Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
April 3, 2012

In attendance: Carolyn Bloyed, Doug Briney, Frank Bushakra, Jeff Dense, David Drexler, Darren Dutto, Leandro Espinosa, Chip Ettinger, Mary Fields (remote), Heidi Harris, Rebecca Hartman, Mike Heather, Chris Heidbrink, Colleen Johnson, John Knudson-Martin, Charles Lyons, Elwyn Martin, Mike Pierce (remote), Deanna Timmermannn.

Visitors: Sally Mielke, Doug Kaigler, Susan Murrell, Mary Koza, Cory Peeke, Peter Wordleman, Peter Johnson, Amy Yielding, Jodi Varon, Brian Sather, David Axelrod, Jerry Isaac.

Meeting called to order at 3:00.

Jeff Dense reported that he attended a meeting of all Faculty Senate presidents in the OUS system. Nathan Tublitz and Dense met about promoting small schools at IFS. Small schools will also have 3 seats at the table, as do large schools. Another issue that arose is that the large schools.

Dense also had a meeting with the Provost and the new Human Resources Director regarding the background check policy. EOU is looking in particular at the U of O model. The HR director is going to a meeting of all HR directors to see how policy is implemented at other OUS schools. Anticipate a discussion of criminal background check at next meeting.

Policies from Academic Standards:

Gen Ed Transfer Degree: Clears up policy to see whether or not students are able to transfer. The practice will remain the same. The policy will just get clearer.

Questions about how Gen Ed transfers regarding the A.A. Concerns regarded having particular requirements, such as the Artistic Process and Creation requirement, if students transfer in an A.A. degree. Chip Ettinger said that we have one of the most strict general education requirements in the system. Colleen Johnson said that the APC component was a signature of EOU, and this might create a big door for students to use to get through without artistic creation. Chris Heidbrink asked about the accreditation body for the northwest schools. Students have always been accepted with this caveat. Jeff Dense asked if a friendly amendment could be made.

The amended policy passed. Dense abstained.

Foreign Language Policy:

Issues have arisen with students completing the foreign language entrance requirements. Students might be provisionally admitted with a foreign language deficiency. This puts pressure on students to get a foreign language competency more quickly. Chris Heidbrink asked about the requirements for telling students that they have a deficiency. Students who have to plan out courses in advance and need to register early have problems with this deficiency. Is it possible that we can we make students aware without placing a hold on their accounts?

Carolyn Bloyed said that students are notified with a letter and then the hold comes on their account. They have to contact their advisor, and then the hold will be removed from their account. It is an admissions requirement, not a graduation requirement. Dense asked if we
are granting exceptions on a case-by-case basis, and if so, should that language be in the policy? Bloyed said that students might take advantage of the exception. Concerns were raised regarding the availability of courses. Chris Heidbrink said that he has a concern with the language.

Rebecca Hartman asked if we could just require that students take their foreign language starting in the Fall of the year they are admitted. Carolyn said that students are not always admitted in the fall. Heather Stanhope said that provisional admits might also be taking CORE or other classes and that taking language as well would be difficult for those students.

Darren Dutto asked if we have enough sections of foreign language to accommodate students that come in throughout the year. Carolyn Bloyed said that she does not have the numbers to answer that question. Dense said as a point of information, the Spanish position has been saved, but it is not a permanent fix.

Charles Lyons asked if the exception language could require them to go before a committee for exception after the second quarter. Colleen Johnson said that the ASC already has a lot of work at the beginning of the term. This would add another group of students that would come before it. It seems it would be easier for the committee and clearer for the students to craft a policy that would be easier for the student to understand. Chris Heidbrink moved to send the policy back to committee to consider the changes that have been discussed. John Knudson-Martin asked if the appeals to the committee would be overwhelming. Chip Ettinger said it did not seem to be a burden.

Roll call vote:
Ayes: Heidbrink, Johnson, Hartman, Pierce, Drexler, Pierce, Fields
Nays: Dutto, Knudson-Martin, Bushakra, Bloyed, Espinosa, Timmermann, Lyons, Martin
Absences: Dense and Harris

Motion failed.

Holding students accountable seems to be important. Dense can offer friendly amendment draft language...get from Jeff...

Rebecca Hartman asked about the standards for exceptions. What would the policy be for overturning the hold? What will students do if ASC says no? Why would ASC say yes? Chip Ettinger said that a plan of study would be required. The same happens for probation. Mike Pierce said the intent of the policy is sound, but in operation it seems difficult to enforce.

John Knudsen-Martin said that the problem seems to be that the foreign language deficiency carries on until graduation. The two-term limit puts a face with the policy through the ASC so that students can formulate and discuss a possible plan. Chris Heidbrink said that the issue should be handled with the advisors. The arrangements should be made with the advisor, so the advisor can follow up at the appropriate time. The advisor can check to make sure that students register in the classes. Colleen asked about why the advisor would be substituted for the committee (or vice versa). Leandro Espinosa said that the advisors have not worked out or we would not be having this discussion. Charles Lyons said that there is some value to making it aversive and to provide an incentive. Mike Pierce asked if ASC would be willing to boot students for not completing the requirement? Chip said yes. The ASC removes students for a number of reasons.
Jeff Dense asked for a vote for the amendment. Motion carries. Dense abstained.


**Master of Fine Arts--Creative Writing:**

David Axelrod outlined the MFA program. Motion approved. Mike Heather asked if the courses in the consent agenda were associated. Axelrod indicated that the requirements were kept flexible to meet the most number of genres. Charles Lyons said that only 1-5% of applicants are traditionally accepted. Will we not be as selective? What are the admissions criteria? Jodi Varon said that the criteria would be the same as those for other graduate programs. We will also have a portfolio process to review the creative work of the students. The determining value would be the quality of the portfolio. David said that it would be conceivable that we would accept around 10%. Chris Heidbrink asked if in one year more students in a particular genre applied if the program would be flexible. Axelrod said we would accept students according to enrollment; we would hire according to the enrollment. Varon said that the model for the low residency is mentor model (1 faculty to 5 students). Doug Briney said that in COBA, they were taught overload, and it has been successful. Varon said that they built the budget with revenues coming almost totally from tuition dollars and balanced the expenditure of faculty through personal services contracts. People with other full-time jobs at other schools would serve as faculty. People who teach at other schools with semester systems will have free-periods in Jan/June to teach for EOU. We can pay them out of tuition. One student would pay an entire faculty member's salary. Colleen Johnson asked what the budget numbers were contingent on. Varon said that as student numbers increase, so would the budget. Johnson said that those first year students would carry over to the second year, and so the second year there would be 30? How would the money for housing work? Varon said that the two residencies are split because of winter travel to here. They averaged the housing costs between housing here in the summer and housing students in Bend in the winter. The instructional space in LG is free, but Bend is expensive. So Varon did a total and split it. Johnson asked about Central Oregon and their willingness to allow this program. Varon said that there are several complications, but she said that they want to make sure that we have a program before going into discussions. Johnson asked a question about year three: they would hire a director and administrative assistant for the program, right? Varon said that she talked to Janet Frey and Beth Upshaw, and they thought that Janet would handle the paperwork for the first two years (50-100 students). After that, it might be too much. Axelrod indicated that they would be more able to grow the program with a staff. Varon said that every time the program adds 5 students, the administration and additional faculty grows exponentially. Johnson asked about the budget of 8-10 thousand for advertising? Axelrod said they are meeting with Tim about the current advertising budget.

Questions were called.

Motion carried. Dense, Fields, and Pierce abstain.

**Liberal Studies Small City and Rural County Management Program Deletion:**

Program is replicative of Public Administration Major. Motion carried. Timmermann opposes. Dense and Espinosa abstain.

**Special Education program change:**
Requirements for accreditation have changed. Virginia Kelly and Karyn Gomez changed the program to match the requirements. In the program change and listing of courses just reflects the change required to continue program in the College of Education. Motion approved. Dense abstains.

HWS 198:
Discussion of new course first. Colleen Johnson moved for approval of the new course. Motion carried to approve course.

General Education designation:
Colleen Johnson said that she thinks it is a good course and students should be encouraged to take it, but it doesn't fall under Gen Ed or adheres to Gateway description in terms of academic content. It does not follow the civic engagement requirement. Jeff Dense said that the general education is further learning and civic engagement, not or. Johnson said that she does not see how the course satisfied that requirement. Rebecca Hartman said that she agrees with Johnson, and that we might need a gen ed requirement that engages students in outdoor activities, but this course does not meet Gateway requirements. What was it specifically that was in the course that dealt with civic engagement or beginning theory in academic content? Jerry Isaac indicated that they were looking at the course specifically as a Gateway involving beginning theory in a physical context. There is an extensive theory behind the course. What students will be engaging in is the activity. They saw a missed opportunity for physical education to be introduced into the Gateway category. Darren Dutto said that we can recognize that knowledge about personal fitness is important, and this course engages students in lifelong fitness activities for healthy purposes. What phys ed believes is that it is part of gen ed because the body is an important part of general education as well. He has taught a nutrition class, and it would be good to have foundational knowledge of physical body.

Brian Sather joined the table. Colleen Johnson reiterated the question. Sather and Jerry Isaac addressed the issue that they would be interacting on public lands and with the public in these activities. Also, participating in individual activities is important as a lifelong, healthy pursuit. John Knudson-Martin addressed Colleen's question about civic engagement. Is it only involved with city, community, etc. Or is it also the extra part, such as mountains and forests? He does not know the answer but likes to think that civic engagement involves those things as well. Jeff Dense offered point of clarification: he has given two papers on civic engagement, and he does not say civic engagement does or does not extend to natural resources, but we need to adhere to guidelines in policy and with regard to the rubric to assess civic engagement. Deanna Timmermann pointed to the description for Gen Ed proficiency. Part of the problem comes in in the first two elements. The course might fit the last two requirements, but not necessarily the first two. Timmermann said she could see the argument for civic engagement but not necessarily how it is academic content. Sather said that there is value in the activity, but also a theoretical basis of the course. Video works as a great medium for skills and activities and would be a great medium for engagement. Students might be doing some trail maintenance, etc. Charles Lyons said that his concern is that beginning theory in academic content, and the instructors have the theory, but how will the students pick up the academic theory and content? There is a difference between academic content and physical content. Frank Bushakra said that it would be like taking voice. Is voice academic? Lyons asked about the academic soundness of the course. Is it possible for someone not to pass? Chris Heidbrink asked for the syllabus and other documents to more clearly demonstrate how it is a gen ed. Rebecca Hartman said that she would like to make it clear that things being done with the outdoor program are great, and it seems like that we need a course in gen ed that does what this course does, but it is not
academic, and some of the points that Brian brought up are not reflected in the syllabus. There is not a place in Gen Ed for this course.

Darren Dutto said that music has theory and motor skills, which are similar to what the HWS course does. The physiology are the same for the arts and what the HWS class is talking about. A highly skilled musician and athlete are both similar. Mike Pierce said that the question seems to be about the academic nature of HWS, whether it is an academic discipline. Leandro Espinosa said that there is more to learning. Brian Sather said that they are still developing what kind of book to use. Depending on which term the course was taught, the sport emphasized would differ. Rather than try to put everything in the syllabus, they developed it as it is. And the activity itself has merit, just as other academic fields do. Colleen Johnson said that some sort of activity should be a part of the educational process. Something similar to the diversity requirement should be developed. But this course doesn't meet current categories. Chris Heidbrink said that it is not clear how theory and engagement are transferred to students.

Leandro Espinosa referred to Peter Johnson, who clarified that the academic component of APC is not just fulfilled through the act of creating, but the act of representing the philosophy and theory of the discipline. Mary Fields asked if other activity based courses are Gateway. Rebecca Hartman said no, and she would question whether music is activity-based. Peter Wordleman said it is not necessarily about the physical component of a music course; it is more about the public performance, which would make it Gen Ed. HWS is different in that it is not public performance. It is similar to perhaps the stage combat course. It is physical, but it always has to have at least two people. With some changes, this has great potential for this course and others that could be combined and added. Darren Dutto did not dispute the discussion. Dutto said that OSU requires a health and wellness course. This might be something we require as a university. Brian Sather argued that we could have a separate category. But this course still serves as a good Gateway as an introduction to college in general. Colleen Johnson said that the bottom line is that the course as it stands does not meet criteria for Gateway. Questions called.

Motion failed. Dense abstained.

**ART 261:**

Mike Sell joined the group. Course moved to approve. Sell gave a brief overview of the course. The concepts from beginning photography are transferred, the main difference is not using a physical darkroom. Off campus students and non-art majors would be well served by this course through APC. The idea is that the COM concentration in MA will soon hopefully be offered online as a major and a minor. Mike Heather asked if no on campus students could register? Sell said that it would currently be offered only once a year online. Other APC courses are offered online. Discussions in Arts & Letters division meetings indicated that current instructors already regulate online-only enrollment other classes. Sell said that he did not anticipate a long waiting list. Darren Dutto said that they suppressed the online to enrollment with instructor permission. Chris Heidbrink asked for clarification about whether only online students would be taking the course. Sell said that it would initially be limited to online students. Heidi Harris indicated that the restrictions for online and on-campus were problematic if students were getting the same instruction in either. Why would we limit what the location was of the students taking the course. Rebecca Hartman asked if this discussion was necessary to passing the course. Dense said that because it was offered as an online-only class, it was. Charles Lyons called questions.

Motion approved. Dense abstained.
Motion to approve ART 261 as APC Gen Ed passed. Dense abstained.

**Consent agenda:**
Consent agenda passed.

**Program elimination discussion:**

Jeff Dense circulated some documents related to the program elimination discussion. While we do not have a concrete policy, the process for program elimination discussions was not clear. Dense urged the senate to look at the OSU policy, and for next meeting, be prepared to discuss whether or not the documents make sense. PSU’s process map was of particular interest and if the proposal form makes some sense. By the end of the year, Dense would like to come up with a policy so that we do not have to go through the same BUS/ECON issue again. John Knudson-Martin asked if this might be an EPCC issue. Colleen Johnson said that it might be good to send it to EPCC to have them review the issue. Darren Dutto said that maybe EPCC should take it up before we do. Knudson-Martin asked for a clarification of process. Does Senate want to work on the policy or does it need to go to EPCC? Johnson said that where the concern arose and things fell apart is here. Faculty Senate should at least have an initial discussion of what went wrong when the issue came here.

Jeff Dense said another big policy issue that needs to be addressed is the Tenure and Promotion handbook. Having a robust discussion of that policy would be directive as to the will of the senate. Chris Heidbrink said he agrees that EPCC should be the one to address the policy for program deletion, but it might be a burden on that committee. Mike Pierce said that we need to review our current and existing process before reviewing what might change. Senate will review those processes and be prepared to discuss at next meeting.

**Shared Governance Review:**
Jeff Dense and Heidi Harris will create a Google Folder with missions for Faculty Senate.

Four questions that Jeff Dense saw as vital to begin reviewing the mission statement are:
1) Why does the FS exist?
2) What are the values and beliefs of the faculty senate?
3) What should the FS be?
4) What does success for FS look like? How do we assess whether we are successful?

In terms of moving forward with shared governance review, we need to first determine what we need to be.

**Public comment period:**
None.

**Good of the order:**
Jeff Dense said that the administrative task force is close to the next step in their work to try to come up with a narrative and introduction...to hopefully have that document to the Provost by Friday, which will be discussed by FS with next steps to overall administrative structure of the three colleges. That document will be circulated in advance of the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 4:49