

Minutes
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
December 2, 2008

Present:

Molly Litchfield
Steve Tanner
Ruthi Davenport
Richard Croft
Greg Monahan
Jeff Johnson
Allen Evans
DeAnna Timmermann
Rosemary Powers
Ken Watson
Ted Atkinson
Provost Jaeger
Leandro Espinosa
Stephen Jenkins
Gerry Ramey
Peter Johnson
Jodi Varon

Others:

Tony Tovar
Dea Hoffman
Colleen Johnson
Les Balsiger
President Lund

I. [3:00pm] Call to Order

ACTION ITEMS:

II. [3:00pm – 3:02pm] Approval of Minutes for the [November 4, 2008](#) Meeting
Motion to approve minutes seconded unanimous

III. [3:02pm – 3:05pm] January Meeting Reschedule (from January 6 to January 13)
Move meeting to the second Tuesday.
Change the date to the third Tuesday
We have a lot to do should meet on the second Tuesday
Moved and seconded to change to second Tuesday January 12, 2009, passed unanimously

IV. [3:05pm – 3:15pm] [EPCC](#) Constitutional Language Change Proposal (Colleen Johnson)

The EPCC chair points out that there was a change to the constitution 2 years ago. EPCC changed membership and put on the registrar with a vote and a voting DDE staff member. DDE is gone and EPCC proposed the change that is on the agenda. The previous DDE person was changed in the new constitution to an admin faculty without EPCC approval. EPCC came to the Senate last year to change the language in the Constitution. This year EPCC is back with wording that will work for EPCC see the link in the agenda. The committee feels that off campus student community needs to be represented and EPCC wants to review the person's background at the time of appointment. On May 6th The Senate reviewed the needs and constraints on Administrative Faculty as they serve on all committees. It was decided that the Senate should not put restrictions on the qualifications of Administrative Faculty serving on committees. This issue was also taken up by the University Council at the same time. We do place restrictions on Teaching Faculty as well and there are places in the Constitution where we apply different criteria to achieve various purposes. The Shared Governance Committee tried to strengthen the existing committee structure. The Committee looked at the structure of and consulted with every existing committee. In drafting the Constitution the original description of the make up of the EPCC was more restrictive than the one currently being considered.

The chair of the EPCC raises the point that the EPCC was very interested in someone with experience in online instruction and design. EPCC feels that it is critical for the committee to have the right mix of people and expertise.

Friendly amendment proposed “off campus students as they pertain to curriculum” accepted as a friendly amendment.

The established procedure is to discuss the wording and vote at the following meeting to allow communication with constituents.

Onsite, online and on campus are the language used currently in the EOU marketing campaign, propose a friendly amendment to change on campus to online.

If we move to uniformity of instructional delivery, need someone to represent the changing nature of instruction technology. Since there is a difference between unit skill requirements and position requirements how to address the limited number of qualified individuals.

EPCC needs to address the “unique needs of onsite and online students as pertains” this language went to Administrative Faculty Executive Committee for approval.

Mt hood cohort onsite has 700 students not represented as onsite students.

The Senate has to vote on the original wording discussion, the change was pulled and the Senate withheld support for the original language.

Motion that the wording “off campus students as they pertain to curriculum” be substituted for “online” and if the wording is approved by the Senate it then moves to the University Council for their approval

13 For, 2 Opposed, 1 Abstained

V. [3:15pm – 3:25pm] Election of [IFS](#) Alternate (Steve Tanner)

Vote for IFS rep Frederick Pratter, Sheri Carpenter and Sandy Elston are the nominees. Majority wins and if there is not a majority then there will be a run off.

Sheri Carpenter wins a majority of the vote and is elected the new IFS representative.

VI. [3:25pm – 3:30pm] Confirming Elections to the Honors Committee (Steve Tanner)
This discussion will take place at the next meeting after all of the names are in.

VII. [3:30pm – 3:50pm] Reflections on the Representative Senate: Responsibilities to Constituents and Possible Bylaws Revision (Rosemary Powers)
Work on a by-laws revision of the responsibility of members (see the language from Tennessee and Waterloo) either represent or have a diverse body, another approach is the responsibility of communication between senators and their constituents. Change the by-laws to reflect the responsibility of the Senators. Insist that there be issues that come forward that require action and recognize that there are times when business needs to be done expediently. The Senators are formally required to report to their constituents on a regular basis. We can not tie our hands while we poll our constituents. Any of the models put forward will work. While the Senator need to consult with constituents they also must move forward and vote their conscience.

How do the Senators decide what to report.?

Senators are charged with being accountable to their constituents.

How to report differences expressed at the meeting?

Need to inform constituents and need to gather input from constituents, it is a two way street. It is important to engage people.

We have regular Division meetings that provide for routine communication, communication is a natural part of the process and we are doing this already.

We have wording in the by laws to allow for open comment times during Senate meetings.

The Senate needs to be explicit about discussing amendments at one meeting and voting on the amendment at the next. The Senate needs to post reports and read committee reports in advance and accept the reports at the following meeting.

The Senate needs to provide time to address important issues.

If we are going to discuss and then vote at the next meeting we will just continue the discussion. This then further delays any action.

The senate can police it self in the vote or delay of the vote no need to tie our hands with to much ambiguity and delay.

Currently the Senate is attempting to post the agenda, with links, to allow for some consideration and discussion in advance.

VIII. [3:50pm – 4:05pm] Faculty Response to [Latest Budget News](#). unclear
Decide on the two items above and below. We have Provost and President on hand for update on budget.

President Lund reported that the council of Presidents meeting in Portland looked at the Governors budget cuts for the 09-11 biennium. Considering backfill from the Education Stability Fund (ESF), what kind of cuts do campuses need to make in 09-10. The Governor is looking at 3.4% 4.3% reduction less than anticipated with an increase in the ESF.

Provost essential budget level is the automatic increase for next year. Next June anticipate a 1.8 billion deficit in revenues, unclear is 1.8 on Essential Budget Level (EBL) or Current Service Level (CSL). Whether the deficit is on CSL or EBL is a huge difference and it is unclear at this point, no one seems to have the answer.

EOU will ask the Chancellor whether the reduction for 09-10 is firm, a \$433,000 reduction now may get bigger.

Senators question if EOU IFS reps should take the issue to IFS on EOU's behalf.

President wants the Senate to wait until Thursday after the Portland meeting.

Provost feels that education will not escape from the current financial crisis.

The President thinks that so far OUS has been held relatively harmless relative to other segments of the economy.

The Senate wonders, does EOU have any sympathy from Chancellor for our recent history of budget cuts.

President Lund thins we have turned things around and that the chancellor knows the situation and EOUs interconnection with a large region of the state. EOU and SOU can not go lower. We are going to end up a little higher in our fund balance for the year. This slightly higher fund balance, 5.2 to 7% can be used to off set any cuts.

What is the timeline for reporting back to the faculty?

President Lund plans to post the Board forum after both the Presidents Council and the Board meetings there will be an email message.

The Provost indicated that EOU will move ahead as planned. We need to avoid raising unnecessary concerns with the students. Administration should be patient and wait until we have more information and not be reactive.

Cascade College reported that they are closing and turning out 700 students. The area privates Reed Linfield and Willamette will all be reducing their financial aid, EOU needs to approach these students who are already working towards a degree and attract them to our programs.

- IX. [4:05pm – 4:20pm] Faculty Response to the [OUS self-study](#) Recommendations
- X. [4:20pm – 4:35pm] Evaluation of Online Courses

EOU is looking at potential ways of merging old DDE and current online offerings to streamline the evaluation of all courses.

What if we advocated change through the Milay process, find some way to incorporate Milay committee to evaluate both online and on campus courses?

Develop a process for getting student evaluations of courses through the blackboard process.

Provost has studied the system in hopes there could be a screen or button in Blackboard. The difficulty is in getting the students to go to the screen where the button is. Sent out a lot of information to students to get the evaluations, 8% of students responded. We got a 4% bump after doing all of the promotion. We have to imbed the survey in Blackboard so it is required of students to complete.

Writing faculty who teach online do not have a Milay evaluation, most are not coming up for promotion as adjunct faculty. We do not have good way of looking at the quality of online instruction. Each discipline has a different set of criteria.

Provost plans to look at the success of other institutions in developing a student course evaluation process.

Faculty can informally or formally visit online classes as part of the Milay process.

Adjunct Faculty can be promoted to Senior Instructor.

Provost indicated that the Milay evaluation is designed for on campus review and does not address the new pedagogy of online courses. We should have similar tool for online courses as we do for on campus courses.

The online student evaluation must be anonymous from the grading process of the class. There must be no question in the students mind of confidentiality.

Currently Blackboard does not have anonymity built, we in need to fix that.

Completing the evaluation can not be tied to the grade.

On campus is easy and obviously anonymous online less confidential.

A better way might be to come up with 5-6 questions on the board that allows students to respond. Maybe need a set of specific questions for a class.

How does the senate proceed with the issue as we teach more courses online? We need to discuss what is the next step.

Send a note to Division Chairs and the Personnel Committees that we include online courses in the discussions about course evaluations.

One alternative is to reconstitute the DDE advisory committee to provide a forum for input from on campus teaching faculty of issues concerning online teaching. How does EOU deal with online course evaluation?

Provost has looked at other institutions. The administration is looking at using the College Personnel Committees in creating a plan of how to value instruction that is not face to face. The Milay committee standardized the evaluation process for on campus courses. If we wish to use the same process, then we need to develop standardized criteria for online course evaluations.

How does the Senate become part of the solution?

Ask the College Personnel Committee to add a section to the tool already in place. The senate can charge the personnel committee to address this issue.

We have not integrated the old DDE into the new system and the new committee could address the issue. From the DDE perspective the Milay committee issue is only a small percentage of the problem.

Shouldn't the disciplines start the discussion, why do we need a separate committee?

Provost has been working with the Deans to address the problem and the online faculty could create an ad hoc committee to address the problems.

The President went to Mike Cannon to find answers to most common online questions. Ad hoc group was formed to work with the administration, because the integration has not been smooth. There is a larger variety of things going online. We will revisit this issue in January.

XI. [4:35pm – 4:45pm] On the Keeping of Minutes in the Library as a [Constitutional Requirement](#) (section VI)

The Senate officers will work out a process for archiving the Faculty Senate minutes.

DISCUSSION / INFORMATION ITEMS:

XII. [4:45pm – 4:55pm] Faculty Senate Bylaw Change Proposal – [RAG committee](#) – Presentation to be Voted Upon During the January Meeting (Chip Ettinger)

We will discuss this meeting with our constituents and vote at the next meeting in January. There is a tangential problem about what to do about the policy on human study research. This is issue is unrelated from the human study committee.

Currently the RAG Committee has 3 faculty from CAS and 1 from Education / Business combined. This should be changed to 2 to 2 to have better faculty distribution. RAG is primarily a travel fund and generally does not address stipends which are research monies.

The rag committee does on occasion award monies for equipment for field work not only conference travel. The majority is for travel and the stipends are for faculty development.

The web site says priority is for the presentation of papers.

Need to be clear that this does not include summer stipends.

The four year term length seems unusual since most other committees are for two years, this should be changed to be consistent.

The problem has been the size, probably 2 1 and 1 would be better for Education and Business.

CAS needs 3, one for each division because of the tension between arts and sciences.

Do the bodies represent student numbers or faculty numbers?

The committee should be 3 and 2 from business with staggered two year terms.

XIII. [4:55pm – 5:00pm] Good of the Order