sufficient to only accommodate the numbers we had in 2006-07. For the Fall 2007 semester, close sections now. We can open them later if needed.
3. Elective courses:
 - a. Elective courses not in a major's requirement are not permitted.
 - b. Elective courses may be offered only as frequently as the minimum enrollments below allow [no attachment was provided], or once every two years, whichever is greater.
 - c. For low enrollment majors, the total number of elective courses offered in a two-year period shall not exceed the number of electives required for a student to graduate.
 - d. Elective courses cannot be offered solely to meet a minor's requirement.
4. Low enrollment majors courses: Unless prerequisites require it, low enrollment majors courses can only be offered once every two years.

Faculty Numbers and Loads

1. No new positions will be created at this time. We haven't seen an enrollment increase that will justify or pay for additional faculty. If we have shortages, we will have to realign our faculty assignments.
2. Some faculty members are being credited with excessive loads.
3. No new programs will be approved without demonstrating that the new courses can be offered within the faculty load available. New programs will have to demonstrate that there is an identifiable need for the programs and/or that it will generate new enrollment. Currently, the addition of new programs has simply resulted in a shift of students.
4. Overloads in a department are not authorized as long as others in the department are under loaded.
5. Release time for research – carefully scrutinize the research release time. Many faculty are being given release time for research and not doing research. They should be given a 27-hour load.

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee
Report on the Structure and Function of a University Curriculum Committee
February 23, 2007

After studying the composition and duties of a number of regional university curriculum committees, primarily the University of Central Oklahoma and Southeastern Oklahoma State University, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee makes the following recommendations regarding the formation of a University Curriculum Committee at Southwestern Oklahoma State University:

Structure of the University Curriculum Committee

1. The committee should be a standing committee composed of faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Pharmacy, College of Professional and Graduate Studies, College of Associate and Applied Programs, and the Distance Learning Program. Representation from a diverse number of departments and schools is highly recommended. Student membership may also be considered. *Current chairs and/or members of established department, school, or college curriculum committees should be strongly considered for membership in order to provide continuity and a better understanding of curriculum issues between departments, schools, and colleges.*
2. Similar to many standing committees, the Faculty Senate should facilitate the nomination and election of members of the University Curriculum Committee. *This would allow Faculty Senators to identify faculty candidates for membership in their individual departments, schools, or colleges.*

Functions of the University Curriculum Committee

1. *Option 1: The University Curriculum Committee would review proposed changes in non-GE courses and programs. The University General Education Committee would continue to track and manage the University core curriculum.*
2. *Option 2: The University Curriculum Committee would review proposed changes in non-GE courses and programs, non-teacher education courses and programs, and non-graduate courses and programs. The University General Education Committee would continue to track and manage the University core curriculum. The Teacher Education Council would continue to review teacher education courses, and the Graduate Council would continue to review graduate courses and programs.*

Note: If option 2 is selected, the University Curriculum Committee should be informed of curricular changes that have been approved by the University General Education Committee, Teacher Education Council, or Graduate Council so that the University-wide impact of these changes can be readily assessed and the affected programs notified.

3. Specific duties and functions of the University Curriculum Committee:
 - a. *review of proposed new courses and programs and review of proposed changes to existing courses or programs*
 - b. *assess the broad impact of proposals and to identify programs that may be peripherally affected by proposed changes*

- c. *submit a summary report regarding a proposed course or program change to the Office of the Provost for Academic and Student Affairs*
- d. *the summary report would contain a detailed description of the proposal, the rationale for the proposal, and a description of the possible impact of the proposal on other University programs*
- e. *notify programs that may be affected by a proposed curricular change*
- f. *unless a proposal is obviously misguided, inappropriate, and/or detrimental, the University Curriculum Committee would generally not serve as a body for formal approval and disapproval of proposed changes*

Note: to provide some perspective and insight into the function of a university curriculum committee, please see the following description provided by Southeastern Oklahoma State University (<http://www.sosu.edu/university-committees/curriculum-committee/>):

"The function of the Curriculum Committee will be to provide leadership in developing and continuously reviewing undergraduate curriculum philosophy. Within the framework of this curriculum philosophy, the Curriculum Committee will continually review, evaluate, coordinate, and make recommendations for changes in the general, specialized, and professional education curricula in the undergraduate programs. The Curriculum Committee will also make recommendations concerning policy and regulations relating to departmental and interdisciplinary majors and minors. This committee will make appropriate recommendations to the Academic Council on all new curricula and on all curricula changes, additions and deletions. Such recommendations may originate in the Curriculum Committee or be referred to it by an individual or a group. A copy of any recommendation received by or originating in the Curriculum Committee will be forwarded to the appropriate department(s) and dean(s) for informational purposes."

The University Curriculum Committee Process

Step 1: *It is assumed that typical adjustments in course or laboratory content by the instructor can be reviewed by the respective department, school, or college curriculum committee without involvement at the University level. However, the proposal must be submitted to the University Curriculum Committee for review if the proposal may significantly impact peripheral programs.*

Proposals that qualify for review include:

- a. *new course or program*
- b. *deletion of an existing course or program*
- c. *significant alteration of an existing course or program*
 - i. *reduction or increase in the number of credit hours*
 - ii. *deletion or addition of a laboratory component*
 - iii. *change in prerequisites for a course or program*
- d. *any change that would be deemed to impact the General Education Program, Teacher Education Program, or Graduate Program*

Step 2: The faculty member, department chair, associate dean, dean, or other official representative (e.g. the department/school/college curriculum committee chair) proposing a new course, new program, or a change in an existing course or program that requires review by the University Curriculum Committee shall obtain a "*curricular change form*" that would be available online. *The form would require signatures from the department chair, associate dean, and dean to insure that the department, school, and college are aware of the proposed change. The completed form would then be submitted to the Office of the Provost for Academic and Student Affairs. The proposal should be submitted to the Provost no later than the midpoint of the semester (by the end of the eighth week) before the actual semester in which the change is planned to begin.*

Step 3: The Provost notifies the chair of the University Curriculum Committee of a proposal and submits the form to the committee for review. *After review of the proposal, the University Curriculum Committee prepares and submits a summary report to the Provost. It is very important that the committee complete the review and submit the summary report in a timely manner so that the initiation of the proposal is not unnecessarily delayed.* A helpful contribution by the initial members of the University Curriculum Committee would be to design a report template.

Step 4: After review of both the original proposal and the summary report, the Provost, with the assistance of the University Curriculum Committee, would:

- a. *notify the originating department, school, or college of University-level recognition and approval of the proposal*
- b. *notify programs that may be directly affected by the proposal*
- c. *provide a courtesy notification to the chair of the University General Education Committee, chair of the Teacher Education Council, and chair of the Graduate Council*
- d. *in the case of proposals that require revision or additional information, return the proposal to the University Curriculum Committee, which would communicate with the originating department, school, or college regarding resubmission of a revised proposal*

Resources and Models for the Preparation of this Report

1. *University of Central Oklahoma*
UCO has five different curriculum committees that are part of the Academic Affairs Council, which is similar to our Administrative Council. Duties of these committees include the review of new courses and programs, review of changes to existing courses or programs, and submission of a summary report and recommendation to the Academic Affairs Council for approval or rejection of the proposals.
2. *Southeastern Oklahoma State University*
SOSU has a teacher education curriculum committee for both undergraduate and graduate courses and programs, a non-teacher education curriculum committee for non-teacher undergraduate courses and programs, and a graduate council that handles issues related to non-teacher graduate courses and programs.
3. *Northwestern Oklahoma State University*
NOSU has a standing Academic Affairs Committee that has many functions. One specific function is "to study and make recommendations related to course offerings and major and minor requirements". This function is restricted to non-teacher education courses and programs. A separate teacher education committee focuses on proposed course changes in the teacher education program and a graduate committee studies proposed changes in the graduate curriculum.
4. *University of Sciences and Arts of Oklahoma*
The curriculum committee of the USAO Faculty Association (our Faculty Senate) is responsible for studying and approving curricular changes.
5. *University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University*
Typical of large universities, the individual schools and colleges within the university have curriculum committees with extensive membership and a fair amount of autonomy regarding curricular issues in their respective programs.

Request from a member of General Business Faculty

With the increasing technological changes, we are better connected with all aspects of our environment, both in and out of the classroom. The cell phone is a good example. In the past, we used analog telephones which were not in the classrooms. Now, a student with a wireless communication device can send and receive digitized verbal and "written" communications that include conversations, video, and slide presentations at the global level. The use of a cell phone can and is disruptive to the management and purpose of the classroom for those using and for those who are around the user. To refocus and minimize the disruptions of communication devices, it is requested that a university-wide policy be established to augment the professor's classroom management policies.