

Faculty Senate Meeting
May 1, 2012

In Attendance: Carolyn Bloyed, Doug Briney, Frank Bushakra, Jeff Dense, David Drexler, Darren Dutto, Leandro Espinosa, Heidi Harris, Rebecca Hartman, Chris Heidbrink, Colleen Johnson, John Knudson-Martin, Charles Lyons, Elwyn Martin, Mike Pierce, Donna Rainboth, Deanna Timmermann

Visitors: Steve Adkison, Regina Braker, Anna Maria Dill, Chip Ettinger, Allen Evans, Mary Koza, Sally Mielke, and Heather Stanhope.

Meeting called to order 3:01 p.m.

Meeting minutes from April 17 were approved.

Provost Adkison on University Council request for review of Deficiency in Foreign Language Policy:

Two broad categories of concerns about DFL have been expressed. The first is about process. How was the action was communicated to University Council as an FYI item was one issue, but an FYI item is all that communication would be. There were also concerns about the process about how it was discussed at ASC. The second concern was content-related. What are the impacts of the policies themselves, and whether they should be one- or two-year and the impacts on students.

The questions that were raised are how the faculty governance process should work. This is faculty governance, not shared governance. What is before Senate and the Provost is to sort this issue out. One other issue is that there is not a routing process using a form that he would sign as there would be for EPCC actions. The issue regarding the DFL policy was first raised when it was announced at the Summit without it having gone through the Provost's Office and to the Registrar for operationalizing. Given content-related concerns, we are not ready for Fall 2012 implementation.

Provost Adkison did not want to spend time on process-related issues, which seem to be a specific case of the need for a larger shared-governance review of the operational details.

Regarding content-questions: There are a few ways those could be addressed in respect to the DFL Policy. The policy that ASC looked at was not radically or markedly different from our standing policy. What was different was that the policy was going to be operationalized. Substantive concerns over the time frame indicates that current policy should be reviewed and why we were not reinforcing the policy already should be discussed. If we are concerned on the one hand with students not being able to do it in a year, we do it in two years, which is problematic with transfer students. Carolyn Bloyed's investigation at the system-level and with the Chancellor's office and of our own admission policies and processes is interesting. The

foreign language requirement is a graduation requirement in Oregon schools, which became a de facto part of OUS admission policy. But it has been problematic for the same reasons that it is problematic for us. They quit tracking and took the language out of the systems admission policy. Three years ago, they quit coding and tracking admitted students who were DFL. Admitted students are admitted students; OUS doesn't draw a distinction. What they should have done was have a conversation with Oregon Department of Education and either get rid of the requirement or have some flexibility. Instead, they disappeared it. The feeling with the Registrar's council was that it became a graduation instead of an admissions requirement. To have students who are DFL graduate, we then have to have them remediate high school coursework, an interesting concept. So the degree and scale of our concerns at the system level are what they need to be. But it gets better. We have been tracking admitted students to see if they have met that high school foreign language requirement, which is a requirement for college-bound students. We see so many students here who 1) were not in college-prep courses or were from 2) a rural school that could not offer two years of foreign language, and they get an exemption from that requirement. Do we want to say that those who were not thinking of going to college that they can not enter? That might cut our enrollments in half. When we admit transfer students, who are any students who come to us with college credits, we admit them as transfer students; we don't even look or request their high school transcripts. But we have continued to designate junior transfers as DFL if they did not meet that high school requirement. We could get a transfer from a community college who has finished the AAOT and could be admitted DFL. Community colleges do not check that high school graduation requirement. But we do even for students who have an A.A. We ask if they have completed that language requirement. That is a pretty serious inconsistency in our practice and policy. It also means that the concern about transfer students not having time to make up that DFL is probably a moot point.

He wanted to underscore the importance of the dialogue because the concern surfaced through this process. But it also changes the larger context of that conversation.

John Knudson-Martin said that it sounds like this is a requirement that looks like it wants to go away. But it is so ingrained in the high school idea that we might be trying to reinforce an effort that is not being taken seriously.

Adkison said that foreign language is important in terms of learning and education. We are not talking about changing program or degree requirements.

Knudson-Marting said that it ended up being a de facto graduation requirement. Adkison responded that the way that we were constructing our approach was too broad. Students couldn't properly be held to that.

Motion re-opened.

Deanna Timmermann mentioned that we have a Senate routing form that would apply to ASC. That policy with the routing form is given to the Provost. If the Provost chooses not to sign, then

the Provost needs to return to the Senate to explain his choice. It seems that he has decided not to sign off. Adkison said that he has not seen the policy in his office. Timmermann said that he seems to be returning to the Senate saying he can not sign off on it at this time. Adkison agrees with Timmermann, but he has not seen the policy in his office. Timmermann say that we could then make a motion that we could send it back to ASC as an official motion. Jeff Dense asked what happens if the Senate does nothing after the Provost sends it back. Timmermann said that it does not become policy. Senate passes a policy and it is "passed" because the Provost's agreement has been implicit. But we have had issues with Gen Ed requirements through EPCC that were assumed to be in place for months but ended up not being policy after all because the Provost did not sign off on it. Dense said that if the Provost does not approve the policy, and he comes back to Senate with his reasons, then what does the Senate do? Timmermann said that we could then just make a resolution to address it.

Adkison said that he would only bring something back to Senate in cases of process issues; either it was not comprehensive or there were some informational pieces missing. We can not have Faculty Governance without the faculty expertise behind it. He will not second-guess; his job is to raise questions about the integrity of process.

Knudson-Martin said that it seems that the body is in agreement that we need to send it back to ASC to reconsider before it comes back to us. We need to vote on current motion, then have a second motion going back to ASC. Call questions.

Reconsideration of original vote: all in favor. Jeff Dense and Heidi Harris abstain.

Rebecca Hartman said that the other piece of process is that we have to reconsider it if it comes back from University Council. Timmermann clarified that we do not have to acknowledge the request.

Knudson-Martin moves to send the DFL Completion Policy back to ACS for reconsideration. All in favor. Dense abstains.

Knudson-Martin said that we should thank University Council for drawing our attention to the issue and to make a point to communicate to University Council that this has been the decision of Senate.

Adkison had a further note that the ASC's discussion through Blackboard was good, and he sends the policy back based on content-related issues. There were process-related issues, but it needs to be acknowledge that ASC did address it appropriately. He is not raising process-related questions. The concerns here that are substantive are content-related.

Timmermann said that there are a large number of individuals who are DFL. The numbers indicate that if we are going to make people meet that foreign language requirement, we can not meet it with the current way that SPN 107 courses are scheduled. This might be an issue where ASC needs to work with the Provost and language faculty in order to deal with hundreds

of students.

Adkison said that we should not be looking at the language requirement for transfer students. Considering new freshman from high school, this number is very different. One question that ASC is going to have to wrestle with is how Eastern Promise students will be considered. The textbook definition of a new freshman is zero college credits. But with Eastern Promise, we will see more and more "transfer" students with early college credit. The starting point might be students who come into college with credits without attending a post-secondary institution. In either case, it will have serious implications for our first-year modern language sequence.

Chip Ettinger clarified what needs to be considered by ASC. Are there alternative means by which students can get that credit? Adkison said that we cannot create or approve credits for high school graduation requirements. Ettinger asked if ASC should be constrained by the constraints of the EOU language department. The Provost said that ASC decides on the policy issue and then the Provost and Dean will determine how to implement the policy. Chris Heidbrink brought up that transfer students do not worry, but also that he would second that we need to consider high school students with early college credits.

Regina Braker offered as a comment that why OUS no longer pays attention is that our sister institutions already have the required two-year foreign language. Only a handful of students at other places do not have that requirement. We are the outlier on that. Heather Stanhope said that she was surprised by that comment because of the high number of home-schooled students or students from out-of-state.

Provost Adkison also provided a brief OEID Update: OEID expects to announce the Chief Education Officer within the next few days, but no one knows who that might be. As soon as the Provost's Office knows, something will be forwarded to campus.

Dense asked that 5th week enrollment numbers should be sent out from the Provost's office as well.

Provost Adkison stated that the Arts and Sciences Dean's Candidates are on campus May 7-17. He encourages Senate participation in those visits. He has received a fair amount of feedback from the College Task Force from individuals and anticipates feedback from Senate, too.

Faculty Senate President's Update:

Jeff Dense indicated that June 8-9, the state faculty senate presidents will be meeting in Portland, where the number of votes for the small schools being equal to the large schools will happen. The ad hoc task force will meet with University Council this Thursday to discuss the Faculty Senate Representative to University Council. Once again, we might not get to the update for the shared governance review. But this discussion highlights the need for the shared governance review. The routing of documents to bodies is an issue, the composition of committees is an issue, as well as new members knowing where everything is at. Leandro Espinosa, Darren Dutto, and Charles Lyons as the ad hoc committee will deal with a few issues

this year, and then Senate needs to consider if we want to consider this as a body of the whole or if we want some sub-committees that will address this to get it done by Spring 2013.

Report from University Council:

Elwyn Martin reported that a significant portion of time at the previous UC meeting was taken up with the DFL policy discussion. Sandy Henry also indicated some concerns with FERPA regarding student participation on the Financial Aid committee. Therefore, they are not following the constitutional membership requirements. There was a motion not to deal with the membership issue this year, but to deal with it next year. Chris Heidbrink brought up a point of clarification. In not filling the positions this year, the committee had mostly addressed the issues for this year. Heidbrink said that the steps that were taken were to modify the form for confidentiality, but the committee would need to vote.

Mike Pierce had a comment that FERPA allows students to participate in the governance process on these committees, which might address whatever concern there is. They are already institutional agents. The concern is that if we require students to sign something different from the other members of the committee. They should sign no more or less than other members of the committee.

EPCC consent agenda:

Move to approve. Dense abstains.

Administrative Task Force Report Discussion:

Jeff Dense asked Colleen Johnson to discuss what happened at the previous CAS meeting.

Colleen Johnson said that the Task Force Report should be on the CAS agenda Thursday. The Provost has been invited, but she does not know if he will be attending. Doug Kaigler had implored the CAS Senate members be at the CAS meeting this week. There were not many people at the last CAS meeting, and people had not had time to review the document. There was interest in the discussion at the division-level, but more importantly at the college-level. Dense clarified that in terms of input from the CAS, Senate members be the appropriate venue for feedback. The floor was opened for discussion from Ed/BUS.

J Knudson-Martin said that Ed/BUS will use program meetings for discussion. People have been encouraged to pass comments directly to the Provost, which seems to be working satisfactorily.

Frank Bushakra said that it might be valuable that if we prove feedback, we might invite the President and Provost to meetings, but that we might share the discussion between CAS and BUS/ED that addresses some philosophical concerns that have been upheld at the university. He requested that concerns be shared not just in an email environment.

Leandro Espinosa said that his understanding was that after the Provost gathered information, we would have a larger discussion.

Heidi Harris indicated that the timeline for the first stage of feedback to the Provost had passed. He would be coming back with his next level of recommendations, and we might wait to convene then.

Tenure and Promotion Handbook Revision:

Dense invited Allen Evans to speak to the T & P handbook revision. Evans thanked Senate and then indicated that FPC has not withdrawn the draft, but they think it is wise to continue the discussion in more detail next year. The amount of conversation that needs to take place and the input is not available now, and the collective thinking is that FPC isn't killing it, they are just putting it on pause and will take up comments and revisions in the fall when they have more thoughtful time to draft and present, take in comments.

Dense indicated that we have a lot of feedback from CAS, but one of the problems was that a number of faculty were doing Dean interviews and didn't have time for input. In fact, there are some issues that need to be addressed, including the evaluation of online faculty; the language says "on-campus" and "onsite," and we need to protect the hybrid faculty who are coming up for review.

Rebecca Hartman commended FPC for holding off, and indicated that starting in the fall we could see this at the division and college level before we get it at the Senate. She felt that was a piece that we could make stronger. Evans said that he believes the same concerns would come from ED/BUS as well. It took a good amount of time to find the drafts and history, which exist at least in part in oral culture or in policy that has been misplaced.

Hartman said that the 2009 document was initiated by Michael Jaeger as Provost and that those changes did not originate in Shared Governance. Evans does not disagree with that point. Dense said that the breakdown was with the "collegiality" language.

Evans indicated that two items needed to be addressed. The basic structure of the Faculty Review process predates the establishment of the union. The structure addresses the teaching faculty but not necessarily the librarians, who became part of the instructional faculty with the establishment of the union. The governance structure and practical policy are out of step. The governance needs to be brought in line with practice. The constitution states that the colleges have personnel committees, but the library is in limbo. So the constitutional amendment that we bring would add a library personnel committee in parallel to the CPCs, but the membership would be slightly different because the Library doesn't have a list of tenured faculty as of this point. To bridge the gap, they are proposing an amendment that puts the structure in line with what needs to be done so faculty can go through the process.

Moved to approve. David Drexler said that the library faculty are in approval because the language aligns with what is actually happening in practice. The language is similar to what Clay

enacted. Dense indicated that the external librarian was taken out for uniformity. John Knudson-Martin asked what the particular language was. Evans said it was on the agenda. Chris Heidbrink clarified the language about "at least five years" which takes the place of "tenured." He also asked about student input in terms of evaluations at the library, both for students and student librarians. Dense clarified that the issue is dealt with in the Tenure and Promotion revision draft. No one in the library will be up for two years, which gives us opportunity to clarify the language. Rebecca Hartman asked why were we taking this on as an action item if no one is going through tenure in the next few years. Dense said that an ad hoc committee was formed, and the Provost said that was not a sustainable structure. Evans clarified that the current structure was an interim process based on a procedure and structure agreed on by the Provost and Library Director. This amendment would put a formal process in place. In a few years, once more librarians are tenure, they might revise to remove the CAS and ED/BUS faculty. Colleen Johnson clarified whether or not this would be a piecemeal change like the Budget and Planning committee, so could we not bring the other item back. Dense said that reconsideration would be based on the decision of the ad hoc meeting. Anna Maria said that the problem would be that a constitutional amendment would need to be out to the university for two weeks, but if the Senate isn't convened again this month, it will be too late for the amendment about Budget and Planning to be voted on this year.

Chris Heidbrink asked the question again about how student feedback would be brought in. Dense clarified that there are other feedback options aside from teaching.

Rebecca Hartman asked for clarification regarding the decision for the Budget and Planning membership aside until the ad hoc committee considered it. Dense said there was no action and no vote from Senate. Chris Heidbrink clarified the discussion about the "piecemeal" nature of the amendments.

Dense clarified that he and Anna Maria Dill asked for a committee to consider how we should proceed and to provide a recommendation. Colleen Johnson said that the ex officio was a part of the discussion, but there was also a position that had been eliminated, which was out of sync with reality. She agrees that the LPC looks appropriate, but the Planning and Budget looked reasonable as well.

Heidi Harris asked if the issues were the same considering one is part of a larger group, and the other doesn't seem to be the same. Colleen Johnson clarified that there seemed to be two issues, one related to ex officio and one related to a position no longer existing. Dense said those could be voted on differently.

Anna Maria Dill came to the table and asked that Faculty Senate reconsider the Budget and Planning Chair issue. University Council voted to change the VP of Budget and Planning to ex officio, but since that isn't going through, the VP of Budget and Planning is being asked to recuse himself each and every meeting. UC work would like to be recognized. UC passed it, and they would like FS to consider it. Looking at ex officio members is a good idea for next year, but each committee would need to reconsider their members. She asked in the interest of time

that we reconsider the issue.

Dense said that the UC has the prerogative to ask the FS to reconsider, which takes a majority vote of the UC. John Knudson-Martin asked a process question. The process issue that Evans has brought to us needs to be voted on. Leandro seconded what Knudson-Martin said; these were separate issues.

Deanna Timmermann had an issue with the thoughts and concerns of UC and of Colleen Johnson. She said we could potentially have a meeting to two weeks or an online vote where we could consider all of the amendments. She also indicated that the CPC has a student member, and asked if the librarians would consider a friendly amendment to include a student member.

Sally Mielke said a student worker would not be equal. Questions were called.

The motion was to accept the FPC committee recommendation to add a section to the constitution. Motion carried. Dense abstained.

Tenure and Promotion Clock Stop:

This is a change to existing policy that was adopted a few years back. This addressed the issue of family additions (birth, adoption). One of the things that happens in FPC review is to look back at the process to see what needs to be modified, and based on events last year, one of the recommendations was to consider a broader tenure-delay policy to consider more than additions. There are possible cases where a faculty member could have a serious illness or a family member who has an illness that could take the faculty out for a number of months. This change to policy will do a number of things. First, the one-year delay is automatic, but the new policy says that it will be automatic if it is requested, but it should not be forced if someone does not want it. The policy also adds an issue other than childbirth or adoption. A serious family crisis might have a significant impact. This is not a constitutional issue, this is a policy issue for action.

Motion moved to approve.

Leandro Espinosa offered a friendly amendment by CAS "for purposes of record keeping, the Provost will send a letter of information to the College Dean and or the Library Director." FPC agreed. Hartman indicated that there was never a forcing of the policy; it was just written in a way so that a faculty member did not have to request an extension. Dense clarified that the faculty member be allowed to stop the clock upon recommendation and read the policy according to the AAUP Red Book. Hartman indicated that there is a stigma attached to requesting the policy. As more women enter academia, they are working to get tenure just as they are of childbearing years. The tenure delay policy was to acknowledge that there is a commitment to family responsibilities that needs to be addressed. The policy in place reduces the stigma of taking advantage of the policy. She would argue strenuously that we think carefully about having the policy that the clock as that a person be a special exception. Colleen

Johnson asked if the automatic without request applies only to having or adopting a child. Hartman clarified that it was so. Johnson clarified that at some point the person would need to let a person know. If a person is a potential father, how does the policy work? Won't he need to go to the Provost and indicate that his partner is having a child, which would be also stigma? Hartman clarified that the division chair would know, which would notify the dean, who would notify the Provost, without being requested. Hartmann said that universities that have an automatic extension that comes through parenthood versus the broader policies for other instances. Those are special cases that need to be requested and discussed. Dense asked Evans to expand on the part about the extenuating language was added. Evans said that there are foreseeable cases where an individual would have a major family issue, and that policy is not addressed at all. John Knudson-Martin is impressed with the argument that Hartman is made. It seems that we can have both. We can add the extended family policy without taking away the automatic deferral benefits.

Dense said that he is also convinced. Timmermann asked for a friendly amendment to replace paragraph C in the proposed document with the current policy. Dense asked if there was a notification timeline with regard to the extension in the existing policy. Hartman added the existing policy to the record. Harris asked a question about whether or not the individual would have a year to revoke the policy. Lyons asked for clarification of the separate policies and that the automatic extension apply only to the childbirth or adoption. Evans indicated that the spirit of the amendment is keeping with the discussion at FPC, who did not want to force something on to anyone. Chris Heidbrink recognized that the amendment included legal guardianship. In terms of all of the other elements, they are all comprehensively covered in Part D.

Hartman wanted to clarify that in Part A, there was language that also pertained and would need to have parallel language. Chris Heidbrink made a friendly amendment, changing "can request" to "will receive." The concerns raised were that it would then impact the other issues other than childbirth or adoption. Heidbrink said that it just says that they can request one. Colleen Johnson said that it is a bad idea to wordsmith in a hurry. She asked for it to go back to FPC to double-check for the policy to be consistent. We can approve it by the end of the academic year. Evans indicated that the personnel policy to go into effect the following year have to be approved by May 1 due to the union contract. Hartman said that to get the policy in place now took two years to get every constituency. She supports a friendly amendment as long as it does not change the original policy for the automatic extension. Timmermann clarified that Heidbrink's language in Part A will clarify this point. Dense indicated that it wasn't the intent to change that specific part of the language with regard with childbirth and adoption. The more daunting part of the policy was Part D. Evans clarified that an OUS person was requested by the Provost for recommendation, which came back that we add a section of policy to address the circumstance outside of childbirth or adoption. We don't have a policy that addresses that. We need to have some language to specify how that would work. Hartman asks if we could just take D and add it to the existing policy. Dense asked if there would be a confidentiality policy under E that would be a substantive change. Bushakra asked if there was language to operationalize this once it is passed. Evans said that a process was built in to the language. In the case of personal issues, it is not automatic; the individual would need to initiate and the

Provost would need to make a judgement call.

Evans received the friendly amendment that Chris Heidbrink (from request to receive) and to replace C with current policy.

Questions called. Dense clarified the friendly amendments from Senate and from CAS (three).

Motion carried. Dense abstained.

Dense indicated that as part of the shared governance review, questions were asked regarding the composition, the size, the ascendancy, the terms of office, and the voting with regard to the ex officio issue. Sally Mielke has addressed these issues in a memorandum in regards to a document storage site. Dense also initiated a study of the curriculum committees throughout the system. Two issues: with regard to the EOU committee, we are the only one that an academic advisor is a voting member. In other committees that person is a resource. Second, with the exception of OIT and EOU, the registrar is not a voting member, but a resource for curriculum.

Leandro Espinosa clarified the request Anna Maria Dill put forward. Dense indicated that the UC would need to vote on the reconsideration. She will take it back to UC for reconsideration and clarification. She was not making a personal request considering that UC had voted at the last meeting to pass that amendment and ask that it be brought forward to the Senate for a vote. At that point, it was not voted on, but was forwarded to an ad hoc committee. The request is based on the UC vote, but will defer to Dense in terms of reconsideration. Dense said that he wanted to clarify the constitutional process.

Dense indicated that he is following through on discussions with the committees, and those discussions will continue and be taken through the colleges. Dense asked Colleen for her input given her work on the EPCC.

Johnson indicated that the minutes from EPCC are not detailed in terms of what is going on. The minutes indicate the motion and the vote. It is important for all committees to provide that information. Darren Dutto asked for clarification regarding the charge. The documents indicated that curriculum matters should be in the hands of faculty. The current make-up of the committee indicates that the advisor and registrar could be there for informative purposes. Two of the issues are getting students to serve and having faculty show up as a quorum. Dutto said by addressing the makeup, we can address some of the other issues. Harris indicated that there might be language with EPCC committee meeting attendance, and Dense asked whose role it is to implement that. Johnson agreed with Dutto that there are members of the committee who are important information sources but should be ex officio regarding a vote if we are to abide by AAUP guidelines for faculty controlling curriculum. At one point, there was an evaluation of the committee members based on their attendance and if they took their duty or responsibility seriously. On some committees, such as EPCC, members haven't shown up, which exacerbates the problem of who is voting on curricular items. If the people are going to be elected and it is part of their service, there needs to be a way to hold them accountable for that.

John Knudson-Martin asked for a point of clarification. There is nothing in the bylaws for attendance. Dense clarified that it is in the language for Senate attendance.

Chris Heidbrink said that it should be part of attendance and for students to be seated to a committee. He would not like student seats to be removed. The person who should sit on that committee did not have training and went through a rapid succession of individuals. There should be language and process for ensuring that seats are filled and that members attend.

Darren Dutto said that the workload for EPCC can be daunting, and for students on the committee understanding and providing input on the committee is the most difficult. He is not against students on the committee, but it is a difficult task given the course load. He is not saying that it isn't valuable at EPCC, but it is difficult to have viable input from a student. Sally Mielke said she has the same concerns that Dutto raised, and that Mike Pierce gave a recommendation at EPCC that students be given credit for serving on the committee. Johnson clarified that it is difficult for a student to understand the process and is opposed to offering credit for students. Mike Pierce said that there are valid reasons for encouraging student participation, and that any stakeholder analysis involves student input. There is a lot of work. Why in the world can we not incentivize students to participate. As an institution, we encourage civic engagement. The committee involvement is a perfect example of civic engagement. Why not model how we as faculty members bring significant stakeholders to the table. We can do better than write it off.

Dense commented that he was guided by the OUS study. The curriculum committee traces back to 1886, and students have always been on it.

John Knudson-Martin asked about committee attendance. This is an issue about other committees in particular. There needs to be something to account for the review. Carolyn Bloyed indicated that she as the registrar didn't have a personal need to vote. But it is necessary to have the position on the committee because of the details that are necessary to making decisions. The registrar is not a faculty member, so she doesn't participate in what constitutes a Gen Ed course. So if we look at making the Registrar non-voting, then the faculty members need to be present. Harris indicated that students voting might raise the same issue of faculty governance. And also that the tenure & promotion process might indicate a way of talking about what we do. Colleen Johnson said that student participation was important, but giving academic credit was problematic. We could tie EPCC attendance to a course with civic engagement. But it isn't academic work in the same way that a class is. Pierce said that it might be accommodated in a Practicum. Pierce wants to talk about the voting perspective. The more the voice is diminished through participation or lack of participation, the importance of ancillary member retaining their vote is important. There is more to curriculum than content. There are deliverables, accessibility, etc. That plays into how curriculum is offered at our institution. If we are to minimize students, then we need students represented through other members of the committee. Leandro Espinosa said that both points seem correct. Involving a student through curriculum committees is hard. Perhaps it could be a part of civic engagement.

John Knudson-Martin said part of the issue is placing the right student. EPCC is a significant and special appointment, and the ASEOU might need to pick carefully who serves on that committee.

Dense recommended that it is up to faculty to perhaps indicate students who have the ability to serve. Heidbrink said that this issue has come up in shared governance. It should be incumbent on students to fill committees, but it should be up to members of shared government to make a recommendation when they see an open seat, which has happened on Tech Grant committee. ASEOU is willing to accept recommendations by committee members for students who might serve on committees.

Dense thanked Sally Mielke and EPCC's thoughtfulness in the memo. His take is that we want to be inclusive in terms of changes in shared governance. We want to talk with our colleagues, which is part of why he tasked the ad hoc shared governance task force. We need the input of all stakeholders as we move forward with the shared governance review. He encouraged Senators to seek input.

Meeting adjourned: 5:12.