**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**December 02, 2013**

**SU 313 4:00 - 5:30 p.m.**

**Present:** Roni Adams, Marlene Alt (for Robin Strangfeld), Jackie Apodaca, Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Todd Carney, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Carol Ferguson, Byron Marlowe, Richard May, Kasey Mohammad, Pete Nordquist, Garth Pittman, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Mary Russell-Miller, Kevin Sahr, Larry Shrewsbury, Jamie Vener, and Elizabeth Whitman.

**Absent:**, Steve Jessup, John King (Sab.), Robin Strangfeld (Sab.), and Erin Wilder.

**Visitors:** Mary Cullinan, Jim Klein, Dennis Jablonski, Dan DeNeui, Karen Stone, Mark Tveskov, Alma Rosa Alvarez, Vincent Smith, Steve Thorp, Rachel Jochem, Kristin Nagy Catz, David Oline, Lee Ayers, Chris Stanek, Max Goldman, Tommy Letchworth, and Sue Walsh.

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.

The approval for the minutes from our last meeting will wait until next meeting (so that the Senate can also view the addendum that Shrewsbury had just finished typing up).

**Announcements:**

There were no announcements.

**Comments from President Cullinan:**

There’s not much that’s new, the same issues that I talked about last time are still swirling around.

Cullinan wanted to make a couple points about the Houses:

The Houses are a tremendous act of love that a lot of faculty have spent a great deal of time on. A number of our faculty had come up with this creative and collaborative way to address the problem of freshman retention. Of course we will need to tweak it as we go along.

I want to stress that the Houses are really one of the most exciting ideas to come forward from SOU and addresses one of the most serious problems we have on the campus. We’re going to keep and support the Houses. If we need to change them in some ways as we move forward, then that’s what we will have to do.

Cullinan then asked if there were any questions.

Richards: My issue is certainly not with the Houses, but the way in which they were rolled out, the way they became programs rather than pilots, the way no prior analysis was done on how to revamp the general education curriculum to accommodate Houses, and to accommodate the needs of our students. I hope that the task force is addressing those issues and get them squared away.

Cullinan: I think that a lot of the conversation today will be on answering those questions. One thing that I do want to stress is that those Houses are built on nationally normed best practices. This is the result of research that’s gone on for a couple of decades nationally. The faculty that have worked on these have been very explicit about looking at best practices that engage students, help them learn, and keep them in school. And typically, that is not how we set up a curriculum. We don’t usually look at those kinds of national best practices. So a part of the tremendous work that was done was to connect this curriculum to best practices.

Sahr: When we look at these best practices used by other universities, did we look at the salary structure of faculty at those universities to see if the faculty at the universities with high retention rates are in, say, the 15th percentile?

Cullinan: I have no idea what the faculty looked at. You would need to ask the faculty who put this all together.

**Comments from Provost Klein:**

He didn’t have any comments at this time since he will be talking later on in the meeting.

**ASSOU report:**

Tommy Letchworth first thanked the faculty who showed up to their last senate meeting, and also thanked those who encouraged their students to attend the academic reorganization/retrenchment forums we’ve been putting on.

On Nov. 26 ASSOU officially decided to move forward with the plan to stage a sit-in, for an indefinite period of time, in the capital, during the February short session. Asking for:

1. Emergency funding for our institution, and other institutions within the system, to help stabilize our financial situation.
2. A reinvestment in the system, over “x” number of years, to fund the level that we all feel is appropriate and sustainable.

We will be cycling students in and out on a weekly shift, so we get new students in every week, get students back here onto the campus back to their classes, jobs, and family. If you do have these students in your classes the only thing we ask is to allow some flexibility to do their assignments online for that week (we are not asking you to excuse them from class).

The reason why we feel it’s necessary to take such a radical action is because we’ve seen the trends. We are in a pressing enough financial situation at this point that somebody needs to stand up and say something. And seeing as we are poor students and can’t pay lobbyists to speak on our behalf, we’re going to have to take time out of our busy schedules to do it ourselves.

Any questions or concerns?

Russell-Miller: Are there any other universities joining you?

Letchworth: Right now we’re working on reaching out to the other regionals, and PSU specifically, and also Willamette – they’re right across the street from the capital and even though they’re private, a lot of us have friends there, and they would probably be sympathetic to the cause.

Carney: Where will you be sitting in, or in what will you be sitting?

Letchworth: The plan at this point is to stay inside the capital building, but we’re still working out the specifics.

Richards: Do you have logistical support set up for this?

Letchworth: We have 5 task forces with approximately 5 people working on each task force who are currently working on things, such as securing potential bail money – not that we’re expecting to get arrested, but it is possible. We are engaged in civil disobedience and we don’t want students to get thrown under the bus if they decide to crack down on us. These task forces are working on “legals”, on-site logistics, more broad logistics, messaging, and coalition development.

Nordquist: So the on-site logistics includes wireless, the ability to get information out in case they shut you down?

Letchworth: Yes, we will be looking at that. And if anyone has any ideas or wants to help offline, let us know.

We did have a conversation with president Cullinan about this …

Cullinan: I can’t condone anything illegal.

Letchworth: She didn’t tell us not to.

Carter: Having met with Max and Tommy last week they let me know what their plans were, and of course I said “Be on your best behavior”, but I’m certainly willing to support their action and their intent for what they want for the students, as far as allowing flexible release. So that while the students are still responsible for their materials, if they’re not physically present in the class for that day or two days, as long as they’re responsible for their materials, I fully support what they’re doing.

Apodaca: What are the dates?

Letchworth: It will be during the February short session. We haven’t hammered out a specific date. We want to be cautious about publicizing our start date because we really don’t want to be met by a line of police. Not saying that we would be, but it is possible.

Goldman: Something that this campaign is going to rally around is the elements of professionalism and respect. That will be essential to the success of this campaign. There’s not going to be any drugs or alcohol allowed. We will have a very specific list of guidelines that will be read to members who are participating in the sit-in every single day. We’re going to be encouraging professionalism and respect the entire time, because that’s really the only way we can see this as being successful. Along with working along with the other universities we will work with other entities such as unions, organizations, community members, and any members in society who feels that this movements is something that they feel they need to get on board with. This will be a multi-lateral campaign in its very nature.

Ettlich: I think it would help to make it visible that you are doing schoolwork. It shows that you’re not just looking at this as a way to get out of classes. And that would help to carry your message: We are serious students, we really want an education, just give us the opportunity to get one.

Goldman: Exactly. We’ve talked about dedicating one to two hours every single day for homework time. The days are going to be planned “out to the T”. We’re going to have activities the entire time.

Letchworth: We’ve been digging through Oregon’s budget for the last 20 years, and we will be compiling a list of five to fifteen policy options that we will be presenting to the legislature, when they will invariably say “Well, where do you want this money to come from? From Kindergartners or old people who are sick and retired?” And our response could be “No, you could if you so chose, but here are fifteen various ways that we’ve identified that you can do to save money or generate revenue.”

We’re in the process of constructing that, so if anyone has any ideas, if anyone has a piece of legislation that you want to see go through the legislature for the last 20 years, now is an opportunity to get it out in the public. If you have ideas please contact us.

We will keep you updated as things progress.

[This was followed by applause from the faculty senate]

**Curriculum Committee Report:**

Carter: David Oline is going to present the material on the Innovation and Leadership proposal. Rather than have him wait until the very end of Senate for the action item to vote on the curriculum committee catalog and curriculum materials, David will start with the first part, the Innovation Leadership proposal, and then when we’re finished with that, we can potentially vote on the second item he brought two weeks ago.

Online explained that this was approved by the Curriculum Committee last year, but did not get by the senate. The Curriculum Committee made a few revisions: creation of an INL prefix so that it was not tied to Psychology. It’s to be taught entirely at the Medford HEC campus in a non-standard format, with 5-week sessions on single nights of the week in a hybrid course format. It’s also designed as a cohort experience. One of the reasons we wanted to bring it forward is that it wasn’t brought up last year, but if we act on it now, then the sooner we can get a cohort started.

Questions? I have Jeanne Stallman here who can help with answering your questions.

Ettlich: I’m curious about the IAL, are those new courses or old courses? And who’s overseeing that prefix for faculty credentials, etc.?

Stallman: It’s actually IML since Education uses the IAL for certain things.

The two courses specifically listed as IML are currently offered by psychology, they are not new courses. Psychology said that these two courses could be taught in a number of different disciplines, and that’s why they encouraged us to go forward with it. With this prefix someone outside of the psychology department can teach them. This program includes a program coordinator whose job it is to work with the departments to make sure we have the faculty and/or the adjuncts and to bring them to the departments for approval.

Ferguson asked about how the faculty loading would work for the faculty overseeing the adjuncts that would be teaching. Jeanne Stallman didn’t know if that detail had been determined yet.

Ferguson asked if they could explain a little better why these are cohorts. She just see a series of different classes.

McBee: They take all of their core classes together.

Stallman: Also, they’re doing more than sitting together in a classroom. Because it’s applied they’re doing a lot of hands on work together and they can address an issue and be looking at it across different parts of the economy and learn from each other.

Nordquist asked if they are bringing in new faculty to teach. The only new position is the coordinator, it’s being taught by existing faculty along with adjuncts. It’s a self-support program.

Purlsow clarified that for self-support programs 10% of total gross revenue, not profits, is taken by SOU. So the budget needs to consider that, and asked that the numbers be rerun.

Carter: The second item for David was the curriculum changes that came from our last senate meeting. Any other questions or comments on those? We are seeking approval from faculty senate.

Ettlich: Is this the 11/18 summary? It was emailed on the 16th.

Carter: Yes

Carney moved and Belcastro seconded. The motion passed with none opposed, and all were in favor with one abstention from Apodaca.

Carter: The last two discussion items for today are the Academic Reorganization materials and then the House discussion.

The request from senate was to be informed of the materials in the Chairs meetings from the last time.

Klein summarized the information in the documents we had received.

Questions?

Ferguson: You have a Dec 16 due date for AVP application, so you already have a committee?

Klein: I have a part of the committee. I have two chairs and an administrator, but I need two faculty if anyone in this body that would like to volunteer for that. And we still need a classified person.

Purslow volunteered to be on the AVP search committee.

Marlowe: How many Program Chairs would there be in a center?

Klein: Two or three.

Carter: Our last item of discussion for today is the Houses. At the request of many, and the willingness of a few, Vince Smith, Alma Rosa Alvarez, Mark Tveskov, Dan DeNeui, and Karen Stone have all agreed to come and talk to us about the House model and their experience.

Vince Smith shared many of the outside activities their 44 students have engaged in. He described the team teaching they have done. This freshman experience has been an eye-opening experience for him as he’s been their instructor, their advisor, and their Dad all at once.

Ferguson asked for further clarification on how their team teaching was done.

Purslow wanted more specifics on how the ELU loading was done for the faculty that were team teaching.

Alvarez explained it takes a lot of faculty time to create the community connections and creating the experiential experiences for the students.

She also mentioned that there isn’t a lot of clarity in the expectations for the second year from the administration. And this lack of concrete answers has limited their ability to get faculty on board to teach for the House. The consensus among the Justice House is that they couldn’t have gone to a year 2 without seeing what that year 1 looked like. And we feel the same way about year 3 in some ways, that we need to see what year 2 looks like.

Nordquist stated that he didn’t believe that the level of time that they are putting into this is sustainable. Alvarez said that this first term had been very demanding, but that’s because it was all new, and it should be more manageable after they know the curriculum better. Smith explained how he just wrapped his research into his classes more.

Karen Stone, one of those who has been working on the “nuts and bolts” of getting the Houses up and running, gave a summary and update on the Houses. She offered to answer the “nuts and bolts” type of questions

Sahr asked about the breakdown on the mix of students the Houses are getting as compared to the USEM students. Are they comparable, or do they have higher GPA’s, etc.? Stone said they have not run that analysis yet, but they likely will. Stone followed up with the hope that the Houses will eventually allow us to recruit a different type of student. In answer to Belcastro’s question, Stone clarified that the Houses have a goal that is “two-fold”: to help retain the Oregon freshman students AND to help attract out-of-state students (who have a higher retention rate).

Purslow expressed concern that we have this impression that USEM is failing, which is troubling considering all of the work those faculty have put into it. Stone said the adoption of Houses is not lessening what those faculty have done, they have USEM instructors along with their best practices brought into the Houses because of their expertise. Providing students another option does not diminish their other choice.

Then Purslow expressed concern over the adsorbent increase in Houses over the next few years, and we need to be aware that we are taking a lot of money and time to invest in these Houses, rather than finesse the USEM experience.

Ferguson said that this pilot doesn’t feel like a pilot. And that you can’t expect these Houses to be attracting students from all over until they have been up and running successfully for many years. It concerns her that: we are being told that we have to do this fast; what was wrong with USEM?; were the USEM faculty brought into the conversation of being comfortable with being brought into these Houses? That seems to be a huge assumption that the USEM faculty would be willing to take this on. Also, she didn’t see how you could analyze the data with the way we are running our pilot.

DeNeui addressed the issue of analyzing the data. In a different economic climate we could have the luxury of running a four year pilot of randomly assigning students to USEM and Houses and then run a statistical analysis. That doesn’t pencil out for us, and we have to do something. Now if this is not the thing to do, then bring something forward as an alternative.

Ferguson felt there was not enough time allowed for reflection on the first year on the Houses before starting up so many more.

Stone assured Ferguson that they are responding to what’s happening in the Houses as the issues come up. Deneui referred to the USEM faculty who just described to us how they adapted “on-the-fly” to the issues that came up, and how they really needed that first year experience in order to make the subsequent year seamless.

Nordquist acknowledged and appreciates the enormous amount of work that people have put into the Houses and wished to go on record that he’s not willing to work *that* hard. His understanding is that the job of the senate is to come up with some kind of evaluation of whether this thing is going to work. And “work” means whether or not we would get a return on investment for all of this work being done. From question #4 in the Questions for Karen Stone we see that 36 ELU was allocated for HSEM, and for the same number of students in USEM we have 30 ELU. That tells me that it’s costing us 20% more to run the Houses, so we need a ROI of 20% either in retaining students or in new students.

Tveskov explained that if you’re comparing the cost of Houses with USEM it’s important to know that Houses are not envisioned to be another version of general education. They deliver general education in a form of doing other things that are integral to the student’s experience. It’s not comparing two identical things. It delivers general education, but it’s not just a different general education, that’s not ALL that it does, and that’s a very important distinction about what the House experience is supposed to be. The Houses cost more than USEM because it is more than USEM, and the return on investment is important. One of the big challenges in building the Houses has been how do you ask faculty to be extremely creative in delivering their material? The amount of creativity that came out of these House builders is frighteningly impressive. If you want a business model, would you invest in something that’s one of the ways leading you into becoming distinctive, more marketable, and more successful? It’s a matter of where you invest your resources; it’s a matter of prioritization. It’s risky and we have to be nimble with change. How can you expect a greater return without an initial investment?

Carney was concerned that our two Houses don’t reflect the dominant political viewpoint that our region cares about (though he felt they should). Will we have Houses that address their interests?

Tveskov believes a faculty member has a sense of what the region wants, and the Houses gives the faculty the opportunity to deliver it.

Stone shared that at Preview Days the parents were very excited about the Houses.

Pittman was wondering what the rationale was for rolling out so many Houses instead of just running a couple of them to see how they do.

Stone said the idea is to get our incoming students into a cohort experience that extends beyond one year. How are we going to do that? Are we going to run multiple pilots of different kinds of things or are we going to run a program like our House experience?

Whitman said that a “gen. ed. plus” program needs to put forward a plan that justifies the entire four-year curriculum that’s being developed. If you’re going to run a different gen. ed. instead of the one currently being run then the burden is on the faculty to present the entire package. Just as a major, minor, or a certificate has to present their entire package.

There was discussion about how the impression is that “USEM is failing”, and they don’t feel that is true. To address this Tveskov felt that no one has said USEM has failed, but the reason why we have to do the Houses, and how the Houses were originally developed by faculty, was to address a specific set of problem they were given. Whatever the advantage is of USEM, it deposits students out into a void from which they do not then return – and that’s data driven. That is one of the problems that the House experience was designed to address, to continue the cohort experience through a second and third year. And they were designed to address retention and the distinctiveness of the SOU campus, to give something to students that they weren’t getting at another university, making us less of a “revolving door.” We do have problems: we have this horrible retention rate and a financial free-fall. The House experience was one tactic in the midst of other tactics asked for by the administration to address our problems.

Purslow wanted to form a senate sub-committee to look at the issues of USEM compared to Houses. But there was concern that this would be redundant work for what’s already being done by the Curriculum Committee, University Studies Committee, and a task force that was put together by the Provost. This task force consists predominantly of faculty, and Ettlich was concerned that a senate sub-committee would devalue the work that is being done by faculty. Carney disagreed since we are discussing what the senate position will be, and therefore a senate sub-committee makes sense, and that their work would not devalue the work of the other committees, but rather would be taking the other committees work very seriously. And he added that there are some of us who feel the administration brings us things that we are essentially asked to “rubber stamp” them, and he doesn’t feel that we should allow faculty to do that either – a faculty committee of any kind.

Whitman inquired what would happen to the results from the current task force. Ayers explained the process: The results from the task force goes to the University Studies Committee, then to Curriculum Committee, and then to faculty senate. Walsh clarified that University Studies is really focused on the learning outcomes that they established for the strands. The Curriculum Committee looks at “a broader stroke” of what’s being proposed: rigor, class level, whether library has adequate resources to support the proposal, and those sort of things.

Pittman expressed that if we were to just run these two Houses for a few years then we would all be a lot more comfortable with letting them run and see how they do, without worrying about managing every moment of it. The fear is that we are adding all these Houses before we’ve had a run with it. He bets that we could all walk away from this “extra mantle of authority” if we could just back-off from how many Houses we are going to do.

Stone referred back to what DeNeui had explained earlier that if we had the luxury to do that, it would be ideal. But with our current situation we have to do something.

Richards said faculty senate concerns over the process would be greatly allayed if they were to see what the task force has been charged with and Klein said he could email the charge of the task force to him the next day.

Tveskov closed with the comment that it seems to him that a lot of the discussion about Houses on campus has been presented as an administration initiative and it’s something that those administrators having been doing to us. He would like to respectfully request of the senate to acknowledge the efforts of faculty in developing the House experience as a program, the hard work that they put into it, and that it has often come at a high personal cost. He would like the senate to acknowledge that this has been a faculty driven initiative.

Richards acknowledged the extraordinary work that the faculty have done to create the House experience. But the constitutional issue is an important issue: that this four-year program got approved without ever going in front of the Curriculum Committee, the US Committee, or the Senate. That is what irks him, not the incredible amount of work that’s been done.

Adjourned 6:25 p.m.