

**EOU Faculty Senate
Minutes, May 7, 2013**

In Attendance: Rebecca Hartman, DeAnna Timmermann, Charles Lyons, John Knudson-Martin, Genesis Meaderds, Jean Morello, Susan Murrell, David Drexler, Colleen Johnson, Barbara Schulz, Elwyn Martin, Doug Briney, Heidi Harris, Mike Heather **Attending via Google Hangout:** Mike Pierce, Laurie Yates, Kerri Wenger **Also attending:** Jeff Dense, Scott McConnell, Peter Maille, Nicole Howard, Colleen Dunne-Cascio, Les Mueller, Stephen Clements, Jeff Johnson, Dan Mielke, Sharon Nelson, Shelley Schauer

Meeting called to order 3:03 pm

Motion and second to approve meeting minutes from April 2, 2013 and April 16, 2013. Motion passes unanimously.

Senate Committee Reports and/or Information Items

EPCC Consent Agenda: Motion made for approval of consent agenda. Second. The motion passes unanimously.

EPCC Action Agenda:

PPE Program Change: Move to approve PPE program change. Second.

Jeff Johnson addresses the Senate with his thoughts on the proposed changes to both PPE and Public Administration. He believes that the proposed changes as a whole amount to empire building of Political Science and the marginalization of Philosophy. He states the numbers and data do not come close to supporting the change. Johnson notes that the PPE faculty alleged that there was a survey conducted and students expressed a dislike of taking Philosophy courses online. Johnson finds this puzzling because a majority of PPE majors are online students, almost all Political Science will only be available online next year, and on campus PPE majors have personally thanked Jeff Johnson for allowing them to complete their major with online courses. Johnson notes he believes it is highly misleading to claim changes are needed so EOU can have the only fully deliverable distance major in country. In fact, EOU already has a fully deliverable distance major in Public Administration. Johnson notes that the paperwork states that the courses will require additional FTE allocation. The response at EPCC to this was that the coursework could be offered with adjuncts and overload. Johnson reminds Senate that the Provost has stated that this type of program is not sustainable. Johnson states that he is grateful for the opportunity to share his thoughts.

Jeff Dense responds to statement. He states that he believes when the post retirement agreement was signed there was no discussion on best interest of program or students and PPE has had their hands tied with regard to ability to dictate what courses teaching. Dense asks the

Senate if retired faculty should set direction of EOU and who speaks for students. Dense notes that these changes are not built on the empire building claim mentioned, but instead for the best interest of the students. Dense also notes that he does not see the program as being reliant on overload. Dense notes that there is still a requirement for one upper division class in Philosophy and that classes have been removed that have not been taught in several years, including his. Dense points out that the changes are modification and not wholesale revision. He believes that changes will attract a number of students, particularly online.

John Knudson-Martin asks, based on the two viewpoints presented, what critical issues the Senate needs to consider. He notes that the changes were approved in EPCC and he has a lot of faith in their decisions, but wonders what about the controversy that the Senate needs to decide. Senate President DeAnna Timmermann responds that it is not so much a controversy, but when there are major changes to programs having the wide expertise of Faculty Senate is important. Nicole Howard responds that our role is technical. We need to look at and decide if the changes serve students. Colleen Johnson states she believes the Public Administration issue is a resource one. Certainly a tenure track line item is inappropriate, but also inappropriate for adjunct and overload to teach. The program is already stretched. The headcount for PA is three and asks how a tenure track line with three people is justified. Colleen Johnson notes that in a survey she conducted of other PPE programs Philosophy was an equal partner and in the program presented Political Science is twice as heavy as Philosophy and heavier than Economics. The Senate President reminds Senate that PPE is the only topic on the table at the moment. The Public Administration motion has yet to be made. Heidi Harris asks for clarification that what is happening is that courses that relied on faculty from other departments are being streamlined and this is an effort to have more control of curriculum. Doug Briney adds that faculty controls curriculum and it is existing faculty that decides and does not believe he can replace his judgment with theirs and would support the changes. Colleen Johnson responds that though we are retired, we have a four year fixed term contract as full professors. Rebecca Hartman states that she cannot support the changes because it requires a new FTE. Timmermann notes that it is her understanding from the paperwork that it is the PA change and not PPE that requires the new FTE. Dense responds that the paperwork does look bad because it was submitted when everyone was told there would be tenure track lines. We did not revise paperwork to indicate that it will not require tenure track line; however, we have figured out a plan where Professors McConnell and Professor Maille will offer fewer sections of their economic principles classes which will free them up for one course each in regard to this program and it will not require FTE at this juncture. Dense also notes that one course that will require configuration under the PPE program is Social Science Research methods and we agreed to rotate. With regard to the paperwork and the tenure track question: this was raised at EPCC and they were made aware.

Knudson-Martin calls for PPE program changes question. The motion passes with ten ayes and four nays. No abstentions.

Public Administration Major Change: Move to approve Public Administration program changes. Second. The motion passes with nine ayes and five nays.

Political Science Minor Changes: Move to approve Political Science Minor changes. Second. Dense explains how to combine courses for minor. The motion passes with two abstentions.

Public Admin Minor Change: Move to approve. Second. Comment that all changes are in Political Science courses. The motion passes with one abstention.

Economics Minor Program Change: Move to approve. Second. Clarified that program changes include all courses. The motion passes with two abstentions.

Business Program Changes: Howard notes that EPCC approved. The change moves all five credit courses to four courses. Move to approve changes to business curriculum. Second.

Stephen Clements presents reasons for change presented. The changes came out of self study review of program. There is no other Business Program in Oregon with five credit courses and we wanted something comparable. We recently added a course to upper division core and a class to our upper division concentrations. With this new change we lower credits and are brought into alignment with other programs in state. This also adds flexibility. There are no additional resources needed for change. In fact, this will allow us to in load additional courses and to deal with overload effectively. The change does present some problems. Registration started last week and if we make changes they would go into effect in the summer. Once recommendation is that they are not implemented for summer and the credits stay at five credits for that term. We are aware of impact for students graduating. Discussions with the Provost have taken place and he is willing to work with students on a case by case basis. Les Mueller responds that he understands trying to be like other schools, but our students are not like other students. Over half of EOU's students are online and we represent lowest income of any students in state and due to other commitments are more sensitive to credit hours. Transitioning to four credits will require students to take more classes. Mueller is concerned that we have not done research for students and believes a study of students should be completed. Susan Murrell comments that she equates credit hours with time spent and is confused why it would tax schedule. Discussion on credit hours ensues. Clements responds that he does not believe the changes require less, they are just an adjustment. John Knudson-Martin suggests a friendly amendment: if we vote in favor of change implementation should be deferred to the winter. This will give time for research to be conducted. Colleen Johnson suggests that Senate discuss Carnegie next year. Johnsons also asks how this will help to alleviate overload. Clements responds that salary doesn't change but need to teach more courses. Also notes that they won't be adding courses to existing concentrations. Suggestion made that changes not be implemented until Fall of 2014. This will provide enough time for a study to be conducted and times well with the new catalog. Dan Mielke notes that he thinks it is important to recognize that this is a pedagogical change being implemented by the business faculty. Hartman notes that the friendly amendment is well intentioned, but too messy. Timmermann asks if there is a reason it why implementation should not be delayed until the Fall of 2014. If no overwhelming reason it would be a good idea to make a friendly amendment to delay implementation for a full academic year. This will give students time to understand impact. Clements responds that changes have not been made in a hurry and they have been discussed for years. He adds that there is some merit to waiting until winter because of where we are with registration. He adds that the overload adjustment is worth \$90,000 to \$120,000 of savings. Jean Morello states that summer implementation would be very sudden. If it needs to get done as soon as possible winter sounds like the best time for students to adjust. Clements responds that he is fine with waiting until winter for students and registrar's office. It is clarified that Knudson-Martin's friendly amendment was accepted.

Call for question. There has been a move to accept all business changes with the friendly amendment that implementation will take place in winter term of 2014. The motion passes with two abstentions.

Senate Discussion Items

Grievance and Academic Honesty Policies: Student Success & Engagement and the Academic Standards Committee are responsible for updating these policies and they are at meeting to present. They are being brought forward as an information item at this meeting and will be brought forward as an action item at the June Faculty Senate meeting. Colleen Dunne-Cascio reports that the change to the Academic Honesty Code is that the faculty member is required to notify the student before sending to Student Affairs. This was added to the form. The policy remains the same. The mentioned requirement was just added to the form.

The most significant change to the grievance procedure is the streamlining of the process when a student files a grievance. They are to meet or attempt to meet with a faculty member first, then if there is no resolution meet with assistant dean of college, then to the college dean, and if any revisions or if student wants to appeal the grievance committee would hear appeal. The major suggested revision by the Grievance Committee is to add a statement that no less than five members of the committee must be present there to hear case and in the event of a split vote the appeal is denied. If anyone has any questions can email questions to Colleen Dunne-Cascio or Peter Maille. Hartman notes that the process seems backwards. It would be intimidating for student to go to faculty member and then on to the bureaucracy of an institution. They should instead be able to go to neutral body like the committee.

These policies will be voted on at the June meeting.

Faculty Development Fund Process Discussion: Due to time constraints this discussion has been postponed to the June Faculty Senate meeting.

Senate Action Items

Vote on Proposed Tenure & Promotion Handbook Changes: Motion to approve Tenure & Promotion policy as it is. Second.

Hartman states that the second suggestion was about consistent standards for faculty evaluation and asks if that is that on agenda for next year. Dense responds that the FPC will take this on next year. The question is called. The Senate votes to end discussion and vote.

The motion to accept Tenure & Promotion as is passes with four nays and two abstentions.

Emeritus Policy Vote: Motion to approve. Second.

The motion passes unanimously.

Senate Information Items

EPCC Constitution Change: Approved by University Council and will go out for a university wide vote. This will go out on May 20 and the voting period will run from June 3-5. Voting will be available on Webster.

University Council Bylaw Recommendation: The University Council is requesting that its committees add a desire to their individual bylaws stating that the vice-chair will serve in a continuous format and will take on the duties of the chair the following year; therefore, the vice chair should be someone who is beginning their term. This is being suggested as a solution to it currently being possible that vice-chairs in their second term of service will, if not elected for the next term, not be able to transition to the role of chair the following year.

5 Minute Access:

None

Good of the order:

None

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.