

Faculty Senate Minutes Nov. 4, 2008

Present:

Molly Litchfield
DeAnna Timmermann
Jeff Johnson
Greg Monahan
Richard Croft
Steve Tanner
Ruth Davenport
Rosemary Powers
Leandro Espinosa
Jim Tooke
Allen Evans
Gerry Ramey
Peter Johnson
Ted Atkinson
Jodi Varon

Others

Colleen J
Les Balsiger
Provost Jaeger
Tony Tovar
Kerry L
Barbara S
Penny D
Mary K
President Lund
Jill G
Regina B
Cori Brewster
Cat Galloway

I. [3:00pm] Call to Order

ACTION ITEMS:

- II. [3:00pm – 3:05pm] Approval of Minutes for the [October 7, 2008](#) meeting
III. [3:05pm – 3:20pm] [EPCC Consent Agenda](#) (Colleen Johnson)

Discussion of consent motion - moved and seconded to approve the consent agenda

Clarification in the future the consent agenda will appear a week early and the Senate will review in advance of the monthly meeting

Lib Science classes are being deleted from the catalog, the media program was cut in 1994 (Library Media Certification Program)

The motion passes unanimously

EPCC clarification - The EPCC chair passes off the Consent Agenda to the Senate President. When a consent agenda is approved in the Senate it then goes to Provost

Update from EPCC for activity for the coming year. Continue to tighten up Gen. Ed., extended the moratorium through the fall on the addition of new Gen. Ed. classes

IV. [3:20pm – 3:35pm] RAG committee – allocations and priorities (Chip Ettinger)

Some committee changes from last year, the committee needs a Loso Art or Theatre dept. representative. The committee will disperse \$60,000 faculty salary dollars as stipulated in the AAP contract. Historically the money was in a faculty development fund and must be used by the faculty. Go to RAG site to see the current status of the funded grants. None of the funded proposals currently exceeds \$1500. The committee currently has \$35,000. Each year is different because the balance rolls from year to year. There is \$5,000 set aside for students to do required senior capstone work. The committee has a question of whether we want to raise the limit from \$1500 to \$1800 primarily to help fund presentations of research to international or national conferences. While \$1500 allows for 40 full allocations, \$1800 would allow for 33 full allocations and \$2000 would be 30 full grants.

We do on average spend all available money by spring break.

The committee keeps back \$4,000 for overages. They have covered second and third trips. This accounts for \$10,000 and this is usually a reimbursement for travel already made.

Do not raise the limit because of increased pressure for people to do research. We don't want to be in the position of turning people down in the spring.

At the end of the year the surplus could go as a second award to the recipient of an earlier \$1500 request.

Do not raise the limit better to allow a second award. Not only for papers and presented research, want to also encourage junior faculty to just attend meetings and conferences.

In Loso there is some tension as to how awards are decided. There needs to be more opportunities for more people from different disciplines.

Does the senate want to advise the committee or pass a motion or resolution in favor of the status quo?

The RAG committee is outside of the formal governance process. Does the Administration have some recourse if RAG goes off the chart? The RAG committee sits at the pleasure of the Provost, who originally set the grant level at \$2000. The limits have been set in the past by the Provost.

The Constitution does not speak to the RAG committee. The committee is all faculty and if things go crazy the recourse is to dismiss the RAG committee. The committee is a voluntary standing committee.

The Senate wonders how to bring the RAG committee into the governance structure?

Motion is made for the Senate to recommend that we not raise the grant allocation limit from \$1500 to \$1800 and amend the amount at the end of the year to \$2000 if there is a fund balance.

The motion passed with one abstention.

Anyone can recommend priority changes of how we allocate the grant funds. This process is adjudicated by your peers. The Senate feels the amounts should be equalized over the disciplines.

Junior faculty are just as likely if not more likely to present at conferences.

The students disagree with the idea of bringing the Tech Fee Committee into the established governance process.

If it is not broken then leave RAG alone. If faculty are dissatisfied, they should become members of the committee.

With the change proposed by the Senate the grantee would need to keep track of the award if they wanted additional financial support at the end of the year.

- V. [3:35pm – 3:50pm] Policy on granting honorary degrees – update and further action (Leandro Espinosa)
 - i. [UO policy](#)
 - ii. [OSU policy](#)
 - iii. [State Board policy](#)

Controversial some universities do and some don't

Do we want to award honorary degrees?

Propose using the U of O policy for Honorary Degrees as a model for our own.

The internees that came to OUS Universities were granted honorary degrees by the governors office. However, the individual being considered by EOU for an Honorary Degree was not an internee.

Two issues; One granting of honorary degrees and two the granting of posthumous degrees as an honor.

A motion was made to create a sub committee to develop a set of policies.

- Formal policy posthumous
- Formal policy honorary
- Make recommendations for the disposition of the current applicants
- If the afore mentioned policies don't apply is there an alternative solution for their individual situations

The motion passed with one opposed and one abstention.

The Sub-Committee members - Ted Atkinson, Leandro Espinosa, Allen Evans and a liaison from the provost or presidents office.

The sub committee's work needs to be done by the end of winter term. The policy recommendation must be before the board by the last meeting of winter term, which is 100 days before graduation.

Policies will be posted one month and voted on the following month. The sub-committee will have a draft policy ready for review by the Senate meeting in February.

VI. [3:50pm – 4:10pm] Faculty Oversight of Interdisciplinary Programs and the Liberal Studies Program (Rosemary Powers)

The Faculty Senate needs to start looking at the growth and success of interdisciplinary programs like Environmental Studies which is currently a pre approved degree. Generally how does the institution meet the goals of our students who get into the liberal studies programs 2 minors independent studies or one minor from EOU and one from somewhere else. There are 20+ on campus 120+ of campus currently in the program from year to year. The degree is so variable that it has some weakness in some situations. The Senate wonders what policies we need to have in place to support this program

Before the fact and after the fact issues move students from Liberal Studies to a degree interdisciplinary programs are often weak in one of the areas and the capstone may rely to much on one half of the degree.

The institution has lost a sense of ownership in degrees more meaningful and active liberal studies committee to buy into how the Liberal Studies is structured

Interdisciplinary programs are heart and soul. We need to protect the integrity of the academic degree. Advisors need to make sense of where the student is in their course work and help students to meet their needs.

How do we protect the integrity of programs? There are two approaches to the problem. o
1 Plan ahead and put two fields of study together in advance.
2 Avoid trying to cobble four years of disparate courses into a degree

We must not see Liberal Studies as the first degree of choice. The Liberal Studies Committee could bring policy recommendation to the Senate.

Provost has met with Liberal Studies Committee and commends the program for its work. He has talked to the committee about our largest and most amorphous degree granting program. There are questions as to who is in charge academically? The Provost agrees there has been an erosion of the degree. Sees new opportunities to prepackage program to insure the rigor of earned degrees, Environmental Studies or Communications are examples of this approach. The 2 minor model may be better under a different configuration. The institution needs to do better at giving ownership of the degrees to the involved programs. The existing Liberal Studies committee has been wrestling with this issue.

Senate needs to share concerns with the existing Liberal Studies Committee. It would be great to have a course in helping students navigate the process and course for creating a capstone.

The Liberal Studies committee feels that it needs to be stricter in the review of applications. We should decline some applications that don't make sense.

Liberal Studies Committee has an online tool.

It was suggested that there ought to be a place on the minors-approval forms where the student summarizes her/his capstone project in advance of approval of the minor. The recognition of minors tends to come too late in the process.

We have a lot of control as faculty, the template for Liberal Studies has already been approved we need to be accountable for our programs.

Do we require a second reader in the approval of two minor programs? This has been cumbersome and has not been followed

The Liberal Studies Committee does not require two readers.

In early childhood concentration there have been problems with the writing component. It is very important to hold the line on academic standards.

It is important to see the capstone as a focus for students in their academic preparation for their degree.

VII. [4:10pm – 4:25pm] IFS Election (Jeff Johnson)

Recent history before the beginning of the fall term Janet Hume resigned and asked Jeff to find a replacement. Currently Jeff is leaving the Inter-institutional Faculty Senate (IFS) after the December meeting. Kerry Loewen the current IFS alternate will join Jeff at the December meeting. Jeff asks that we elect the current alternate as the permanent IFS representative for a 3 year term. We will then need a person to finish the remainder of Janet's 1 year term and an alternate.

A motion and a second to elect Kerry Loewen as our IFS representative passed unanimously.

A motion and a second for Jeff to serve the remainder of Janet's term passed unanimously.

The Senate President will send out a request to the faculty for nominations for the IFS alternate position.

The current board and chancellor are paying closer attention to the IFS and its work. The chancellor and Board members are frequent attendees to the IFS meetings and the IFS President is asked to address the Board

DISCUSSION / INFORMATION ITEMS:

VIII. [4:25pm – 4:30pm] (update) Faculty Athletic Event Passes (Steve Tanner)

There is now a pass available for athletic events for 5 events over the year being budgeted through \$1000 from the EOU Foundation budget.

IX. [4:30pm – 4:45pm] Faculty Senate Discussion of the Accreditation Recommendations

Question for provost and president about assessment and overload did we dodge all of the bullets

The Provost feels we dodged all the bullets, because we were well under way with portfolios and general education improvements. The result was like getting socks for Christmas with a Ho Hum report from the Accreditation Team.

There are some concerns about the first two points as they relate to the Board. We would like attention to the issues not micro management from the Board. There is always a little let down because the 4 commendations and the recommendations were fairly generic, the draft report will be coming out in a couple weeks.

In January we will testify at the Northwest Council office in Seattle then we will get a final letter at the end of January from the Accreditation Team to the Board.

The Senate wants to know how the evaluation of online instructors will work?

The EOU administration has plans and the accreditation team wants to see how they work. The person on the accreditation team was Muriel Oaks she has a lot of expertise in distance education and will be helpful with how to increase the response rate from online students in the evaluation of faculty

X. [4:45pm – 4:55pm] Good of the Order

We will talk about block scheduling? We will talk more about this on Thursday the 5th and the need to avoid wacky schedules that mess student up. the deans were strong and we need to help enrollment to get schedules worked out.

Senators heard it as a report from the Div. Chairs as this is what we are going to do and this needs to be a shared conversation. The faculty feels that this is a major change that should go through EPCC and the Senate. We are reacting to something that has already happened

The Provost feels that there is a block schedule on the books already this has not been followed and the institution should follow the existing policy

The Senate feels this a major policy change that should be discussed openly.

The Provost indicated the decision and recommendation was made at the dean level and there was a break down in communication.

When I teach affects what I teach.

This change was made to help clean up schedules for students so that students could have more flexibility. Try to work into normal SCH are down 10% and the online is up 25%

We need to all do things in usual scheduling corridors. We are feeling our way through this communication problems.

The Provost feel the need to address this now to make sure we have every course slotted to the students best advantage. We need to lock in on schedules in the best interest of the students. Deans and Division Chairs are usually the conduit for this type of communication of policies that are on the books. We are moving towards not going over one hour blocks now we have to ask people operate in an even manner.

The policy of not going over 50 min. classes between 8 and 12 is encouraged to create a thoughtful coordination of courses.

There has been no talk in this discussion of putting students first. Very frustrating fitting a freshman into courses because the scheduling and have heard that some faculty teach only from 10 to 2.

The faculty are very concerned about the unintended consequences of any changes to the way courses are scheduled. Students prefer not having classes at 8 am women don't like taking classes at night. How successful is offering classes at 8 if the classes are offered online?

The policy focuses on Tuesday Thursday or Monday Wednesday courses. Avoid blocking classes during the 9 to 12 period. If you are doing blocking do it during other than these times