SUNY Korea

The State University of New York

Faculty Senate

Meeting No. 4, Fall Semester 2023
(Plenary Session)
08 Dec 2023, 2:00pm
Room A402

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**

   The meeting was called to order at 2:02pm. All senators were present (Lenz, Houghton, Jeong, Herold, Tran, Han, Lee, Omondi, Hsieh, Cabuay, Ryoo).

2. **Acceptance of Agenda**

   The Agenda was accepted.

3. **Approval of Prior Meeting's Minutes**

   The Prior Meeting's Minutes were approved.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. Executive Committee

      The Committee viewed the Committee reports for this month. Regarding the APP committee, there is a proposal to review the senior administration, but as Chair Omondi notes, it is a complicated issue, and it is not clear that it is a priority for now. The APES committee is apparently looking at some issues that do not fit their remit, and the suggestion to them is that they should consider proposals (to the Senate) for developing an ad hoc committees for those kinds of issues. The feedback to the Education Council is that, although they have proposed to develop an "Office of Research Excellence" and an "Office for Teaching and Learning", their committee should drop the former and focus on the latter; and fast-track the developing the latter via a pilot using already-available resources.

   b. Academic Personnel Policy

Professor Tran mentioned that the committee met to discuss specific proposals. He described the prospect of adding two entries to the table on p. 21 of the Faculty Handbook (re: degree requirements and experience requirements for faculty): one representing the FD department, and the other representing the FBM department. For FD *Adjunct Professors*, the proposed faculty (recruitment) requirements would be a bachelor's degree and 6 years of professional experience as a fashion designer. For FBM *Adjunct Professors*, it would be a master's degree and 7 years of experiences as an executive in the fashion industry.

Prof Tran also indicated that their committee also investigated the evaluation policy in Chapter 4. They expect to gather more opinions from other Senates to further investigate the evaluation policies.

Prof Hsieh asked where the education and experience requirement numbers came from. Prof Jeong replied that they are following the FIT (New York campus) policy.

Prof Tran indicated that, currently, FIT (Korea) does not use the evaluation form currently found in the SUNY Korea Faculty Handbook.

Prof Omondi pointed out that a Master's + 7 years w/e aligns with the title of "Associate Professor" on the p. 21 table, so whatever the APP committee proposes, they will need to make sure that the headings and requirements can appear logically consistent.

Prof Jeong indicated that the requirements for her position (i.e. Assistant Professor) added the requirement of teaching skills/experience.

Prof Hsieh pointed out that the current p. 21 table lists a Master's degree and 7 years w/e as reflecting Associate Professor, and asked the FIT senator whether they preferred that that profile earn the title "Adjunct Professor" or "Associate Professor" and the FIT response at the meeting was "Adjunct Professor".

Prof Omondi indicated that there's an agreement now between FIT in New York and FIT Korea that there will be more hiring of full-time faculty. Also, he mentioned that the table of academic ranks in the handbook should include all ranks.

Prof Omondi mentioned that, overall, it is not clear what the APPC is proposing, and so he asked for a vote for adjourning the matter to the next meeting. He asks that before the next meeting, the committee will produce a table on what they propose should be FIT's version of the table (found on p. 21), adding whatever footnotes are necessary to help the Senate understand what it is voting on. Prof Hsieh asked that, if an additional FIT table is introduced, then wording about FIT should be struck from the current p. 21 table.

The vote (on Prof Omondi's proposal) was passed by a majority.

Stepping away from the FIT issue in particular, Prof Houghton suggested that the evaluation forms (described in the Handbook) should be updated to include variations

that reflect each of the departments' (separate/different) evaluation criteria. For example, for the English department, research requirements are kind of irrelevant, given that they are teaching 4-5 classes per semester.

Prof Jeong mentioned that, currently, FIT FBM and FIT FD each use different evaluation forms, especially since FD performance evaluation involves more practical (i.e. hands-on) output.

Prof Cabuay suggested that we call FIT faculty as "Professors of Practice" rather than Adjunct Professors, and it reinforces the professionalisms and nature of their merit.

Prof Houghton mentioned that FIT NY is very specific regards to anything to do with job titles or hiring. Prof Cabuay replied that the purpose of our Senate is to be able to contest such things that may be somewhat organizationally illogical for our case.

Prof Omondi pointed out that adjunct faculty are generally (by definition) not full-time faculty, and he agreed that "Professor of Practice" would be a more sensible title.

Prof Hsieh mentioned that "Practice Professors", a term used in the p. 21 table, is not common at all, and that "Clinical Professor" may be a more familiar term to use. Prof Omondi mentioned that this terminology "Professor of Practice" is found at SBU.

Prof Omondi suggested that the committee look into the matter of how to design the evaluation forms (or a system/set thereof) that can be suitable for all SUNY Korea faculty.

Prof Omondi mentioned the FIT survey, administered to their faculty, which seemed to catalog some dissatisfaction; and how it can be used to help the committee derive specific action items. He would like the committee to re-visit that survey (e.g. the data collected) and see what those action items could be.

c. Education Council

Prof Cabuay says that there have been some revisions to their developing concept of a Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). Their committee is currently developing potential programs and workshops, led by one "Program Director" who is skilled in (among other things) facilitation and mentoring; and which will involve a dedicated space with assistants for rolling out teaching skills development programs. Faculty would be invited to attend, on a one-to-one basis (i.e. on-demand coaching). While the programs would be optional, the Center's records would indicate if faculty members did show up for this training (and that could contribute to their university service or professional development record). The Center's offerings could also be useful as part of new faculty onboarding processes.

One of the purposes of the CTL would be to ensure that there is a shared standard for teaching excellence. He expects that he and the committee will finalize a master list of CTL programs between December and January; and that a pilot program could be rolled

out around April/May 2024. The committee has come up with a set of three workshops that could be a part of that pilot: (i) effective and interactive lecture techniques; (ii) inclusive teaching practices; (iii) student engagement and retention. The overall expectation is to be able to lay out a plan by the end of the academic year so that a new Education Council can hit the ground running. Prof Cabuay mentioned that he has walked through our building and wishes to secure a space for the CTL.

Prof Omondi asked that Prof Cabuay suggest some rooms, and Prof Cabuay mentioned the rooms and lounge-like space at the end of Building C's Hallway on the 3rd floor. Prof Omondi says that we can approach admin about that.

Prof Ryoo mentioned that the CS and MEC departments have some materials that might be useful for the CTL.

Prof Lenz asked Prof Cabuay who would be running the pilot and the workshops, and he replied that he would probably do it (esp. as he remarks that he has the background for it). However, he hopes that admin and HR will eventually hire somebody that could be the CTL's Director.

Prof Omondi asked Prof Cabuay what would be needed for the pilot, and he replied that we need program development and resulting reference materials (that can be useful for faculty), as well as legitimate program facilitation. As far as human resources, Prof Cabuay is looking for assistance from his committee members.

Prof Hsieh mentioned that lunchboxes would be a good way to draw faculty to attend. Prof Cabuay added that he envisions the CTL to be at the center of a specific kind of faculty 'community'.

Prof Hsieh also mentioned, to link back to the topic of evaluation forms, that attendance at CTL events could count towards 'professional development', which might eventually be considered as part of faculty evaluations. If this could be added as evaluation criteria (a la "extra credit"), it could incentivize faculty to attend.

Prof Omondi indicated his hope that a pilot could be completed by end of June. Prof Han asked what would be most important to be able to cover in the next Senate session, re: the CTL. Prof Cabuay responded that during the winter break, he will be working on creating the draft of the pilot program, to be approved by everybody the next semester. He said that he would like to have participants from all different departments in the pilot, to get a feel of whether or not this kind of program is appealing to us.

Prof Omondi suggested that the Senate will need to come up with a recommendation that this pilot be run, and that the Admin give the CTL a room. Prof Cabuay mentioned that there may be an avenue by which to ramp up development of the CTL externally.

Prof Hsieh asked whether this CTL pilot program will be mostly lecture-oriented or seminar-oriented. He felt that there's a lot of teaching and pedagogical expertise just distributed across our entire university, and that we have a lot to share with each other. For that reason, the coordinator or the organizer for this pilot could not only end up attempting to offer some expertise, but also mediate discussion and knowledge-sharing among faculty.

d. Campus Environment and Faculty Welfare

Prof Han shared policy terminology (underlying a possible proposal) in a file that he distributed to Senators, with hopes that they will share with their respective departments. Then, sometime next semester, perhaps in March, he and the CEFW committee wish to send out a survey to Senators and/or Faculty, after which a Senate vote could be held.

The terminology has to do with three plans: participation in (a) a funeral association; (b) resort membership; and (c) group medical insurance. The estimated budget for participation in the funeral association would be 10-20m KRW per year; in the resort membership, around 4-8m KRW per year. The benefit categories for the group medical insurance include 'fatal injury', 'severe disease', and 'medical expense reimbursement'. In total, one estimate from KB insurance company is about 27m KRW per year; but the benefits and costs can be customized.

Prof Lenz described a new 'fake makeshift smoking area' on campus, and that some (but not all) students are now using that smoking area. She will keep asking the IGC about progress to get a more permanent smokers' (physical) structure in place.

She also mentioned that a survey has been created to ask faculty members about their accommodations, but it has not been sent out yet. She hopes that it will be sent out and data can be collected during the break.

Prof Jeong and Prof Cabuay addressed their perceived need for departmental lounges, to foster "a more solid organizational culture based on people trusting and knowing each other". Prof Omondi responded that we already have a faculty lounge, and hardly anybody uses it; and he is not sure that walking distance is a problem. He noted that FIT's situation sounds different, in the sense that they have their own lounge but it cannot accommodate all the one-on-one faculty-student meetings that they have regularly. Prof Hsieh mentioned that the existing faculty lounge (i.e. 'Innovation Lab') will need to be used a lot more before departments can readily get their own dedicated lounges. Prof Lenz mentioned that both the English department and FHS each already have these kinds of departmental lounges, and those respective departments already pay for them. Prof Omondi mentioned that each of the departments apparently have an allocation of rooms that they can decide what to do with.

e. Academic Planning and Education Services

Prof Ryoo said that the committee's main focus was how to improve the Graduate School. He mentioned that, some time ago, there was a suggestion made that we might offer incentives to those faculty who publish in good journals. However, the feedback was that it would take too much effort to administer this incentive system. He mentioned that some rural schools in Korea have a very detailed incentive system, which incentivizes not only according to journal publications but also according to number of PhD students. This latter incentive drives advisors' recruitment of graduate students at those institutions.

He proposes distributing incentives to faculty who have funding to hire/recruit thesis students (i.e. Masters and PhD's). For example, for faculty able to fund a PhD student (with a minimum of 70% hiring support), they may receive 2m KRW. If they have a

master's (thesis) student, then they may receive 1m KRW. This kind of system can offer an incentive with little to no such administrative costs incurred.

Prof Omondi mentioned that the Korean Ministry of Education sets quotas for both graduate and undergraduate students at SUNY Korea, and while we have basically filled the quota for undergrads, we are very short on filling the quota for grad students. The admin is ready to send messages that our faculty/staff should recruit more graduate students because otherwise this quota is going to waste.

He also mentioned that we may need to consider what happens in case graduate students have their own funding, or they have their own external scholarship; and thus they don't need their tuition funded by SUNY Korea professors' grant money. Then do SUNY Korea professors still receive the incentive money? He also noted that university Admin of course would like to see incentives for graduate student recruitment, albeit ones that ideally wouldn't cost the University any money.

Prof Ryoo will talk to the Research Support team and Admin about these ideas.

Prof Han mentioned that maybe an alternative framework is to incentivize the graduate student rather than the faculty.

Prof Omondi mentioned that one of the issues also is the matter of the costliness of advertising on websites such as 'hibrain' to attract high quality PhD students.

5. **Possible changes to constitution and bylaws**

Prof Omondi mentioned that somebody cannot be elected to an office in the Senate unless they're a new senator because they wouldn't have a two-year term. Furthermore, looking at when two-year terms start, people can only be elected to offices from certain departments in any given cycle.

There are some concerns with removing two-term limits for senators. For the short term, when we elect somebody next year, we need to elect a chair with a two-year term. However, the only people who have two-year terms next year will be the newly elected senators.

Prof Omondi suggests that we have three people volunteer to look at this quandary in the first 2-3 weeks next semester, to come up with a proposed solution. Professors Han, Lenz, and Hsieh volunteered to serve on the ad hoc committee.

Prof Han raised the issue that this year's Executive Committee is made up largely of members of only one sub-committee (i.e. the CEFW), and we should look into policies that promote or enforce a greater balance for the Executive Committee.

6. **Any other business**

Prof Han mentioned that our Faculty Senate should have its own email account, so that surveys can be sent out in the name of the entire Senate, and not sent out affiliated somehow to any one particular Senator (i.e. Secretary). Prof Omondi mentioned that he will work on that in the following week.

Prof Omondi also mentioned that, if Senate meetings are to be held on the 2nd Friday of each month, the last meeting of the Spring 2024 semester will be on June 14th. Given that this will be the last day of the Spring semester, we may consider moving that last meeting to June 7th. He asked for feedback from the Senate, made a motion to hold the last meeting would be held on June 7^{th,} and it was seconded.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.