

Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, November 16, 2020

4:00-5:30p

Present: Melissa Anderson, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Enrique Chacón (rep. Marianne Golding), Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Justin Harmon, Laurie Kurutz, Merrilyne Lundahl, Brendan McMahon, Matt Moreali, Jesse Longhurst, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Michael Stanfill, Chad Thatcher, Precious Yamaguchi, Kemble Yates

Absent: No one.

Guests: Lee Ayers, Sherry Ettlich, Sarah Grulikowski, Donna Lane, Karen Mager, Sean O'Skea, Alena Ruggerio, Linda Schott, Karen Stone, Sue Walsh, Jody Waters, Chance White Eyes, Elizabeth Whitman

Meeting called to order at: 4:01 pm.

1. 4:00p Approval of Minutes from 11/02

Motion & Vote:

Stanfill moved to approve the minutes, and Fedorek seconded. **Motion passed** with 1 abstention from Kurutz.

2. 4:05p President's Report – Linda Schott

Report:

HECC Meeting

President Schott shared the following information from last week's HECC meeting.

- Update: Student Success and Completion Funding Model (SSCM)
 - SOU stands to receive close to \$1 million more next year as the result of a change to the SSCM.
 - The actual amount SOU receives will depend on the total allocation and distribution to the other public universities.
 - Though the model is not exactly equitable, with some institutions having greater power, SOU has gained and will continue fighting the good fight. The current model still falls short of serving certain student groups and regional universities.
- Stability for Regional Universities
 - The HECC made a commitment to undergraduate education and to helping regional universities find some stability. More on this later.
 - President Schott and VP Perkinson just talked with Jim Pinkard (HECC, Director of the Office of Postsecondary Finance and Capital) to discuss SOU's current financial situation, what we are doing to improve, and how the regional fires impacted SOU.
- Financial Impact of the Wildfires
 - Josh Lovern (SOU Director of Budget and Planning) has done an excellent job in his analysis of the financial impact of the wildfires.
 - This year, Lovern estimates that SOU has lost about \$1 million from (1) lost tuition, housing, and fees and (2) additional costs.

- The financial impact will stay with us for the next 4-6 years, as we now have a smaller college-going population.
- Lovern and VP Perkinson presented this data to the HECC in a way that showed the impacts very well.
- President Schott sits on the Southern Oregon Wildfire Relief and Recovery Group and will discuss, with that group, whether it would support a request to the state to assist SOU.
- RCC's enrollment is down much more than SOU's, and we are working together to show the impacts to higher education in our region.

Increasing College Aspirations in our Region

President Schott, Provost Walsh, and VP Woolf are part of a group convened by Pam Marsh that is focused on increasing the college aspirations of the youth in our region, including Grants Pass. There is the hope that the efforts will also reach family members who have not yet completed a college degree.

3. 4:10p Provost's Report – Sue Walsh

Report:

Provost Walsh wished everyone well and stated that her report would be brief to allow time for the general education task force, which has been a large focus for her, too.

- Faculty Searches
 - Provost Walsh has been meeting with directors to discuss which searches meet a large need and could potentially go forward in 20-21. The conversations with the directors have been very good.
 - The decisions as to which searches go forward are being balanced with the current hiring freeze.
 - The discussions will be wrapping up in the next few days and perhaps by the end of this week.

Discussion:

French asked whether the searches would begin this academic year and Walsh clarified that these searches would begin in Fall 2021.

4. 4:15p Advisory Council Report – Chair-Elect Melissa Anderson

Report:

Anderson shared the main topics of discussion at the last AC meeting.

- General Education Task Force
 - AC discussed the next steps of the task force, the main agenda item for this Senate meeting.
- Emeritus Status for Professional Track Faculty
 - In 2014, Senate voted to make emeritus status available to professional track faculty.
 - Updating the language in the bylaws should be a simple task and may just take a couple of words.
- Finals
 - There was a discussion regarding finals in Fall and Spring. We will discuss this more later.

- Reopening Report
 - Oliveri shared a report from the reopening committee.
 - In her report, Oliveri provided updates on the status of quarantining, contact tracing, and notifying faculty/others if they have been in contact with someone who has tested positive for COVID 19.
- Pause/Freeze Rules
 - The pause/freeze rules do not apply to higher education.
- Spring Course Delivery
 - AC talked a little about whether it will be safe to hold in-person classes by Spring and the desire to bring students back if possible.
 - The campus will be starting discussions on this subject soon.
- Staff Assembly
 - There has been some progress toward the creation of a Staff Assembly.
 - Jason Catz has drafted bylaws for the group. There are some details to work out, but it is moving along.
 - Information, particularly regarding how the Staff Assembly might interact with Faculty Senate, will be forthcoming.
- Hate Incident on Campus
 - AC also talked about the hate incident that occurred on campus.
 - SOU is strongly committed to EDI work.
 - As of last Monday, the investigation by campus and the Ashland Police Department was ongoing.

Discussion:

Yates stated that SOU is committed to not holding a Finals Week this quarter, but that it will in Winter quarter since Winter term will not be impacted by furloughs. We will revisit this discussion to talk about Spring and how to handle Finals Week when terms are impacted in the future.

5. 4:20p ASSOU President's Report – Sarah Grulikowski

Report:

Grulikowski thanked everyone for having the opportunity to present at Senate and stated that she had a long list to share.

- All-ASSOU Issues
 - ASSOU held its first formal All-ASSOU meeting last week and discussed the submission form for All-ASSOU issues.
 - Student leaders have been asked to submit All-ASSOU proposals to identify those which are most important for this year.
 - There is currently not a deadline for these proposals, but ASSOU hopes to have them by the end of the term.
 - If you are a faculty member interested in working with students on an issue, it's a great time to encourage these students to submit a proposal.
- Student Representation
 - The Tuition Advisory Council, Academic Policy Committee, and Transforming General Education Task Force are currently looking for student representation.
 - Student government is looking for students to fill openings in the Student Fee Committee and the Student Budget Committee. These students will need training. If faculty know of any students who might be interested, please reach out to Grulikowski (assoupresident@sou.edu) or anyone in ASSOU.

- Student Body Presidents Meeting
 - Grulikowski recently met with the student body presidents at Oregon's other public universities to discuss shared goals for the year.
 - The presidents plan to collectively work to help fight rising costs of higher education, to support students during COVID 19, and to battle student food insecurity.
- Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
 - ASSOU wrote a statement in support of equity, diversity, and inclusion in partnership with representatives from SEIU and APSOU. It will be shared with the campus community soon.
- Daily Health Checks
 - Grulikowski continues to remind students to fill out their daily health checks, and she encouraged faculty to remind them as well.

6. 4:25p IFS Report – Donna Lane

Report:

Lane provided a summary of Friday's Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) meeting.

- Strategic Plans
 - IFS had the opportunity to speak with Ben Cannon, the executive director of the HECC.
 - They discussed plans for rolling out strategic plans for individual institutions.
- Funding Model
 - IFS discussed the HECC funding model that President Schott presented in her report. While SOU will receive a little more, Eastern Oregon University will receive much less.
 - President Schott clarified that EOU was already receiving a very large amount of funding from the State, so while the reduction seems large, their overall funding will not be significantly low.
- Faculty Representation
 - IFS has representation on the following bodies: the Student Success and Completion Funding Model (SSCM), the Oversight Committee for High School Based College Credit Partnership, the Oregon Online Course Exchange, the Oregon Transfer and Articulation Committee (OTAC), and the Provost Council.
- OTAC
 - Criminology and Computer Science are not going through OTAC easily.
 - Nailing down MTH 243, which is part of so many disciplines, will be important before moving forward.
 - Business will pass this time, though it was intended to pass with the first group.
 - The next group will include Psychology and some form of Public Health.
- Moral Support
 - IFS members shared current challenges, including the search for a new president and burnout.
 - Lane shared some of the support we have at SOU, and others shared support from their institutions as well.

Discussion:

Belcastro asked whether IFS is involved with HB 4160, which provides support for underrepresented students in higher ed, and Lane stated that IFS is not involved.

Yates asked how members of IFS are elected. Lane responded that, at SOU, the term for an IFS representative is 3 years. The current representatives are Lane and Devora Shapiro. IFS goes by the calendar year rather than the academic year, so Lane will be in her final year in January, and Shapiro will be in her 2nd year.

7. 4:30p Carpenter II Grant Recommendations – Faculty Development Committee

Motion & Vote:

Gay moved to waive the 2-week rule to allow a vote on the Carpenter II grant recommendations, and Oliveri seconded. **Motion passed** unanimously.

Motion:

Gay moved to approve the Carpenter II grant recommendations, and Thatcher seconded.

Discussion:

Parker asked whether the low number of applicants was COVID related, and Morey replied that this seemed like a reasonable assumption. She stated that 3 of the awards were for conferences and one was for a book launch.

Vote:

Motion passed unanimously.

Additional Discussion:

Yates asked about awards that were granted last year for proposals that could not be completed. Waters responded that the committee decided it was preferable in such cases for the faculty member to return the award, as there was uncertainty as to *when* the faculty member would be able to complete their proposal and there are challenges in carrying the same grant monies across fiscal years. Further conversation between Yates and Waters revealed that faculty who had been awarded a grant but could not complete the proposal *would* be allowed to apply again for the grant the next year. Waters emphasized that she is an ex-officio member of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) and her suggestions to the committee were entirely consultatory.

Yates requested a policy stating that those who had to return the grants because they could not complete their proposals and reapplied would be prioritized for receiving grants the following year.

Morey stated that the FDC is working to improve the evaluation and recommendation process for the Carpenter Grants. Specifically, the FDC is creating a rubric that will help members of the committee evaluate proposals and provide feedback to applicants.

8. 4:35p General Education Task Force Capacities (Action)

Motion:

Morey moved to provide a provisional vote approving the proposed core capacities, and Fedorek seconded.

Preface:

Provisional Endorsement/Vote

Gay stated that the task force was seeking a provisional endorsement or vote indicating that the task force was moving in the right direction with the proposed capacities.

Subcommittees

The endorsement or vote would include an approval to form small subcommittees to work on capacities in ways outlined in the document shared with Senate. The subcommittees would be:

- tasked with a number of details that would further define the capacity, including refining the language, providing proficiencies, and developing a rubric
- expected to report back to the task force by the end of February

The subcommittee work would be intensive, and the task force would bring the subcommittees' work back to Senate.

Inquiry & Analysis

The Inquiry & Analysis (IA) capacity has been of great interest to many faculty, and discussions tend to lean toward an alignment between the IA courses and disciplines. The task force is concerned about this.

Paddock and Gay met with Walsh after a recent task force meeting and decided to create a series of Tuesday/Thursday 12:30 - 1:30 pm focus groups to discuss how IA is done in different disciplines. The goal would be to identify common elements of IA across disciplines so as to define IA in an inclusive manner. The idea is to present IA from a cross-disciplinary perspective.

Discussion:

Anderson asked whether the focus groups would be open forums, and Gay clarified that they would be guided discussions by the task force. Anderson asked if the task force would be writing the capacities, which was confirmed, and she expressed concern about how feedback would be incorporated. Anderson stated that although the AAC&U value rubric, which was mentioned, was useful, information literacy is usually guided by the *Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education*, which wasn't mentioned.

Siem said she believes SOU should uphold numerical literacy as a value and shared concern about representation on the subcommittee for the Numerical Literacy (NL) capacity. She inquired whether Senate could help identify representation, at least at the division level, for this and other subcommittees. She also suggested that the IA capacity have a subcommittee with different, balanced representation. Gay replied that the NL subcommittee would likely have representation from people who use quantitative reasoning in their research and could make it meaningful for students. Siem mentioned that there are examples from other institutions. She also emphasized that in college we have the opportunity to change students' perceptions about subjects they may have given up on for the better.

Gay emphasized that the subcommittees will need to work quickly and the aim is to have 3-4 faculty on each one. The task force will survey programs, gathering information that will help each subcommittee address needs identified across programs and skills all SOU students should have.

Oliveri stated that math and writing are both fundamental and while writing is present throughout the curriculum, math is not. She said that she likes the idea that any discipline could teach any capacity, but she shared a concern that the new model would allow students to complete college without taking a math class. She shared concern with the current breadth of the capacities.

Kurutz asked if the task force had proposed a final number of credits with the gen ed model. Gay clarified that model proposed at the beginning of Fall carried 40 gen ed credits but that number had been tabled after feedback. The task force expects that the next proposed model will be available in Spring and the total number of credits will be lower than they currently are.

Kurutz asked why there is not a specific capacity for the arts. Gay stated that the capacities are not meant to be discipline specific but instead to focus on cross-disciplinary skills. For example, numerical literacy could be taught through a lens using the arts. The task force is looking to approve the capacities, and the next step will be to develop the model and then the shapes and templates of the classes. Parker added, in the chat, that the subcommittees will address the detailed questions about specific disciplinary knowledge/skills.

Belcastro asked how the subcommittees would be formed, and Gay replied that the task force would like faculty who are interested in and have expertise in a particular capacity to self-nominate. Belcastro said that she would like Senate's involvement in approving the subcommittees or providing input in their formation.

Fedorek inquired how the process of gaining approval from the NWCCU (Northwest Commission on Colleges & Universities) about substantial changes to gen ed works and when we would need to start that process. Waters replied that once the curriculum is changed, we submit it to NWCCU as a substantive change, and they may/may not have concerns or questions. Waters said that they would be less concerned about the details of the curriculum and more concerned about whether SOU is working with the standards, which have recently been updated and are much more focused on student learning and success.

French thanked the committee and shared that members from his department are concerned that the proposal does not have a liberal arts feel and that there should be more discussion about this. He stated that the proposal doesn't seem to align with SOU's culture, vision, and mission and that it lacks a focus on the fine and performing arts and humanities in general. [There was some clarification that SOU is not a member of COPLAC.] He then asked the question of whether SOU is still a liberal arts college. Gay responded that the task force still believes in the liberal arts and the point of the capacities is that students do not understand why they are asked to take humanities, science, and social science courses—they do not understand what these things mean or why they matter to them—and that the perception is that we are asking them to take courses from these areas because it's good for them. The proposed model instead helps students see which capacities they are developing through the liberal arts.

Moreali asked for clarification as to whether voting to move forward to the capacities as they are would preclude amending or reworking them later in the process. Could the subcommittees meet and even come back with a new formula? Gay affirmed that the vote would just tell the task force that it's more on the right than the wrong path. If the vote were to fail, the task force would hold their work until Senate gives clear direction regarding what needs to change in order to have more campus buy-in.

McMahon shared that some OCA faculty stated that the original goal and intention of the task force was to make the model less complicated and reduce the number of gen ed credits. The understanding was to move away from strands, but it seems like the core capacity model is a reorganization of the strand model that is more complex and could become more complex moving forward. They would like to hear about other models before moving forward with the core capacity model. Gay responded by asking how the task force would know which model to move forward if the purpose of gen ed wasn't clear. He said that the capacity discussion tells us what the purpose of gen ed is and what we want to teach. **Gay solicited further feedback from OCA** regarding what gen ed should teach. McMahon stated that being prescriptive about values we want students to learn takes away choice from students regarding what they want to make of their own education.

Anderson stated, and Gay later confirmed, her understanding of the next steps: If the motion to approve the capacities were passed, subcommittees would be formed for each capacity except for the IA capacity. Those subcommittees would then meet to create new versions of their associated capacities. However, there would be no subcommittees for IA; instead, there would be discussions with the current task force, and the current task force would create the new version of the IA capacity.

Yates asked for a clarification about creating the subcommittees. The task force plans to send an email to all faculty to solicit volunteers to the subcommittees and then fill those subcommittees with the volunteers. He shared concern about delays that might take place if the subcommittees need approval from Senate. Yates reminded Senate that there is one more meeting before the end of Fall term. [Senate involvement was not, ultimately, attached to the motion.]

Siem asked who was currently on the task force, and Gay replied with both names and division/program representation.

Amendment to the Motion:

Siem moved to amend the original motion so that subcommittees be formed for all capacities, including Inquiry & Analysis, and Anderson seconded the motion. Morey and Fedorek signaled that this was a friendly amendment.

Discussion:

Yates asked Gay whether the amended motion would be practical or if the task force needed more guidance, and Gay replied that it would.

Vote:

Amended motion passed with nays from French¹, McMahon, and Stanfill and abstentions from Chacón, Gay, and Siders.

9. 5:25p Announcements/New Business

Yates stated that a discussion about final exams will be forthcoming and asked senators to bring forward issues they would like to discuss.

Meeting adjourned at 5:27 pm.

¹ French voted "yay" in error and reached out to Siem and Yates directly after the vote to clarify his intention.