



Faculty Senate

Meeting No. 2, Spring Semester 2024
(Plenary Session)
12 Apr 2024, 2:00pm
Room A402

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:03pm. All Senators (Profs Houghton, Jeong, Lenz, Tran, Han, Lee, Omondi, Hsieh, Cabuay, Ryoo, and Cho) were present. Provost Hefazi also attended the entire meeting.

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

According to Prof Omondi, the executive committee met a couple weeks ago, in large part to discuss the regulations issue, and also briefly address some of the CEFW matters. As a result of the meeting, some feedback was given to each of the committees. He also reported that the research website looks to be ready by the end of this semester.

b. Academic Personnel Policy

Prof Tran and his committee proposed to split the table on p. 21 of the Faculty Handbook into two tables, one re: SBU qualifications and another table for FIT qualifications (the latter shown as table "7-2" below). A quarter of the handbook has been assigned to each APPC committee member for review, and they will address some suggestions for revision at the next meeting.

The APPC committee also addressed a potential "linguistics bias" for teaching evaluations. That is, Korean-speaking professors may get higher teaching evaluations

just due to being able to give more detailed explanations (of course material, during lectures or office hours) in Korean versus English, insofar that the students will better understand a Korean-language explanation versus an English one. This is becoming an issue as we see more (SUNYK) students who are weaker in English language skills. Given that instruction at our institution is supposed to be 'English-only', our teaching evaluation system should reflect actual teaching ability versus Korean language ability.

Prof Hsieh mentioned that this table 7-2 is difficult to interpret, insofar that the ranks are not tied to experience requirements (n.b. this shortcoming echoed by Prof Omondi 10 minutes later). Prof Jeong clarified that the ranks of FIT faculty upon hire would be up to the Program Directors' discretion.

Prof Hsieh also mentioned that these high Experience Requirements may be tough to justify insofar that we simply don't have the kind of local labor pool that FIT's NYC campus has access to (n.b. this shortcoming also echoed by Provost Hefazi 15 minutes later).

Prof Lenz and Prof Houghton together indicated that whatever new table is included for FIT, it should be included in such a way that FIT faculty don't inadvertently skip reading it (i.e. it should not be 'buried' deep in SBU-side language).

Altogether Prof Omondi, Prof Houghton, Prof Lenz, and Provost Hefazi indicated that our efforts to update the tables should ensure that the PhD degree requirement for SBU-side faculty is to be retained in any new set of tables, aside from English language faculty and FSH faculty (who are largely only required to have a Master's degree).

Prof Omondi reminded the APPC to consider not undertaking or proposing policy that FIT's NYC campus would object to, esp. re: vague rules for assigning ranks to incoming faculty, the vagueness of which FIT NY may not appreciate. Prof Houghton added that, according to his knowledge, FIT faculty are hired in at the Instructor level, and then are promoted basically every 3 years. Provost Hefazi re-affirmed that we need to ensure that we basically follow FIT NYC's lead on hiring policy.

On the next point, Provost Hefazi mentioned that SUNYK has an English-only instructional policy, and that faculty are only permitted to speak Korean to students "on a personal level". All instructional and academic activities, including those from advising/mentoring/coordinating roles, should be conducted in English. Student learning of "technical English" is one of the main objectives here at SUNY Korea. Prof Cabuay re-affirmed those remarks, saying that SUNY Korea presumably promises full immersion in American education, and that SUNYK should stick with this kind of English language policy for competitive differentiation of our brand.

Prof Hsieh recognized that our teacher evaluations are administered by SBU campus, and asked whether it would be difficult for us to include this kind of particular verbiage (e.g. regarding how well our teachers teach in English) in our evaluations insofar that it deviates significantly from SBU's own survey items or formats. Prof Houghton agreed with this sentiment, and suggested that our SUNY Korea administration should be

sending a (regular) reminder to faculty re: their responsibility to use English when communicating with students. Prof Hsieh added that perhaps the administration should also be reminding the students themselves, that the survey should be answered in light of the instructor's ability to teach in English.

Prof Omondi asked whether we have any anecdotal evidence that bilingually capable professors are receiving systemically higher evaluations. He mentioned that, if we are going to try to change the evaluation system to account for the effects of bilingualism, we need to be able to address why we think this is really a problem.

c. Education Council

Prof Cabuay addressed the EC's latest documents describing the objectives and design of the proposed Center for Teaching & Learning. Specifically, he introduced the idea that the Center can design and/or collect data on an 'onboarding metric so that newly hired professors have an understanding of what the SUNY Korea teaching methodology and expectation is'. Another major purpose of the center would be to offer a forum whereupon faculty can share their experiences and lessons learned at the end of every semester, led thematically by a pedagogy expert moderator. Later on, additional metrics could be added as regards improving our faculty's teaching methodologies. He mentioned a one-day workshop mandatory for newly hired professors, and voluntary for other professors. Those incumbent professors who attend would be able to claim attendance on their faculty annual self-reports.

Prof Lenz asked for clarification on whether the 'onboarding metric' would be designed to 'judge new hires' or not. Prof Cabuay replied that it would be used mainly as part of an orientation behind what SUNY Korea expects from new hires; in other words, it's a matter of sharing a guideline regarding what kind of teaching standards or quality-related outcomes we expect or deem 'acceptable' at SUNY Korea.

Provost Hefazi noted that the proposal seems to imply that this Center will need to be staffed by partially or wholly dedicated (paid) directors and/or lecturers; he wanted to know whether the current proposal expects a separate budget for the CTL as a separate organization. Prof Cabuay replied that this CTL is best if developed with some kind of legitimization re: directors and program coordinators, but otherwise he is open-minded about the staffing particulars. He would like to have a pilot event around the end of May.

Prof Omondi highlighted the issue of scale, and whether SUNY Korea is large enough (i.e. with enough faculty) to keep a CTL busy. The issue is whether we have enough faculty to maintain an ongoing center. He suggested that RSVP invitations be sent out, to help gauge genuine interest in these kinds of events. Prof Cabuay replied that there is an organizational political effort that must be made to explain the purpose and value of this Center's offerings in ways that other parties can understand and appreciate. In other words, the leader of this proposed CTL should have political sensitivity, emotional intelligence, and communication ability to create the political network and 'power base' that can drive the Center forward.

Prof Hsieh pointed out that he doesn't recall that the past faculty survey from EC (regarding CTL) did not poll faculty regarding the reasons why they might/would not

want to attend CTL events. Knowing those reasons could be useful for helping the CTL market their programming. Prof Cabuay agreed, and added that trust-building will be key to gathering support for the Center; the Center needs to make sure that the Center's marketing message is accurately delivered to the faculty. Faculty should be addressed and convinced that attending and participating in these CTL events will count in their faculty evaluations.

Provost Hefazi mentioned that half of the faculty don't actually list/describe or explain their own teaching improvement in their own annual faculty self-reports (i.e. "Curriculum Development activities" section). Another ~25% of the faculty list matters that are "irrelevant". The CTL's events could offer our faculty a concrete way to make efforts to improve their teaching.

Prof Hsieh mentioned that he's had experience with faculty colleagues (whether here or elsewhere) that don't seem to be open about hearing others' advice or "lessons learned", especially insofar that it opens the door to admitting (to themselves and/or others) that they were using inferior teaching methods beforehand. The problems associated with non-participation from faculty may be pretty deep. Provost Hefazi added here that we are currently "in an era... where faculty need to be re-educated... via new technologies and new approaches" because "we are facing a new generation with new students... who learn differently, with different interests...".

Prof Houghton re-raised the issue that we are a very small campus at SUNYK, and asked whether there is any chance that we can open up the CTL's coverage somehow to IGC. Prof Cabuay replied that this is also his preference, perhaps doable in the longer term.

The EC has also been tackling the matter of SUNYK-wide teaching award(s). Prof Cabuay mentioned that one challenge is making the award 'special', e.g. via a cash prize. Provost Hefazi remarked that his view was that adding money to an award devalues it, rather than increasing "its prestige". Prof Omondi suggested that a semester award is too frequent. Provost Hefazi added that the overall concept of this kind of recognition is very valuable, but that perhaps it need not be awarded regularly and instead only when there is a really qualified candidate.

Both Prof Cabuay and Prof Lee added that they'd like to see a balance at SUNYK in terms of recognition for research excellence and teaching excellence. Prof Cabuay indicated that the next step in his committee's deliberation will be to find out whether the award should be granted every year or every two years, and what kind of criteria would be used for judging.

d. Campus Environment and Faculty Welfare

Prof Lenz indicated that the CEFW was still unsure what (kinds of) matters require formal Senate proposals. The committee is also unsure what defines the boundaries of (governance of) the "environment" in the term "campus environment". For example, what belongs to IGC and what belongs to SUNY Korea, and what are the restrictions, if any, on how we are allowed to make improvements to our classrooms and hallways. Prof Lenz mentioned that their committee has learned that the SUNYK classroom projectors actually belong to IGC, so we may be restricted in how to manage those. Provost Hefazi

mentioned that he can share a map that identifies the physical boundaries of SUNY Korea in relation to IGC, for governance purposes. For other matters outside of that boundary, he can approach IGC leadership in their regular meeting. What he has learned is that IGC has remarked that they don't have the budget to help us with maintaining our projectors but that we can "go ahead" and do it ourselves. Provost Hefazi mentioned that CEFW should compile a wish list, and then the administration can see which items are doable. The CEFW and Senate should not be discouraged to ask for support for our campus environment, as we can always ask/pressure IGC for support.

CEFW has recently received a request to add a bike pump and bike racks on campus. However, putting a bike rack in the basement parking lot is an IGC decision, not a SUNYK one. Prof Omondi mentioned that we once had old sofas in a part of the building and asked IGC for their assistance to dispose of them, and IGC replied that, since we brought those in, we need to dispose of them ourselves.

Prof Han addressed the recent survey sent to all faculty re: resort membership, supplementary private group medical insurance, and funeral association membership. Fifty out of 92 faculty replied, and 50% voted for the group medical insurance. The committee would like to propose to the Senate to recommend the implementation of that insurance to the administration. Prof Houghton supported the idea, given that Korean National Health Insurance does not cover major illnesses such as cancer.

Provost Hefazi mentioned that given the discussion for this kind of valuable benefit for faculty, our staff also must be considered. If not, they may feel alienated.

A vote was held during Senate, overwhelmingly supporting a proposal being made to the administration. Prof Omondi has asked the CEFW committee to draft the proposal and send it to our Senate for comments before forwarding to the administration.

Prof Houghton mentioned that a survey was being planned regarding our faculty's satisfaction levels and feedback about the faculty housing. He has been asking for any feedback regarding what should be in the questionnaire (or how it should be worded).

Prof Houghton also mentioned that some faculty have been asking about international school vouchers, which is something that other universities on campus have started offering. Provost Hefazi mentioned that SUNYK currently has agreements with Chadwick and CMIS, and that SUNYK does help cover IGC childcare. Prof Ryoo mentioned that there are some differential discounts at CMIS and Chadwick for international non-Korean versus Korean parents. JICS (Jones International Christian School) in Songdo also offers 50% discounts for SUNY Korea parents.

e. Academic Planning and Education Services

Prof Ryoo mentioned that the committee is currently discussing a faculty research award, which could be meaningful to help incentivize faculty to do impactful research. He proposes two kinds of faculty research awards – an Excellence in Research Award, and an Excellent Research Advisor award. At least, for the former, we should have a campus-wide metric that can transcend departments. Impact factor is not a good one, insofar that different fields will have systemically different ranges for impact factors, thus putting

some departments at fundamental disadvantages compared to other departments. The alternative is to use the Journal Citation Indicator, which is a "field-normalized measurement of journal citation impact". Besides the JCI, other factors that could be used to determine the faculty research award winners would be:

- Number of co-authors on a publication (less is better)
- Number of SUNY Korea authors on a publication (more is better)
- Number of SUNY Korea students on a publication (more is better)

From the scoring, in total, two award winners would be chosen (one for each award). The frequency of the award, and the relevant timeframe of research output (for scoring purposes), would still have to be determined. (Prof Ryoo suggests that one faculty member may be able to win both awards simultaneously.) The nature of the prizes, if any, also must be determined. Overall, the expectation is that an award (especially one that includes a financial reward) could help to stimulate better graduate student output and a more active research environment at SUNY Korea.

A committee would likely have to be formed to validate the legitimacy of the research output and the, say, JCI numbers (or other metrics).

Prof Omondi raised the issue that journal impact factors (and therefore derivatives such as JCI) are calculated based on a lagged timeframe, and may not adequately represent the impact of a publication that otherwise manages to collect hundreds of citations within 1-2 years of publication. He asked how such research would be rated, for the purposes of our awards. He also mentioned that there is little reason why some faculty members might not just add non-contributing student names to the co-author list of a paper, just for the sake of artificially increasing their scores.

Prof Cabuay asked what the incentives are, for applying for these awards. Prof Ryoo replied that other institutions offer cash awards for publishing in the most notable journals, and that SUNYK's Research Support team is willing to offer a similar kind of compensation, funded by the overhead from our research grants. Thus far, the APES committee has proposed to Research Support team 10m KRW and 5m KRW for the two cash prizes. Prof Ryoo will meet with the Research Support team monthly to discuss the proposal.

Prof Lee mentioned that he would like to see 'symmetry' in the teaching awards versus the research awards. Specifically, he would like to see that we offer the same number of awards for teaching and research, and also the same amount of prize money for both sets.

Prof Ryoo mentioned that, at least customarily, at many universities, the faculty research award winners will donate their cash prize back to their respective universities. Many winners end up not only donating all their winnings back to the school, but then also add some money on top of that. (In some cases, apparently, it can be enough of a donation that office spaces are then named after their faculty donors, i.e. as an 'endowed' office space.)

5. Vote on regulations re: Senate Terms (via ad hoc committee)

The last item up for APES-led discussion was the regulations issue mentioned in the previous Senate meeting. The idea is that, in order to help ensure that the Senate is always made up of some faculty with past Senate experience, and to help ensure that the Senate's leadership (i.e. Executive Board) is always made up of people with at least some Senate experience, we should follow one of the following options (please see attached table below for detail):

- Option #1: 2-year Senators terms, 1-year officer terms
- Option #2: 3-year Senator terms, 1.5-year officer terms
- Option #3: 4-year Senator terms, 2-year officer terms

Prof Omondi mentioned that we should drop Option #3, because 4 years is an extremely long Senate term. So, a vote would be held now between Option #1 and Option #2. Nobody objected to this suggestion.

Prof Houghton mentioned that 1-year terms for the Secretary is "more than enough" insofar that it involves a lot of extra work. However, he also said that the Executive Board should have people in there that consistently have more than one year at a time, because they are the ones who have to okay everything that's going through and they have to know "what's happening".

Prof Hsieh acknowledged that, if we have active enthusiastic senators, then Option #1 is reasonable. However, if we instead have senators who have to get used to faculty governance, and they have to learn how to enjoy it or be enthusiastic about it, then Option #2 becomes more reasonable. Prof Omondi mentioned that perhaps we shouldn't want to have unenthusiastic senators around for longer. Prof Hsieh replied that he has noticed that some senators don't really know what Senate is about, and they slowly seem to learn how/why to become more active. He mentioned that, overall, this decision ultimately boils down to whether we choose Option #1, in which case we potentially err on not giving Officers enough time to 'learn the ropes'; or we choose Option #2, in which case Senators must stay in their role for quite a long time. Prof Houghton mentioned that he would rather that the Senate err on the side of 3/1.5 years, given the time it takes for Senators to become acquainted with Senate. He also mentioned that he would like to see service on committees to also be extended from 1-year terms to 1.5-year terms, for similar reasons; he pointed to the EC's slowness in getting a Center up-and-running, as an example.

A vote was held between Option #1 and Option #2, and there was a 5-5 stalemate. (The Chair did not vote.)

After some discussion, another vote was held, with another 5-5 stalemate.

6. Any other business

No other business.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned around 3:57pm.

SCENARIO I: 2-year term for Senators, 1-year term for Officers																		
Year	24F	25S	25F	26S	26F	27S	27F	28S	28F	29S	29F	30S	30F	31S	31F	32S	32F	33S
Track 1	Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE				Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE				Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE				Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE				Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE	
Track 2	Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP		Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP				Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP				Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP				Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP			
Officer	Officers from Track 2		Officers from Track 1		Officers from Track 2		Officers from Track 1		Officers from Track 2		Officers from Track 1		Officers from Track 2		Officers from Track 1		Officers from Track 2	
* Term of Senator is 2 years as it is. Term of Officer is one year.																		
** All current CS/MEC/FBM/FD/EE senators stay until end of Spring 2024.																		
*** All current AMS/BM/DTS/FSH/ELP senators stay until end of Spring 2025.																		
SCENARIO II: 3-year term for Senators, 1.5-year term for Officers																		
Year	24F	25S	25F	26S	26F	27S	27F	28S	28F	29S	29F	30S	30F	31S	31F	32S	32F	33S
Track 1	Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE						Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE						Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE					
Track 2	Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP		Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP				Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP						Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP					
Officer	Officers from Track 2		Officers from Track 1			Officers from Track 2			Officers from Track 1			Officers from Track 2			Officers from Track 1			
* Term of Senator is 3 years. Term of Officer is 1.5 years.																		
** Term of current senators in CS/MEC/FBM/FD/EE stay until end of Spring 2024.																		
*** Term of current senators in AMS/BM/DTS/FSH/ELP extended until end of Fall 2025.																		
SCENARIO III: 4-year term for Senators, 2-year term for Officers																		
Year	24F	25S	25F	26S	26F	27S	27F	28S	28F	29S	29F	30S	30F	31S	31F	32S	32F	33S
Track 1	Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE								Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE								Term of CS, MEC, FBM, FD, EE	
Track 2	Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP			Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP						Term of AMS, BM, DTS, FSH, ELP								
Officer	Officers from Track 2			Officers from Track 1				Officers from Track 2			Officers from Track 1				Officers from Track 2			
* Term of Senator is 4 years. Term of Officer is 2 years.																		
** Term of current senators in CS/MEC/FBM/FD/EE stay until end of Spring 2024.																		
*** Term of current senators in AMS/BM/DTS/FSH/ELP extended until end of Spring 2026.																		