

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
February 7, 2012

In attendance

Doug Briney, Frank Bushakra, Darren Dutto, Jeff Dense, David Drexler, Leandro Espinosa, Heidi Harris, Rebecca Hartman, Chris Heidbrink, Colleen Johnson, John Knudson-Martin, Charles Lyons, Elwyn Martin, Mike Pierce (remote), Donna Rainboth.

Guests

Steve Adkison, Matt Cooper, Allen Evans, Nicole Howard, Peter Maille, Dan Mielke, Sally Mielke, Marian Mustoe, Debbie Rogers, DeAnna Timmerman, Peter Wordleman

Meeting came to order at 3:04.

January 17 Meeting Minutes

There should be an amendment under the pg. 5. BUS ECON discussion regarding the comment that only items of order were at question. It should be amended to be relative to senate bylaws and appropriate functions rather than Robert's Rules of Order. Also, the abstentions for the vote on the issue should be clarified at 4. Move to approve as amended.

Jeff Dense reported that there has been a commitment from the President for professional support to both archive senate documents, update website, and perform other shared governance administrative tasks.. President Davies has also charged the Senate, University Council, and ASEOU with the shared governance review. Some questions for the review are whether committee sizes and reporting structures are appropriate and whether the succession of leadership is sound. Should we have vice-chairs of committees that accede to leadership? Dense intends to have time at each senate meeting for these issues to discuss and send recommendations. If there are issues to talk about in terms of shared governance, please send them to Dense to get on the agenda.

EPCC Consent Agenda

Sally Mielke indicated that several of the items on the consent agenda were passed on condition of revised syllabi--MUS 140 195, 225, 230, 311, 313, 362, 395, 421 have not yet provided syllabi. Dense ruled that those items need to be pulled from the consent agenda. Motion to approve other items in the consent agenda moved and approved. Dense abstained.

EPCC Action Agenda

Colleen Johnson asked about the purpose of EPCC, indicating that we should have discussion of the items that come forward to Senate and questioned the role of the Senate in terms of authority in shared governance and allowing the full range of debate and full range of motions. John Knudson-Martin asked about the possibility for replication in duties when EPCC is asked to discuss an issue and then Faculty Senate revisits the discussion. Colleen said that debate needs to happen on a number of levels at all parts of shared governance. Provost Adkison said that there needs to be a distinction between shared governance and faculty governance. What is at issue here is faculty governance. The institution does not govern curricula; the faculty does. What we are talking about is the role of the larger faculty in relation to the discipline-specific expertise of the faculty. Rebecca Hartman disagreed with the Provost. The BUS/ECON decision is to eliminate a major or program,

which is bigger than a curriculum issue. We are actually talking about who has the authority to make a decision to eliminate a program, which she argues is Faculty Senate. The EPCC reports to the Faculty Senate, and the senate represents the faculty as a whole. This is a cross-collegiate interdisciplinary major, so it is distinct. Hartman wants to move that we ask the deans and provost to meet with appropriate faculty and then the decision to delete the program can go through the colleges, who can decide, and then Faculty Senate can vote on the decision. We also need to make a clear decision about who can make these decisions for when this happens again.

Jeff Dense said that this situation has highlighted a lack of process, and he has reviewed other OUS institutions and their policies. OU has no policy. OSU has a policy that clearly indicated conferring with appropriate parties, providing criteria for elimination and the contrary position, which is where he believes we need to go. The way we are right now is that we "act" upon recommendations. At OU, the Faculty Senate is the legislative body who passes things; the President or designee has possibility to veto. Then they must negotiate with senate and go forth. Right now, our current structure does not support this process, which is why shared governance review is important.

Doug Briney asked if Faculty Senate had this discussion at the end of last year, and thought that the result of that discussion was that we would rely on the expertise of EPCC. Chris Heidbrink said that he remembers that conversation about the role of EPCC. Heidbrink said that the orders were to approve, reject, or send back. Some discussion would be warranted. Colleen Johnson said that she is not suggesting curriculum proposal by curriculum proposal being reviewed again at Senate. The question is whether, once arriving at issues that require action, there are other issues that might require debate.

Darren Dutto asked if there have been other programs deleted in recent past. Jeff Dense said that there is no written procedure. Provost Adkison said that he knows of three program name changes in 18 months, and two program name changes to Provost's Council from other institutions. There is not a lot of precedence for universities dropping programs period. Accreditors pointed out that we added 67 programs in 10 year period and dropped none. They thought that was an area of concern in a time of declining resources. He agrees with Hartman, and that we can respectfully agree or disagree about the particulars. There is a conversation to be had. But something that should be kept in forefront is not how Senate functions in the abstract but relative to how program faculty do their business from day to day. If Faculty Senate decides it can approve, remand, or reject, the obligation is to ask what the implications are of these three actions. When Faculty Senate approves and action, does this direct the Provost to do something that according to the program faculty is not appropriate for them to do...same for approval and remanding.

Hartman indicated that the Provost was right about it affecting program faculty and asked Jeff Dense and Peter Maille if they had discussed as a program the BUS/ECON issue. Dense said that the program must be taught out, which will take three to four years. The move, should we approve, is that it is removed from BUS part of the catalogue. Business will not be responsible for oversight or assessment. Hartman said that we need to resolve the issue but she does not approve of the process. Doug said that the college of business faculty strongly want to remove the program. Colleen said that her objection is that one program faculty has discussed it, and that CAS should discuss it as well.

Chris Heidbrink asked if we can take the BUS/ECON section out of the action agenda.. Leandro

moved to separate MUS from other items on the consent agenda.. Hartman moved to remove the BUS/ECON from the remainder of the items.

Discussion of the POL 317 course ensued. Mike Pierce questioned the prerequisite to be 21 to take the course. He wanted us to be cautious of prerequisite courses that included exclusive practices. Dense quoted the appropriate OAR concerning discrimination in education, and noted there was a section on 'reasonable' exceptions. Therefore, Dense would interpret that prerequisite to be reasonable. Pierce spoke to the point of inclusive courses. A review of the course requirements indicates that a student could receive a passing grade foregoing participation in the questionable event, even though the syllabus indicates that attendance is mandatory for passing. Pierce said that EOU course should strive to be inclusive. This is a good course about beer and tourism. We should encourage inclusive actions. He asked if we have any other courses with age prerequisites. Dense asked for the vote numbers at EPCC, and Sally Meilke said it passed handily. Colleen said that this issue has arisen with other classes. The participants must be 21 in order to get into the beer festival that is a part of the course. Dense will be committed to verifying that students are 21-years-old for legal reasons. Pierce said to be cautious about excluding students. Imbibing alcohol is not a part of the course objectives.

Public Administration major change

The program will switch ECON 201 for ECON 202 in minor to align major.

Anthropology Concentration

No representative. No questions.

Art program revision

No representative. No questions.

Geography minor revision

Marian Mustoe indicated that the program made a major overhaul. Part of the problem was with courses on the books that we were not teaching. The changes needed to be made to both maintain the spirit of the program while also aligning the program with others on campus. There are a lot of details and changes to align more with online objectives. The revisions maintain geography's position with General Education on campus. Learning outcomes were added for some courses. No questions.

Journalism concentration

No representative. No questions.

Questions called. Motion carried. Dense and Pierce abstained.

Emeritus Discussion

Allen Evans came forward. He clarified the date on the memo. He indicated appreciation for the recommendations from Faculty Senate. The previous discussion of the emeritus policy in Faculty Senate related to the number of years of service required to be eligible for emeritus status. The language drafted in the current document reflects the concerns of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC).

A motion was made and seconded to accept the policy. Colleen Johnson asked what would happen if a faculty member retired, had been here 15 years, and then goes somewhere else. Does it make sense that that person would be emeritus here and then full faculty somewhere else? Doug Briney asked if Faculty Senate could overturn an emeritus recommendation from FPC. Allen said that he believed that we could. Two groups of faculty and administrators, deans and presidents, who have been granted emeritus status were not under the purview of the FPC.

Dense said that the document seems to read that Faculty Senate would not fully review the recommendation. Rebecca Hartman asked what the procedure was for disagreeing with a recommendation. Dense recommended a friendly amendment under 6. Allen asked if Faculty Senate's consensus was that they wanted to be bothered with it. The current procedure lets personnel recommendations go directly to the Provost, whereas we would be micromanaging emeritus status. The emeritus status would be more of an information item than a vote. Questions were called. Motion passed. Dense abstained.

Informational Item from President Dense:

In addition to FPC review, the committee has been charged with two other tasks. One is a fresh look at the entire Tenure, Promotion, and Retention policy, tweaking it a bit to make it clearer. Also, there are some new policies that the Provost asked to develop, one related to distinguished teaching faculty and the other for the McKenzie Endowed Chair. Those items will be on the agenda perhaps in early April.

Charles Lyons asked about the teaching evaluation document, which was on the agenda, but will be deferred to the next meeting. Elwyn Martin clarified that the ad hoc committee that reviewed the instrument did not create the instrument. It was originally drafted a few years ago and has already been through the process. We made some minor changes to sentence structure, but did not create it. Dense asked DeAnna Timmerman about the process for originally reviewing the document. She said that the FPC brought it forward several times, but there was difficulty with the language related to the rating scale. It was to go back to FPC to clarify the language to bring it back forward. The discussion on the teaching evaluation instrument will be continued at the next meeting.

IFS Senator

Dense spoke with April Curtis, who does not want to serve. Ruthi Davenport wrote a memorandum to Dense indicating that she is willing to serve the rest of the year. Senate accepts Ruthi's continuation in the position through the end of the academic year. Darren Dutto asked for the Faculty Senate to cultivate someone to find her and recommended that we go back to our constituencies and ask who would be interested.

Music Program Changes

Peter Wordleman and Matt Cooper came forward. Dense asked if any of the courses that were provisionally approved at EPCC were required in the major or minor. Peter said 140 is in major along with the majority of the other courses. Motion to approve. Darren Dutto then asked if we could approve the major and minor without the courses being approved. Sally Mielke said that the syllabi were asked to be revised because with accreditation, the syllabi must show how each course learning outcome will be assessed. The syllabi have not yet been submitted as revised. Dense clarified that the approval was contingent on receiving the revised syllabi. Dense was leery about contingent approvals and the precedent being set. Darren Dutto tabled the motion until the next

meeting to get firm approval from EPCC.

BUS/ECON

Colleen Johnson thinks it is a mistake at this juncture to eliminate the program when a full consultation has not taken place. Doug Briney indicated that business faculty did have the discussions at the College of Business, and the decision was to remove the program. Frank Bushakra indicated that he was troubled by the lack of process. The College of Education did not discuss this. Should it? We need a process before we eliminate further programs. Rebecca Hartman indicated that there are a lot of CAS classes in the program and argued that the procedure is wrong. John Knudson-Martin said that the College of Education houses programs that include courses that are housed in CAS. Charles Lyons asked about whether there were considerations of the impact on enrollment or ramifications of the removal. Heidi Harris asked the question about setting precedents regarding which programs have say in other programs situations. If one group has courses in another program, do they have the right to make decisions about the program, when they do not house or assess the program? Knudson-Martin said he felt like Business did due diligence to delete one of its own programs. Every course in education would have an impact on CAS, but those programs are in ED. Hartman said that part of the process indicated that the programs or colleagues needed to be notified by the program who put forward the deletion. The discussion should have gone to CAS. If we are going to eliminate a program, then we should be as inclusive as possible. Knudson-Martin said that it seems like a slippery slope...if one has impact on the other, then it has to go to another college for discussion and approval. Hartman responded that she agreed; the issue is not about CAS teaching it. The question is that she is not ready to vote because if we eliminate the program, it is unclear whether CAS can pick it up. The issue should have gone to Provost and then the program faculty should have negotiated. Johnson said that programs have input into other programs, and that the process should be clarified before programs are eliminated. The EPCC form indicates that faculty affected have been notified. She indicates that consultation did not occur with her before the program elimination went through.

Chris Heidbrink asked what the real repercussions were to eliminate the program. He said we should hold on to the program, create a new process for addressing the issue, and then reconsider.

Mike Pierce said that the more we say we do not have a process, we diverge from the fact that we do have a process that is codified and has forms. Secondly, the issue is not about the process. It is about the decision that has been recommended from EPCC to Faculty Senate. The questions from previous meetings have been sent back. We do have a process, and it is a decision on recommendation from EPCC.

Doug Briney indicated that he voted to send it back to EPCC to give CAS a chance to respond. Colleen Johnson said that it did go back, she did respond to the rationale that was posted. Johnson disagreed that we have a process for program elimination; we are using a process for curricular review for this.

Darren Dutto said that it seems that the issue was that the justification should have happened at EPCC last week. Nicole Howard indicated that EPCC did not revote. If the body is concerned about it having a place to go, then that issue needs to be addressed.

Heidi Harris asked if the degree would be covered somewhere else. Colleen Johnson said that it

would not be covered in other degrees. Doug Briney said that the discussion was handled, and BUS agreed that it could be covered in other ways.

Colleen Johnson tabled the motion. Dense clarified that other specifications could not be made.

Seven in favor of tabling, 6 opposed. Dense abstained.

Colleen further moved that the Provost pull the relevant deans and faculty together to talk about the next steps in terms of dealing with this program. Dense made friendly amendment in form of recommendation. Frank Bushakra said that this motion was just asking for people to talk to each other. John Knudson-Martin said that the issue that is still relevant is that the process needs to be clarified.

Mike Pierce indicates that in the EPCC handbook, which might have been brought before the Faculty Senate for approval, does have a process for program deletions, and he believes that the process was followed. The process is there, visible, and possibly approved by Faculty Senate. What is the status of this question about BUS/ECON? Dense said that if the motion on the floor passes, then the meeting would need to take place before the next senate meeting, CAS could call a special meeting and then it would come back to Faculty Senate. He called for a conversation in PPE before it goes to the college.

Doug Briney indicated that no matter what happened with the program, BUS does not want to be in the title.

Mike Pierce indicated that his understanding from the Provost's statement before he left was that following the process from Faculty Senate will present it to him. If the Senate recommendation comes forward, the Provost will still have to deal with it. So this still stalls the decision.

Rebecca Hartman said that it did not seem like the same thing. In this case, we are saying we are not prepared to vote because we are not prepared.

The motion to send the recommendation to the deans and relevant faculty was approved.

Mike Pierce and Doug Briney voted no. Abstain: Jeff Dense and Darren Dutto abstained.

Good of the order

Deanna Timmerman indicated that the old agendas and minutes are on the Faculty Senate website. We have something called a Senate Routing Form to indicate a level of approval from where items begin, to indicate if the Provost approves or doesn't approve, and then explain why the recommendation was or was not followed.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:53.