

Minutes
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 3, 2009

Present:

Ruthi Davenport
Allen Evans
Jim Tooke
Ken Watson
Dan Mielke
DeAnna Timmermann
Molly Litchfield
Richard Croft
Leandro Espinosa
Jeff Johnson
Dea Hoffman
Rosemary Powers
Ted Atkinson
Greg Monahan
Jodi Varon

Others:

Colleen Johnson
Doug Kaigler
Jessica Plattner

I. [3:00pm] Call to Order

ACTION ITEMS:

II. [3:00pm – 3:05pm] Approval of Minutes for the February 3, 2009 meeting
Approved unanimous

III. [3:05pm – 3:30pm] [EPCC](#) (Colleen Johnson)

Consent agenda See agenda

Moved and seconded to approve the courses, remove the Media endorsement for further discussion. Passes unanimously

Faculty asks if there is more to the Media Endorsement. Thought that an endorsement should involved more credits.

This is what EPCC was given to work with.

Discussion of the media endorsement, show that this meets the TSPC rules for endorsements. This is a pilot that has an audience and is moved over from the 510 designation.

Moved and second and Media Endorsement is approved unanimously

The Chair of the EPCC Gave an update on Gen Ed core, the EPCC is not looking for a vote today. This comes to the senate for an initial look, and then it goes to the faculty at large for comments. Then we will bring it back in the spring for final approval. There is link to the packet on the EPCC page. Number two is the Evaluation Review Criteria and is to be used by faculty both in the development of their syllabi and in requesting GEC status for their courses. Number three is the Evaluation Form that will be submitted along with the EPCC Action Request

The Chair of the EPCC walked the Senate through the document noting each Gen. Ed course must meet one of the breadth requirements, items 6-9. Gateway courses must be 100 level courses in both content and number. An info item under notes, indicates no 400 level course are to be in Gen. Ed. Currently there are 11 400 level courses. EPCC proposes to notify those 11 courses that they will be removed from Gen Ed. they will have the option of moving to a 300 level course. 300 level courses will be for non majors and without prerequisites. They need to be aimed at a general audience. EPCC also recommends the elimination of the MDI (Multi Disciplinary Inquiry) category currently there is 1 course, Honors 301.

Question if the 300 level Gen. Ed. class is offered, could it be used to meet a major or minor requirement.

The EPCC will regularly review courses to ensure that the courses are useful as Gen Ed. requirements

In the Oregon Transfer Module (OTM) only 100 and 200 level courses qualify. We need to look at the implications of our Gen. Ed. program fitting into the Oregon Transfer Module.

Can not have 300 level classes in the OTM as Gen. Ed. Transfers, there is an online list of the accepted OTM courses

If the new Gen. Ed. policy does require a lot of advanced preparation for any courses above the 100 level there is a problem. Then all upper div courses will have a hard time filling. Overlaying the Gen. Ed. on top will be a problem.

EPCC feels that Gen. Ed. should be designed for the general audience and shouldn't be used to generate enrollment in the upper division courses. The Gen. Ed. courses should stay open to non majors. The more prerequisites will work more to limit the class size.

Had to overlay the rubric into the courses we currently have

We have not come to grips with the lack of resources. We don't need all of the current 300 level Gen. Ed. Courses, we need more sections of 200 level courses. We need fewer courses to increase the size of sections for fewer courses.

Need to reduce the numbers of Gen Ed. Courses overall and need to add Gen. Ed. classes in the spring that do not have a long list of prerequisites.

EPCC is not looking for a vote today. This is just a status report. The Senate needs to take the discussion out to the faculty. There is a time constraint. We have not been able to move forward without the criteria. We can not progress until this is worked out.

There is a draft form located at the EPCC site.

The EPCC plan is to have an ongoing review process. First EPCC will look at all of the 400 level courses, then they will look at the 300 level courses to ensure they satisfy the criteria. Finally EPCC will review all of the 200 and 100 level courses etc.

Question about Dist. Ed. and the number of 300 level courses and their effect on our students ability to get their course needs met.

EPCC's first thought was not to have any 300 level Gen. Ed. courses. This would be a problem for distance education students. We don't anticipate a wholesale elimination of 300 level Gen Ed. Courses. If this passes, with the exception of 400 level courses, everything will exist until their syllabi are reviewed against the criteria.

Some disciplines don't have 200 level courses in which case only 100 level courses would be the gateway courses. Some disciplines currently don't have any gateway courses. The discipline may want to consider moving current 200 level courses to a 100 level.

PE currently has a 200 level that is accepted across the state as a 200 level course so need to rethink that limit.

Presently both Honors 201 and Philosophy 203 are 200 level gateway courses.

Eliminations of the MDI (Multidisciplinary Inquiry) not to be promoting interdisciplinary thinking is a sad state of affairs. This is the world our students will be entering it is unconscionable that we are not supporting MDI

EPCC agrees but it is not clear to the EPCC what MDI inquiry should be. If truly multidisciplinary then we should require that the course should be team taught. Currently we do not support and in fact are penalized to team teach. EPCC looked at leaving MDI on the books and this is still possible. EPCC worries that if you have a vacuum without the needed resources it will get filled with something else. The committee believes that it is more honest to eliminate the designation in the absence of the necessary resources.

Leaving the MDI in, may say more about us, as this would represent a category of hope. If with eliminate this category then the possibility of moving in this direction is gone.

Need to hold that option open as a possibility and an indication of a supportive environment.

EPCC is available to answer questions and needs feedback by mid April to get these changes done this year. There are courses that need to come forward for review.

Senates role is to formalize the review process. Someone should schedule meetings with the Deans and get on the agenda for the college meeting and the division meetings.

EPCC wants to know if others are interested in the concept of multidisciplinary inquiry.

Historically EPCC has thought this was great idea and yet we lack the resources to make it happen.

What we mean by multidisciplinary are team taught courses, by people coming at a subject from different directions, like Honors 301. There also may be outside funding available to help support these types of course. Also we can achieve multidisciplinary instruction by bring guests lectures into classes to collaborate. It is important to lead students down different paths.

The question is will we ever have the resources required to do this type of course. Is there an accreditation issue of having a category with only one course qualifying? We need in check with Sara Witte on this.

DeAnna will take the issue to the Deans.

The purpose is to get the word out once and get all of the criticism back. Then EPCC will look at the feedback at the next meeting in April

IV. [3:30pm – 3:45pm] Vote on the Bylaw Change Proposal – [Senator Responsibilities to their Constituents](#)

Moved and seconded to accept the By-Laws change as amended

Question about the attendance and trust that the Senate President will consult with the constituencies involved. Make strike throughs and changes to the original draft apparent in subsequent discussions

The motion passed unanimously

V. [3:45pm – 4:00pm] Vote on the Policy on Honorary and Posthumous Degrees

The Senate should make the referral to the board in January

The board does look at these.

The question about the blocking of currently employed OUS individuals has come forward.

Why not has a limit on the current OUS employees?

The Senate needs to find out if there is an OUS rule stating this.

A friendly amendment was made to remove the language from the policy. If it is an OUS rule then we will keep it, if not then we will drop it.

Under the section for Posthumous Degrees; strike enrolled from the first criteria and add an or between the first and second criteria as a friendly amendment

Just need to meet the spring deadline so the January date will work.

The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION / INFORMATION ITEMS:

VI. [4:00pm – 4:20pm] Discussion of Budget Cuts and the Budget Cut Procedure

The senate needs to speak clearly about furloughs, they need to be done in a way that makes sense week. For example taking a week at Thanksgiving, lose a week at the start of classes in September. Furloughs will be done under union negotiations.

U of O not sure about legality of furloughs for faculty. The State could possibly talk about adjusting contract lengths. The question is, are they legal for faculty?

Senate might facilitate the discussion process. If the President communicates to the Deans and the Provost about the legality of furloughs for faculty will there be a coordinated process for bottom up input from the faculty?

Not clear what happens on March 12 when a budget crisis will be declared. We need a process in place or schedule a forum to discuss the data from the 12th.

I don't think there will be any new news just matching the calendar. Mar 12 there will not be a change in the situation.

Load reductions don't really match the need to cut the FTE by 10%. Need to think creatively what we might do with our courses to stretch out the credits

Contract commits us to 45 credits for load so 10 would be one course.

OSU has announced a large cut for this biennium.

If we want to do anything in advance we need to move now.

Hard to move in advance before you know what their plan is.

We know that OUS is assuming cuts to something. The senate should chime in on the process. Not just react

For example hybrid classes are a cost savings and may be an administrative solution; however this does not address the drop in on campus enrollment. The more online courses we have the less on campus enrollment we seem to have. Extended residential is offering the courses without having to come to campus.

What we need is a, "Whereas" statement to look at on campus growth that would be supportive of any budget cuts. We must remember that our students don't come here for the administration they come here for the programs.

Someone needs to draft a whereas statement to circulate.

We need to cajole the OUS system into supporting an early retirement plan. It is possible that it could save some money in any given year.

A couple of years ago that may have worked but now with the health care issues, they may negate any savings.

We can do an email exchange to create a whereas statement

Either we let it pass or we schedule another meeting to forward a statement on to the administration.

The administration needs to look at a tuition increase of more than 2% over the next biennium.

Need to think about where that increase will go. We should insure that it goes to student financial aid

Students think that the legislature is thinking about eliminating the in state tuition waiver for EOU.

We can craft a document for approval by the Senate on the 16th of March

Need a larger sense of the faculty at large.

Put the document out there and solicit comments

VII. [4:20pm – 4:30pm] Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned 4:55