EOU FACULTY SENATE
10-3-17
INLOW 201

Senators:

~~Daysi Bedolla~~

Cori Brewster

Shaun Cain

Joe Corsini

Ryan Dearinger

Dwight Denman

Teresa Farrell

~~Theresa Gillis~~

Bill Grigsby

Nicole Howard

Nancy Knowles

John Knutson-Martin

Scott McConnell

Lee Ann McNerney

Michael O'Connor

Brian Sather

Michael Sell

Emily Sharratt

Amy Yielding

Guests: Sally Mielke, Sarah Witte, Lacy Carpillo, Nate Loew, Colleen Dunne Cascio, David Vande Pol, Peter Giesinger, Chris Burford, Dan Mielke,

Nancy		Welcome and intros	
Nancy		No agenda changes	
	Approval of Minutes	- Minutes from 6/6/17 - NK Move to Approve - SM seconds - CB: Most amazing minutes she's ever read - Minutes approved, three abstentions	
Sarah Witte	Provost update	- Transfer bill passed leigslature late spring/early summer - HECC is intent on operationalizing bill, convened statewide group for HB 2998 - Points of emphasis in bill - Work group focus on streamlining transfers across state, specifically between CC's and publics - Emphasizing common foundational curriculum of	

		at least 30 cr. ○ Create statewide unified transfer agreement for first 30 cr. ● Prior to disbanding OUS ● David Vandepol is EOU rep on workgroup, will convene campus group to include staff, faculty and advisors to inform committee statewide. ● David asked to chair workgroup ● First meeting is this Friday. ● Continuing work of Michael Jaeger and others	

David VdP	HB 2998 workgr oup	● Bill prompted by lack of efficacy between CCs and 4yr institutions
		● Bill is a way to make sure CC students are taking the classes they need in order to transfer
		● Bill takes measured approach, 30 cr everyone can agree upon
		● Second level is taking a look at entire degrees, ensuring they fall into 4 yr pathways
		● Third step is to distinguish and advise CC transfer students to take advanced courses with AA in order to transfer into some programs (sciences, etc.) so they transfer in and remain on 4yr plan
		● "Most of our students are transfer students."
		● Ensure we treat our transfer students as well or better than anyone in the state
		   ○ NK: The Oregon English and Writing Advisor Committee (OWEAC) meeting this Friday at EOU. Operating on behalf of JBAC since the 1970s. Efforts in state to do this work already. We're not starting at zero. Maybe have committee go back to see what's already happened.
		   ○ SC: Biology has already done the same. Fast track plans are already available.
		● Committee has that work in hand.	

NK	Review of Shared Govern ance	● We don't have a culture of helping people understand what shared governance is, especially new folks at EOU ● Provided links to BOT bylaws and statements, shared gov model, constitution (undergoing revision this year), bylaws, etc. as starting point to understand what it is we're doing here ● Work last year at college-level, as FS president, to make us be knit together, that you're representing your stakeholders. ● At college-level, there should be a slot for senators to let constituents know what's happening. ● Moved from assembly model to representative model, so communication at college-level is key. ○ CB: visual of shared gov dated Feb of last year.	

Where is it from? Don't think it accurately represents the model we have.
- ○ SW: visual created when shared gov first set up
- ○ CB: arrows can move in multiple direction. Missing acknowledgement that FS can take up any issue regarding faculty. No place to address reconsideration clause in constitution. Visuals should reflect the model and how it works.
- ● Former CAS colleges are setting up their models of operations. Where should senators fit in college structure?
  - ○ SM: COB has regular meetings and senators can report
  - ○ MO: Same for COE
  - ○ NK: I assume there will be time in CAS colleges for senators to report
- ● NK: That's good. I have felt that I've been voting for myself. You can end up at the table voting for yourself, but also bring the concerns of colleagues. I haven't always felt I've known the concerns of colleagues.
  - ○ AY: Should we have permanent slot at college meetings? Use that slot to get consensus from colleagues?
  - ○ NK: Yes. Say what FS has been working on, talk about action items, get feedback.
  - ○ SC: That brings up issue with schedule. Align FS schedule with college meetings. The function of a senator is to be informed what our colleagues think.
- ● NK: We may need to discuss when we have regular meetings. Is FS interested in creating ad-hoc committee to figure out scheduling?
  - ○ NH: Could you schedule yourself to not teach at this time?
  - ○ SC: But also an issue of access for those who want to come, but can't. We have three committees that need to meet regularly, and we could have blank slot in schedule for committee meetings. I.e., Wednesdays at 3:30.
  - ○ NK: Some disciplines have traditions of certain classes at certain times. Competing concerns across faculty. When we're scheduling in January, make recommendation to colleges to make a blank schedule slot.
- ● Is there any interest in forming a committee to work on this?
  - ○ Shaun Cain
  - ○ Mike Sell (?)
  - ○ SC: It will involve going directly to colleges to discuss

- NK: Other issues to discuss in shared governance?
- NK: Add CTLA as FS committee, making it less cultish and isolated. Recommend to constitutional review committee to add CTLA as FS committee
    - NH: Would it make them report to FS or we would be more involved with CTLA?
    - NK: They would report to FS
    - AY: Language in document, item C, number 3. Confusing language regarding "helping" and "leading."
    - CB: Questions related to reporting. If this is a FS committee, it's hard to imagine 8 permanent members and 5 elected faculty. Are 8 members ex officio? This is the work of faculty to think about pro development and best practices, we'd have a committee made of administrators with a greater voice than faculty reporting to FS.
    - NH: other schools have teaching center, pedagogical practice, etc. I don't know what CTLA does here. I need classroom tools, etc. Because of an assessment piece (which is most important thing they do), if I need something for pedagogy in my field, I have nowhere else to go. CTLA trying to do one thing, but really only doing one thing.
    - RD: Drop the assessment to make it primarily CTL. Become two things.
    - SW: Nancy, what is your perception of CTLA? (Nancy has served)
    - NK: Offer a slate of workshops, but not well publicized. Provide feedback in assessment process, and I see assessment linked to faculty development. Connected in reflective practice. But assessment serves admin in terms of needed data, but not practical in classrooms.
    - SW: (I agree.) Clarify issue: what will change? What will CTLA report to FS?
    - NK: Visibility for CTLA. This group could draw input to motivate CTLA to do work we hope it would do. What can CTLA do to serve that need?
        - SIIT is one thing we do well. People come to it, several summers running.
        - Elected folks on committee would bring fresh ideas. Makes sense to have faculty have some ownership.
    - SW: Opportunity for CTLA in concert with FS to get faculty to engage. Spotlight academic quality, etc.
    - SM: Academic quality is discipline-specific, varies by department.
    - NH: There's a budget for CTLA, right? There's a

conference at George Fox end of the month. Incentive to employ pedagogy I'd love to go and it would help me more than brown bag lunch. Pedagogy specific where faculty apply like you would FDFC.
- ○ CB: CTLA should be elected, not hand-picked, something people run for.
- ○ NH: we have a small campus and a committed faculty
- ○ SW: Part of what's behind my questions is "what's going to be different?" Doesn't sound like anything would be different until we talk about incentives and money.
- ○ SC: By having discussions with faculty, CTLA can be responsive to faculty. Each of these things can improve structure of CTLA. I look at this committee structure and I think it would work.
- ○ CB: If we want this to be an FS committee, then the makeup should be more faculty.
- ○ SW: What would they vote on?
- ○ CB: I don't know. Ideally we'd have body of faculty who were invested in CTL as they are in creating curriculum. Pieces would fit together, creating new programs, curriculum PD, etc. I object to the idea of this being an FS committee with a majority of non-faculty members. Bring this to college meetings, identify problems and address them.
- ● NK: Grievances: Do we need a process for grievances that is non-union?
- ● NK: Do we want to revisit FS bylaws?
  - ○ Leave Honors committee on hiatus?
  - ○ Do we want to have FS VP move into President role?
  - ○ Integrate Briney Rule into bylaws?
  - ○ Revise advance deadline for agenda (2 days in bylaws, 1 week in public meeting rules)
- ● NK: How do we streamline process to ensure not duplicating FS and EPCC discussions?
- ● NK: Have FS reps go to BOT committee meetings tomorrow (Wednesday, 10/4)? Gain insight into what happens at the BOT level?
  - ○ CB: Crucial to have someone in attendance. Most of BOT have no background in higher ed. Lots of learning what our background is and actions being taken without considering implications. Things get to vote at BOT meetings before vetting from faculty.
  - ○ CB: BOT Committee meetings are not webcast.
  - ○ NK: I'll pass around document and if you're interested, sign up.

NK	Action items	• UC representative needs to be elected today, as UC meets next week, 10/10 3:15-5:00, Inlow 201. 　○ NK is on UC as elected, she will serve as FS UC rep. • Interinstitutional FS Rep: Important role for understanding what happens at state level. Anna Cavinato giving up her seat in December. 　○ Locations rotate between institutions. 　○ JKM: I am willing to serve on IFS committee. 　○ Steve Tanner is alternate. Marc Duncan is other rep. 　○ CB: respect JKM's willingness to serve, but maybe put a call to other faculty to serve as well. Call for nominations. 　○ NK: Invite additional noms and vote next meeting.	
NK	Commit tee reports	• BG: Student evals ad hoc committee report 　○ Numbers almost the same, 32% response rate. 　○ Summer isn't a great sample, we should try a regular term. 　○ Make sure students understand that it's a shorter eval 　○ Spring 2017 was 25%. 　○ We'll know more by end of fall term. But committee hasn't made decision to pilot this through fall term. 　　■ NK: Is there something to send to faculty to help them get students to engage with evals? 　　■ BG: Yes we should do that. Anyone can, but I'll talk to Will (IT) to see if there are issues we can resolve. 　　■ BG: Question of consent vs forcing students to do it. Demonstrate the value of doing the eval. 　　　● ==NK moves to support piloting new evals through fall term 2017== 　　　● ==BG seconds== 　　■ SC: can't vote on something we don't know about. 　　■ SK: pilot evals ran during summer term. 　　■ CB: one issue is evals being used in evaluation of teaching. Are we getting better info from evals? 　　■ BS: was it set up so course eval was an assignment and factored into grade? One thing we discussed was incentive teachers could use to increase response rate. 　　■ BG: I give extra credit to students dependent upon % of class who completes	

		evals. I will bring and send out to senators. <mark>● Motion passes, three abstentions</mark>	

NK	Old business	● Policy on policies committee has met and is sorting out OUS policies
		● President created interim policy re: protests and demonstrations on campus. Please look over. UC will discuss next week, with vote following month (November)
		  ○ Policy leaves public spaces available for protest to members of EOU community
		● We completed president eval. Time of BOT was inconvenient for teaching contract.
		  ○ BOT evaluating president every year, with more robust eval every 5 years.
		  ○ Appreciate folks who completed evals and sent feedback. Will run eval in spring and have feedback for next summer.	

NK	New business	● EOU faculty ID cards should identify faculty as "faculty" and not just employee
		● Name of Pierce Library, discussed a few weeks ago via email.
		  ○ Part of Pierce's background is affiliation with KKK.
		  ○ We want to be sensitive to populations on campus, is there something we need to be doing to recommend process be put in place to make name change?
		  ○ Sally: Pierce Library is currently named after Walter and his wife Cornelia.
		  ○ SW: Tim's office has a process for naming buildings.
		  ○ NK: I will ask Tim for copy of process and bring to next meeting.
		  ○ Burford: BOT would ultimately make the recommendation to rename a building.	

NK	Good of the order	● NH: I still want the doors back on Stenard Garden. FS passed a resolution 2 years ago but nothing has happened.
		● AY: Should evals be included or not be included when faculty go up for promotion? Should be more clearly defined, as it's not clear to CPC.
		  ○ NK: Recommendation is that they can be included but not primary feature of eval.
		  ○ SC: How can we use them at all when they're statistically insignificant? They don't give broad picture of anything at all that's useful in evaluating faculty.
		  ○ NH: Is there consensus on benchmark for evals to be used in evaluating of teaching?	

		○ SC: can't be less than 50%. ○ CB: **READS NK Resolution from last year** ○ AY: Is it going to all classes or just some? ○ BG: Not everyone uses Canvas, so it proves difficult. ○ SW: This has been a problem since 2013/14. ○ NH: Previous provost recommended FS look at this issue since response rates plummeted. Can we just go back to paper? ○ SW: Half of our students are online. ○ NH: Even so, we'd have more data from responses. ○ SW: Paper and pencil would require more FTE to process. ○ SC: Response rates of online students vs on-campus with online evals? ○ Nate Loew: Fmr institution moved evals online and response rates lowered. So, for on-campus classes, we had faculty leave room and have students complete evals, either on devices or in computer lab. ● NK: Do we want to meet in 2 weeks or meet in a month? ○ SW: Requirement in contract that all changes in F&P handbook ○ NK: Next meeting Nov 7th.	

Minutes prepared by Michael Sell, 10-3-17
Minutes finalized by Michael Sell 10-31-17