

## Faculty Senate Minutes Mar. 4, 2008

### Present

D. Mielke  
K. Watson  
S. Tanner  
D. Timmerman  
R. Powers  
A. Evans  
G. Ramey  
K. Wenger  
L. Espinoza  
P. Johnson  
S. Jenkins

### Other

C. Johnson  
R. Davenport  
Provost  
D. Hoffman

Call to order 3:00

Approval of Minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes was seconded and passed unanimously.

### Agenda:

Approval of minutes (3:00 – 3:05)

EPCC Agenda (3:05 – 3:20)

We have been asked to revisit the procedure for referring EPCC decisions that the senate has ratified. Apparently, after our last meeting where we passed several items, the College of Education is concerned because the SPED (Special Education prefixes) have not yet been implemented because the Registrar is waiting for the 30 day comment period. The Provost has made the following suggestions and I share them with you:

Curricular changes are proposed by faculty, divisions, and colleges.

Proposals are forwarded to all Deans and EPCC at the same time

EPCC considers the proposals, solicits input and makes recommendations

EPCC forwards the recommended changes to the Senate for a decision and to the UC for information at the same time

The UC looks at the proposals and determines if it has any input to the Senate on the curricular change (This would require that the UC precede the Senate in meeting dates by at least a week. There is still a timing issue here if EPCC forwards a proposal after the UC meets and before the Senate meets. There would be a delay in this case.)

The UC looks at the proposals and determines if it has any input to the Senate on the curricular change (This would require that the UC precede the Senate in meeting dates by at least a week. There is still a timing issue here if EPCC forwards a proposal after the UC meets and before the Senate meets. There would be a delay in this case.)

The Senate forwards the approved curricular changes to the provost's office with recommendations for implementation dates

The Provost either a) affirms the recommendation directs the Registrar to implement the changes on an approved date or b) redirects the recommendation back to the senate with concerns or questions. (These should be answered in the senate as the Provost is part of that body, but there may come a time when there may still be further concern in the where affirmation may not be in the best interest of the University. I doubt this will ever arise, but it is in the realm of possibility).

The Provost's Office posts the summary of curricular change to the campus community.

I have some concerns about a "parallel" review process - but I think that we need to discuss this.

Some time ago we discussed the issue of whether we thought it was appropriate to accept ALL Associate of Arts degrees as meeting our GE requirements. Jeff Woodford had done a little research on this issue and forwarded that to me when he resigned. I'll place this on the agenda and we can discuss this if the senate chooses.

The Provost has sent out some suggestions regarding revision of the Tenure and Promotion procedures.

I think that we should invite the Personnel committee to our next meeting to discuss these?

4. Report from the subcommittee that met with the University Council sub committee on the Mission Statement revision.

## EPCC AGENDA

### Action Items:

New Course request: SPAN 326

<http://www.eou.edu/epcc/Agenda07-08/2.26.08Agenda.html>

Discussion – course experiment in hybrid course online and on campus

Moved seconded and approved

Eliminate minors: Coaching and Sports Medicine

<http://www.eou.edu/epcc/Agenda07-08/2.19.08Agenda.html>

Discussion: to remove a program from catalog and to create a new program and you need to eliminate the former programs. Clean up is very important

Moved seconded and approved

### Information Items:

UWR approval: THEA 353 Play Direction

<http://www.eou.edu/epcc/Agenda07-08/2.26.08Agenda.html>

proposed and approved by a majority of both bodies

### Constitutional change

Changes in reorganization have necessitated changes in the structure of EPCC.

Changes are highlighted in red.

### OLD LANGUAGE:

The Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee shall consist of twelve (12) members, including six (6) teaching faculty with representation from each College as follows: three (3) teaching faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, two (2) teaching faculty from the College of Education, and one (1) teaching faculty from the College of Business [at least three (3) of the teaching faculty members must be tenured]; one (1) librarian; two (2) students appointed by the recognized student government; the Registrar and a representative of the Division of Distance Education. The Provost or his/her designee shall serve ex officio, without vote. The Provost's Office shall provide staff support for the Committee.

### NEW LANGUAGE:

The Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee shall consist of twelve (12) members, including six (6) teaching faculty with representation from each college as follows: three (3) teaching faculty from College of Arts and Sciences, two (2) teaching faculty from College of Education and one (1) teaching faculty from College of Business [at least three (3) of the teaching faculty members must be tenured]; one (1) librarian; two (2) students; the Registrar and a representative specializing in Instructional Design. In addition, the Provost or his/her designee shall

serve ex officio without vote. The Provost's Office shall provide staff support for the Committee. Teaching faculty members shall be elected by their respective Colleges to two-year terms

Motion and a second

Instructional designer how designated and who. The intent was to have someone from DDE on the committee. That responsibility has now shifted. The EPCC faculty does not have online course design expertise.

Current language does not make sense with the removal of DDE. House keeping or not

Motion to table 8 for motion passes

Discussion items:

EPCC would like to streamline our reporting to the Faculty Senate by changing our bylaws. Currently our reporting mechanism is the following:

**The following items are among those that require Faculty Senate approval:**

- Course additions
- Course deletions
- Changes in core requirements for a major or minor
- Major program additions or deletions
- Program changes, including new minors and concentrations
- Course number changes
- Policy issues

The following items are among those that do not require Faculty Senate approval but are presented for *information only*:

- General Education requests
- University Writing Requirement requests
- Course name change
- Course credit change
- Changes in catalog language

Motion:

EPCC will move Course additions, Course deletions, and Course number changes to the "information only" list of items.

Seconded

What is the rationale for the above break out? Explicit responsibility is outlined?

Changing of credits is important. Course credit change is currently informational. Consent agenda as a solution to sharing information. Keeping the process to allow for colleges to have a second.

Motion to table passed.

EPCC will return with retooled proposal for another look

How information flows between council and senate is a critical issue  
The President of the Council requests staff time to accomplish the work of the two bodies Senate and Council with their agendas on the web in advance so people can access info before the meeting  
All committee minutes posted on the governance web site.  
Concerned people can view work coming up in the pipeline and go to committee meetings of interest  
good faith effort of the bodies to inform from the Senate to the Provost and the Council to President

**Motion to have the Senate and Council put minutes and agenda on web in advance of their meetings.**

**Motion seconded and approved.**

Provost recommends posting curricular business to the EPCC page where it would be visible to everyone. EPCC recommendations would be posted as part of a notification system. Need to add a step from the Senate to Provost and then to registrar. Provost should have knowledge of majors and minors and any changes.

Senate will recommend an appropriate timeliness of the initiation part of process to the provost.

Provost opening web page would be for students and administration. The page would have a portal to faculty and staff links this would help in the flow of information.

Working on a restructure of the web site

**Look at associate degrees from other inst. Only AA degrees**

Incoming students need to have access to credit from their respective AA programs. CC with AA degrees would we accept 2 yrs of cosmetology equiv. If a student comes with an AA will we accept, do we take AA from anywhere? Partnering of other institutions is a key to our success. With AAOT (Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer) program requirements would address most of the problems as well as advisors.

We accept from schools that we are familiar with. What are the extremes of accepted AA degrees are there around the country.

Ore law requires us to accept AA degrees from Oregon schools. This issue emerges with the senate starting the conversation. The Senate refers the issue to the EPCC

Suggest taking conversation first to the Divisions then the Colleges then to the EPCC. Accept any AA from any institution and would substitute for our Gen. Ed...

As a policy, any issue that a senators wishes to take forward will go to their Division first. What do we mean by accredited? We accept liberal arts or regional accrediting and not professional accrediting.

Personnel Committee process refers to the personal committee of the senate

According to the Provost actions and changes should flow from College Personnel Committee to the Faculty Senate and the Provost.

The process will include the College personnel committee the Academic personnel committee the Faculty Senate and the administration. There will be questions about the process from the President's Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW) and others.

Will the deliberations of the committees come forward from the committee? The committees will choose their own course in the process. The senate will wait until the conversation comes to us.

Mission statement

The revised statement

The BART. Committee worked from the faculty approved version from 2004 and tried to adjust to meet the new reality. Look at the revisions. The committee didn't think rural was important to students and may be was to the board.

Current version is more of a vision statement than a mission statement. The action verbs are there with student centered and liberal arts drive our actions like a mission statement.

Suggest that we continue working with the council on a joint statement. We need to have this done by May to be in place for the accreditation report. The admin will be brought into the process at this point to collaborate with the senate and council. The constitution indicates that the Council is charged with leading the process.

Need a wider discussion at this point to move the Mission Statement forward. The sub committee will take the statement to the council for approval and then move out to the campus community at large. Senators need to take the conversation back to their constituents. The sub-committee will meet with the provost and council and come back with a revised statement for our approval.

Spring Symposium resolution

Include a statement from the Senate

Post the resolution to infoline

Moved and seconded and approved

The motion to table in a committee is the nuclear option. We declined to act on the EPCC and that is unfortunate.

We need to address the disappearance of DDE. Does the constitution reflect the existence of DDE?

We need to be proactive in the structure of committees and the upcoming DDE adjustments. With respect to several committees, how do we replace or do we replace DDE representatives?

House keeping changes should be done by people with some DDE experience. Do we need someone from DDE on the committees?

Can we put in fix before we know how the restructure is going to work? How do we handle the timing of the switch over? The need for the expertise still exists. Suggest accepting the existing committee structure and continue until the next election.

If we continue in Huber we need a third microphone two floating microphones would work with us sitting at the second row of tables. The council meets in Inlow 201 without internet connectivity. There are individuals who are joining us on the internet. The new IT person is here and the plan is to have internet in Inlow 201. The senate should insist with the Admin and IT that the necessary changes takes place now. The Faculty Senate president will look at it.

Report from council

Accreditation is moving forward more will be brought into the process soon.

Now and in future more assessment will take place. And the provost will take the lead on this.

The process for sharing information is progressing with getting the web site up and running

4:45 adjourn

Next meeting on April 8th