

Faculty Senate Minutes
November 14, 2017
Willamette Room, Werner University Center
Primarily paperless, wou.edu/facultysenate

3:15 – 3:30 p.m.

Better Know a Colleague (informal gathering, optional)

3:30 – 5 p.m.

Business Meeting

1. Call to order: 3:30
2. Call of the roll (by circulation of sign-in sheet): Adele Schepige, Bob Hautala, Camila Gabaldon, Chloe Hughes, Cornelia Paraskevas, Elisa Maroney, Erin Baumgartner (IFS), Ethan McMahan, Gavin Keulks, Greg Zobel (Secretary; also substituting for Ken Carano), Joel Alexander, Karen Haberman, Kathleen Connolly, Kimberly Jensen, Kit Andrews, Laurie Burton, Marie LeJeune, Mark Van Steeter, Mary Harden, Matthew Nabity, Michael Baltzley, Michael Phillips, Paul Disney, Terry Gingerich for Scott Tighe, Sue Kunda, Thaddeus Shannon, Tom Kelly, and John Leadley for Zenon Zygmunt.
3. Corrections to and approval of minutes from previous meeting
 - a. No corrections
 - b. Approved as posted
4. Institutional Reports
 - a. Adele Schepige, Faculty Senate President (see posted report)
 1. Call for BA.BS task force faculty representatives 2017
 2. WOU Board of Trustees Faculty Trustee recommendation
 3. Call for WOU Master Plan committee faculty representative
 - b. Question: re: membership from a late applicant from Modern languages on BA/BS
 - c. Question: what is the intent/purpose of the questions on the application for Board of Trustees?
 - i. Comment: the questions changed two years ago.
 - ii. Comment: it's about the faculty perspective and not being a faculty representative
 - d. Action: Adele suggests EC review the questions and see if #4 is necessary
 - e. Curriculum Proposals
 - i. Shared program modifications
 1. Still sending in Proposals for LACC and D designations
 - f. Rex Fuller, University President
 - i. Campus master plan
 1. Looking for four faculty to join steering committee (total of about 25 people)
 - a. Will also have 2 staff and 2 student members
 2. Timetable: new campus master plan will be completed by end of

- year (June)
- 3. Steering Committee is following the same format as 2011
- 4. Idea meet monthly for council and feedback for ideas being explored
- 5. Steering committee is cabinet for process
- 6. Example issue: Ask questions about parking lot behind WUC; haven't made decision, but want to consider it
- 7. Want to link to strategic plan
- ii. Oregon Military Academy
 - 1. Remodeling design work around that space
 - a. Idea most in play is welcome center
 - b. Admissions and financial aid
 - c. Second floor of that space is living space
 - d. Once design agreed to, will front-load with reserve dollars and have state funding come back
 - 2. Think of the space as a site for first time visitor to arrive
 - a. Are there advantages of putting admissions and financial aid together?
 - 3. Related note: January will be remodel of natural science building
 - 4. Related note: ITC is being upgraded
 - 5. Question: what is the best use of the old CoE building
 - a. It's prime real estate; how will it be built?
 - b. Rex: idea of learning commons
 - c. Could imagine a new building being there
 - d. Student success support groups being there--Math center, science center, writing center, honors program
 - e. Registrar's office there as well to make changes to schedule
 - f. Once design agreed to, will front-load with reserve dollars and have state funding come back
 - g. Comment: treasure trove filled with civilian defense materials; how do we properly hang onto it without having to store or or where we store it
 - i. Museum?
- iii. Old Health Center
 - 1. Being remodeled to become new advising center
 - 2. Should be occupied by January
 - 3. Will be advising center for next few years
 - 4. Removes risks of confidentiality and privacy issues faced in current location
 - 5. Long term space will depend upon old college of education building
- g. Stephen Scheck, University Provost
 - i. HECC oversight committee for accelerated learning
 - 1. calling for faculty to serve as peer reviewers of other university accelerated learning (dual credit). WOU's Willamette Promise programming will be undergoing such review in 2018.
 - a. Will forward out an announcement about how to volunteer to serve as a reviewer
 - ii. 180 credit degree
 - 1. preparing for what possible changes in General Education might

happen

- a. What are enrollment trends and majors
 - b. timing frequency with when offering courses
 - c. Will be working on this and providing analyses with findings
- iii. What might impact be any faculty exercising option of going into Window Retirement plan and retire at the end of the current academic year?
Possible outcomes of a retirement:
1. We may need to replace faculty line as soon as possible
 2. May do a search next academic year
 3. Some programs won't know until January whether or not will be affected
 4. What would vacancy do to program? What are enrollment trends in program? Do we have right ratio of tenure track and non-tenure track to have flexibility in scheduling?
 5. Need to be data driven in decision making
 6. Will be able to run some tenure line searches starting in Winter impacted by vacancies
 7. Can/will employ NTT as well as visiting faculty
- iv. Education Evaluation Center @ TRI
1. Will be closing doors at end of month in response to state, national trends
 2. Climate in state has changed
- v. Clarified confusion about future work Dan Clark will be doing for Salem programming: he will not be the WOU representative for programs in Salem; rather, he will work directly for provost to develop stats, support, information about options in Salem.
1. Time was spent addressing concerns that related to a specific individual member of the WOU community.
 2. Question: what's going on with holds being applied at the last minute to student accounts
 - a. Comments: there were also a lot of accounts receivable holds
 3. Comment: concerns about the timing of when Registrar's holds are placed and how it impacts student success
 - a. Comment: Perhaps put hold on when students receive grades
 - b. Students can check holds through DegreeWorks but don't know how to find
 - c. Can bring up at cabinet meeting tomorrow
 - d. Would it be something administration could do where once email goes out, will be last of holds put on account
 - e. Would be great to have conversations—maybe hold is where grades don't get mailed out
 4. Comment: concerns regarding how courses may or may not be removed from the catalog (a grad level course)
 - a. Had to initiate a new course proposal for course taken off catalog
 - b. Took long time to get course back in
 - c. Had multiple students asking about it
 5. Question: who will lead the CAI?

- a. Provost: short answer, looking to have a revisioning of what and how it's going to work in the future; other than having Moodle shell support – wishes to have faculty guidance in future form of a CAI.
 - b. Much of what DEP used to do is not even being done any more
 - c. CAI once was Center of Teaching & Learning
 6. Comment/question: Clarification of Weiwei's roles
 - a. Supervising grad students
 - b. Working with faculty re: course design session
 - c. Designing new academic technology committee and how this/them their feedback may impact her work, her role
 7. Comment: suggest that her role be evaluated
 - a. Provost: that is happening
- h. Tad Shannon, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
- i. HECC workgroup has had two full meetings, now broken into two sub groups (curriculum subgroup and policy subgroup)
 - ii. Each subgroup has had one meeting
 - iii. Initial take on foundational curriculum: should be three foundational curriculum
 1. STEM foundation, humanities foundation, business/professional studies foundation
 - a. Charge Curriculum subgroup took
 - b. Want to hold on to current Oregon Transfer Module
 - c. Currently as general rule, credits come in Ad hoc and count for something
 - i. Impression is desire to rationalize OTM
 - ii. Probably wouldn't require any universities to make significant changes to curriculum
 2. Has California system been examined in this process?
 - a. The California system grew curriculums aligned over 50 years
 - b. We have grown curriculums unaligned
 - i. Amount of surgery on many campuses to create alignment would be disruptive
 3. Wasted Credit: Any credit at time of transfer student expects to count towards degree that doesn't count towards degree is wasted credit
 - a. Need to do better job of aligning things
 - b. Should be frictionless process
 - c. How to make those match better from student's perspective
 - i. Desire is to do this without causing every program to rewrite General Education
 4. Trying to revise General Education when this is in process
 - a. Question: Why aren't we waiting until that settles in order to do General Education in order to have better alignment?
 - i. Comment: Because of foundational curriculum meant to be somewhat flexible, idea is General Education model like one we're going towards would fit better

- ii. Comment: If we wanted to copy someone else, could, and would be simpler
 - 1. People being asked to lead this effort don't want to dictate what should be done
 - 2. Don't know that waiting will make any differences with accommodating what work group recommends
 - a. Hope is that recommendation will satisfy legislature and is something that all universities can buy into
 - 5. Is a lot of communication happening across
 - a. Moving towards better fit for what state is doing
 - b. Keeping track of things happening concurrently
 - c. Passport school now
 - i. OIT is considering becoming a passport school
 - iv. Unified Statewide transfer agreement
 - 1. Looks at what programs get a lot of transfer students
 - 2. Looks at which ones have a lot of excess credits involved
 - a. Pre-professional healthcare programs and biology
 - i. Is also about what happens at community colleges
 - ii. Psychology might be one of easiest places
 - 1. Health Science and Biology still have issues to work out
 - 2. What will community colleges support?
 - 3. Also relates back to optimal transfer point
- 5. Consideration of Old Business
 - a. Interdisciplinary Studies bylaws, Sriram Khe, Social Science and Susanne Monahan, Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness
 - i. Group finds it necessary to have bylaws
 - ii. Would like to have guidance for what is done
 - b. Comment: Seems like unusual structure for program or major on campus
 - c. Comment: Would be creating new structure for how to oversee a major
 - d. Question: Where is the oversight of this degree? Where will it be housed?
 - i. Lots of questions about where this is going
 - e. Comment: Uncomfortable with parts of bylaws, seems exclusive to not include all of the divisions and expertise on campus
 - f. Reason for this is the IDS wanted to be reviewed by Faculty Senate
 - i. Previously there was no oversight other than Dean's office for interdisciplinary studies
 - ii. Tried to get faculty advisory group
 - iii. Think word exclusive should never be part of interdisciplinary, should be whoever is interested
 - 1. Talk about who will be responsible for academic review, need bylaws
 - g. Bylaws provides structure to move forward
 - i. Comment: Have also systematically put in part to amend bylaws for program with no oversight at all
 - ii. Comment: Previously, years ago, program was run by Dean's secretary
 - iii. Comment: No concept of exclusion meant to be there, bylaws make clear on who can participate

- h. Comment: Honors Program has fundamental difference from Interdisciplinary degree
 - i. Honors program has home department and major, interdisciplinary does not
 - ii. Comment: Like Honors program, students have home department, have two home departments
 - iii. Are some parallels there
 - iv. Comment: Still non-faculty member who is coordinating the program
 - 1. Susan is first contact with students if have not talked with faculty
 - 2. Assigns one of faculty in group as advisor
 - i. Article 4.2 All members of advisory board should be tenured and serve with approval of division chair
 - i. Comment: Feel that diminishes roll of non-tenure track on campus
 - j. Comment: Two weeks ago, mentioned don't want a large board
 - k. Comment: Structure seems like will have a small group
 - i. Response: Need group that can meet together
 - ii. When faculty serving as advisors, expecting faculty to think above and beyond
 - iii. For practical reality
 - 1. Doesn't require way more than certain ratio
 - l. Should vote on now or table it
 - i. Question: If not voted on now, would it affect/slow down committee?
 - ii. Comment: Would rather faculty take ownership of this
 - iii. Group ready to send forward curriculum proposal, don't feel comfortable sending forward curriculum proposal unless official group
 - m. Peer Committee Bylaws
 - i. Never approved by senate
 - ii. Question: If have curriculum proposal, can be brought before senate?
 - n. Comment: Bylaws have come to senate only because provost requested it
 - o. Question: What kind of precedent is this setting?
 - i. Question: Is it just this one time a program will emerge or will others emerge?
 - ii. Question: What are some of the ramifications may follow up?
 - p. Comment: Don't know if Bylaws is core issue here
 - 1. These are programs not naturally located within a single discipline
 - 2. Is an alternative to non-single discipline programs
 - 3. We approve programs, not bylaws
 - q. Move that Faculty Senate recognizes need for bylaws for this group and that it is a work in progress
 - i. Three opposed, motion passes, group entitled to write own bylaws
6. Consideration of New Business
- a. WOU Affirmation of the Responsibilities of Faculty Regarding Curriculum, Tad Shannon, Computer Science
 - i. At last meeting, introduced resolution
 - 1. Initiated in discussions in IFS
 - 2. Bringing back slightly revised version
 - 3. Correct statement from ORS on faculty senate powers
 - 4. Final paragraph amended: Resolution 3 includes "assess its institutional curriculum"

7. Discussion items

- a. Formal process for changing WOU to no minor required
 - i. Motion to extend meeting to 5:10
 1. Approved
 2. Comment: child care on campus does not stay open late enough
 - ii. Emails on campus about the Minor concerns
 1. Many catalog changes are needed
 2. Adele: Request that Provost's office put together a curriculum proposal that shows all the changes so we have
 3. Social Science statement about opposing the removal of the minor
 4. Comment: what do we do/how do we handle the advising re: removal of the minor
 5. Comment: importance of remembering the role of the minor; what is its purpose before we request any more or any future work
 6. Comment: 2016 survey was made that had opinions about the status of the Minor
 7. Motion: follow Adele's suggestions: 1 opposed; rest in favor
 - a. Having it put in format means having vetting process to have it put in catalog
- b. General Education program change timeline
 - i. Talked about extending deadline (schedule is posted to Faculty Senate page)
 1. Not really voting on until march
 2. Have framework out there
 3. Need some things to be fleshed out
 - ii. Gen Ed task force agreed to work through December
 1. Part of proposed extension is that work will be handed off to Gen Ed committee
 2. That committee is made up of Gen ed task force members
 3. Proposal that comes forward to this body will come forward through Gen ed committee
 - iii. Not extending deadline for proposal
 1. Just voting process
 - iv. Want to put out there, come back to next time
 - v. Please send questions to get clarification as needed

8. Informational Presentations and Committee Reports

- a. Student Athletes, Curtis Campbell, Athletic Director
- b. Postponed until next meeting

Meeting Adjourned: 5:06 pm

5 – 5:15 p.m.

Better Know a Colleague (informal gathering continued, optional)