**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**February 24, 2014**

**SU 313 4:02 - 5:58 p.m.**

**Present:** Jackie Apodaca, Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Curtis Feist, Carol Ferguson, Richard May, Pete Nordquist, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Mary Russell-Miller, Kevin Sahr, Larry Shrewsbury, Jamie Vener, Elizabeth Whitman, and Erin Wilder.

**Absent:** Todd Carney, Steve Jessup, John King, Byron Marlowe, Kasey Mohammad, Garth Pittman, Robin Strangfeld.

**Visitors:** Mary Cullinan, James Klein, Lee Ayers, Sue Walsh, Kristi Wright, Anne Connor, Karen Stone

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.

Richards motioned to approve all three sets of minutes for January 27, February 3, and February 10 and a second was made by Sahr. The motion carried with all in favor, none opposed, and one abstention (Ferguson).

**Announcements:**

This Friday if you see a whole lot of cop cars around campus this is for the “Lock In” annual event being put on by the Criminology department (this is their 14th year). This is open to all faculty who would like to watch, just let the Criminology department know.

**Comments from President Cullinan:**

She said she realizes that people are concerned about communication issues. David Carter and she have been talking about how best to improve communication, and she is certainly welcome to ideas on how to improve it. She tries to communicate with the Monday Message, small group meetings, talking with folks in Senate, and she is certainly happy to talk in any other way that’s suggested.

The metrics that our graduate, Brian Fox, has been working on were shared with the Finance Committee of the Board last week. Copies were handed out to the Senators. This version is more detailed than prior ones we’ve seen. The Chancellor’s office and the board are proposing that we track many metrics. The Finance Committee of the Board last week made clear that they themselves don’t actually want to see all this data. They want to see the overarching benchmarks that we would be tracking, but they want to be sure that we are doing the tracking. Jody Waters wrote a few comments about these that Craig shared with the Finance Committee, and they responded well. For example, she mentioned that it might be difficult for the staff at SOU to track some of this, and she was also wondering if any of the comparator institutions had been involved as these data were being put together. She added that she thought they would benefit from faculty input (this was probably the crucial piece). Brian says he is going to come back to this campus, probably in the next few weeks, and talk with the faculty.

These data are a work in progress, and the fact that Brian wants to come here and meet with us, tells us there is room for refinement. It’s pretty clear that, in our new relationship with the Board they really want to see a lot of tracking; we’ve not seen this level of scrutiny in the past, and presumably the Board will be requiring the same of Eastern Oregon University. I don’t know if this kind of reporting will be required of all four TRUs. A lot of this information, the president added, will be part of the work that the Divisions will be tracking anyway, but some of it is new.

Any comments or questions?

Belcastro asked if Brian’s visit would be with a forum, in Divisions, departments, or in some other way. Cullinan suggested that the faculty could make recommendations on that. Brian has just offered to come down to make himself available.

Richards: The purpose of Brian Fox’s visit is to figure out how we’re going to track the metrics for the retrenchment plan?

Cullinan: I think it would be to talk about whether these are the metrics that would make sense for us, whether they should be consolidated or reframed. Brian is offering to come down and talk about what this would look like in its final form; this is still a draft.

Richards: But these are the metrics necessary in order to decide how well our retrenchment plan is working. It has nothing to do with the decision?

Cullinan: No, this is to track. It’s not just a retrenchment plan, it’s ensuring, from their point of view, that we’re just always going to be accountable.

Belcastro: Maybe we already do this, but note that under #4 (in the document that was handed out) we delineate between undergraduate and graduate programs, but when we look at retention we don’t look at that. It seems to me that would be a really important piece of data. On the next page you see “Retention”, but it isn’t separated out between undergraduate and graduate. It would be easier to match up with what we are doing with enrollments.

Cullinan agreed that could be a good idea.

Purslow: It looks like a lot of data every month, and I think we could be better stewards of the institution if we have a regular data recording session at each of our meetings so that we could communicate that. I think that would enhance communication for everybody.

Carter: Like a quick report of those actual units through here?

Purslow: Yes, because how many of us actually receive those enrollment reports unless we’re in what used to be Deans’ Council or one of those other places you would hear that. I think everybody should learn that, so that we can help more.

Cullinan: Yes, I think we should talk about what would be in a report that would come in a regular fashion, whatever it would include.

Ferguson: This is a clarification question for Mary. Are the other three regionals expected to do the same thing or is it just us?

Mary: It is just my assumption that Eastern would be doing it too, but I don’t know.

Belcastro: Is this only at the institutional level or will we be mining this at the Division level? Because if we’re in the process of having to make decisions throughout this retrenchment plan at the Division level, this could be helpful.

Klein: You’re right, we’ll roll up to a report for the Board that would probably be done at the Program level, and then from the Program level roll it up to a Division level.

Feist: So what will be required from Programs, and how often? Is there a short answer for that?

Vener: On the timeline sheet (in the document that was handed out) there’s a Business Plan due from the Program level in May.

Feist: I assume Program Directors already know about this?

Klein: Some probably know and some may not have gotten there yet. It’s due on June 1st.

Ferguson: So Curtis, in your question, are you trying to clarify what the program is?

Feist: No, just to be blunt, extra work at the Program level. It started out saying this is just being done at the top and no Divisions and no Programs.

Klein: I’m sure the Division Director will do the work, but it will be by Program.

Feist: Okay, that’s different. That helps, thank you.

**Comments from Provost Klein:**

We have confirmed the Division Director for BCE, this is Communication and the Environment; there’s a joke in there. We’re working this week to finalize the staffing for the academic Divisions plus the Service Center. We’re almost there. Our Innovation & Leadership proposal goes to the Board for approval next Thursday. That will be the last step for that Program. So far it’s been unanimously approved by the Provost Council.

Purslow: Could you give us a run down on who all of the Directors are and where we still have uncertainty?

Klein: There are five of them that have been confirmed. I was going to wait until they were all finished and then send out an email, but maybe I should be sending out updates. Sherry Ettlich for STEM, Greg Jones for BCE, Lee Ayers for Undergraduate Studies, Scott Rex for Language and Culture, David Humphries for the Center of the Arts. The two that are still in process are Education and a lot of other things: Health, PE, ROTC. And SSPA, Social Science and Public Affairs.

Ferguson: In attempting to respond to the Division plan Sue’s office sent out, that template, there’s an alternative that we can propose. It deals with financials, so the question is, in some cases we don’t have the financials behind the cuts to our Program. So it’s hard for us to respond to something if we don’t know what our target is, and also the rational.

Klein: We can get that for you.

Walsh: Some Programs have come to us with that very question and we’ve provided it to them.

Purslow: Could we get that for all of the Programs?

Walsh: Well, we just use averages.

Klein: Yeah, we could give you the average numbers.

Purslow: I think that would be great and maybe we will come up with something creative.

**ASSOU report:**

Kristi Wright said they have been talking to people about an amendment to the budget bill, getting some money for Southern and Eastern. We don’t have a number yet, but we should know by the end of this week. Last Tuesday they had the “Day of Action” when they took about 35 students up there and they made a very positive impression on how many students were there and how much we care.

Carter reminded the Senate that it would be appreciated that if they are free to attend one of the ASSOU meetings, Tuesdays at 6:00 pm, please send David Carter an email and let him know. He can’t attend every single one of their meetings. It would be good for us to do as good a job as they do for attending our meetings.

**IFS Update:**

Carter: I spoke with Jody today and she will be coming to our next senate meeting. She wanted to get a couple more items together to just bring more of a package, rather than string them along.

**HECC Update:**

Carter: Lee Ayers, our HECC representative, had noted that they will be meeting on the 11th, so we will hear from her on the 24th.

**Information Items:**

Anne Connor went over the Carpenter I Grants. There had been a record number of applicants. This was for Carpenter I and they awarded partial amounts to the top eight applicants. They still have $12,835 available for the Carpenter II grants.

Ferguson: I noticed one of these listed was for OHSU Nursing, are they eligible?

Walsh: Yes. Several years ago the Carpenter Foundation clarified that they wanted the OHSU faculty to be able to apply. They don’t apply often.

Carter: We will take this up as an action item on our next senate meeting.

**Discussion Items:**

Purslow: Last time we talked about recording our faculty senate meetings. I guess since it’s not down as an Action Item we can’t take a vote on action on it.

Carter: My understanding is that we were talking about it and then we went to table it and so I never put it back on as an official Information Item. I can certainly put it back on.

Purslow: That would be great.

Carter: David Oline has come to talk to us about the House courses 201, 202, 203, 301, 302, and 303, and some of the issues around the House program, and the House courses. He and I have had a couple of discussions. Just keep in mind that this is not for voting on the approval of Houses, or House programs, or House courses today. All we’re doing is talking about some of the issues around how there are three different concepts going on. So it’s basically more of a discussion for us to have with the Curriculum Committee so that we can have a better understanding of how this particular piece of information is playing out within the Curriculum Committee.

David Oline said that one of the reasons he wanted to be there is because there are a lot of issues and these are major proposals and major overhauls in the House program. And along with that a proposed realignment of the Gen Ed program as well. It’s going to have a huge impact on all of us. The Curriculum Committee has discussed some of these issues and they’re trying to keep a focus on the issues that they are to keep their eyes on. But there are much larger issues as far as the program as a whole is concerned. The difficulty is that they are really intertwined. He would break it down to three issues:

(1) The course proposals for the 200 and 300 House sequence, which they have approved on their last session, but they are not yet an information item. Those are shell courses, basically 201, 202, and 203 will implement E, F, and G Gen Ed strands. And 301, 302, and 303 will implement H, I, and J. Part of what’s motivating them is there is an immediate need to get something available to those in the Houses. In 12 weeks preregistration starts for Fall and students are expecting 201 to be there.

(2) The senate has asked for a House program proposal, which they now have. They’re still going through discussions and there are still some issues they have with that.

(3) And we have the Gen Ed realignment proposal as well. They are intertwined because the House proposal is essentially a new Gen Ed. The Houses implement Gen Ed. We could go several different directions. We have our current Gen Ed program. The House proposal we have could implement Gen Ed in a different way, in a way that is similar to the proposed realignment for University Studies. So one of the things we had a lot of discussion on today was it’s kind of this chicken and the egg thing. If we approve a change in University Studies that makes applying that to the House program easy. We have the possibility though of implementing Gen Ed differently in the Houses than we currently do. And there are issues with students moving in and out of Houses, transfer credits, students transferring in and out of the institution creates complexities if we’re going to have two Gen Ed tracks. And as an aside we also have the Honors program, which implements Gen Ed with its own, somewhat similar to the House proposal, in a series of shell courses.

He had assumed that the senate had reviewed the House proposal and the realignment of the University Studies, but those had only gone to Chairs.

Ferguson said she thought we would see actual curriculum, and we approved courses last year because of timing issues.

Ayers: There’s been a subcommittee for a long time in USEM, so if I want to propose a USEM course, there’s a shell that been in existence. I would open the shell and design the curriculum. What this allows to happen is for the 201, 202, 203 House model for next year to move forward. That will happen, they will start filling in the curriculum and what’s going to be proposed, and then it will come to the subcommittee on curriculum and to U Studies, where they are aligning and approving these. Once the shell is approved and the model is in place, USEM has had a subcommittee for a long time that reviews their strands. Now that this is under a shell model they can come to a subcommittee that will say, “Ready to go” or “Not so ready to go.”

Ferguson: That’s not my concern. My concern is that there be actual specific curriculum from faculty that are going to be teaching those courses. Not the shell of the strands that you are going to cover. But you actually see a syllabus, how the material relates to the theme of those two existing houses …

Ayers: Absolutely. We have the templates in place so they know what needs to be done, and then how it’s going to be done comes through just like we talked about, much like Curriculum Committee now, much like USEM has done for years: they want to see what it is you’re implementing, what it is you’re going to assign, how you’re going to measure assessment. And here it is, the total aspect. One will be 201 for E, 202 for F, 203 for G.

Ferguson: We’re talking about time. Maybe David would know this: Do the two existing Houses have faculty in place that are in the process of developing those courses?

Oline: I don’t know. I know that they’ve had some discussions, but I also know that they’ve been waiting for us.

Sahr: (Speaking to Ayers) To clarify what you said about the USEM subcommittee, was that procedure followed for the 100 level courses being taught this year?

Ayers: The G courses that went forward went under the USEM process that has been in place. They were reviewed outside of that committee because they were approved as individual courses. So we saw what the Green House was doing and what the Social Justice House was doing and we approved it for those particular …

Sahr: So the actual curriculum went through some committee in USEM

Ayers: Not in USEM. U Studies. That’s okay, there’s a lot of “U’s”.

Belcastro: Just to clarify, last year we approved specific courses, we didn’t approve a shell. And I think that’s an important piece, and that it was misspoken earlier that we approved a shell. And I’m wondering if that’s going to be a part of this. If you’re going to build a shell model …

Ayers: The proposal represents the shell model.

Carter explained that we approved *courses* 101, 102, 103, not *shells*, last year for the two existing Houses.

Ayers explained that when we think of future Houses that’s where the proposal comes in.

Feist: Will those come to us as two separate proposals, for existing Houses, and also for the future Houses?

Ayers explained that the proposal is everything we should of thought about when we went into Houses, if it was a perfect world and the stars were all aligned. But that’s not how it happened.

What Ayers really sees changing with the House proposal is that we haven’t really had an enforcement team with the University Studies. Courses come to us, we look at them, and either we stamp them or we don’t. Faculty that propose them may or may not teach them. Faculty teaching the courses may or may not know what the faculty that brought the course forward said they would do. We have no way of assessing these courses all the way through. Even with our integration courses I would be hard stretched to assess any of these courses for what was originally proposed that would be done. So this gives us an opportunity to start some of that assessment and enforcement wrapped around the rubrics we’re developing for everything considered University Studies.

Sahr said he just reviewed the minutes from May and June when we talked about the House courses, and it was made very clear that those three courses were just a temporary thing and a proposal for the House program would come to us in the Fall before we approved any other courses. Now we’re being told something very different from that.

Ayers explained that the House proposal is for all future Houses. For the two existing Houses it’s slightly different. We’ve got a group of students who have started the House experience, and they’ve been told what their curriculum might look like, so we have to at least give them an option between the House proposal and what was promised them.

Sahr said he realizes that our Provost, without consulting the shared governance, went ahead and made this promise. Sahr thought we had a promise last year that we were going to see a proposal before any 200 level courses came before us.

Sahr’s made the following motion, that had a second by Purslow:

“I instruct our subcommittees to consider not approving any individual courses and future courses until we, the faculty senate, have approved the House program.”

Discussion:

Ferguson: I would like that to include a budget. It would be nice to have a financial comparison of proposals; how doable they are.

Sahr: I think there is a concern that the Houses don’t “pan out” in a financial way.

Ayers: I hear what you’re saying, but I just want to caution you that we have a group of students who have come to SOU under the House model and they are moving forward. And if we stymie this at this point in time we won’t have the curriculum next year telling our current students that they can stay in a House. And this is why I’ve been very deliberate in pulling out our two existing Houses from what “tomorrow looks like.”

Sahr: I think we can offer them an alternative without approving those second year Houses forever.

Purslow: I feel that these students could be honored through a special topics process. And what I feel is happening is that the Houses are being placed upon us for the wrong reasons. We need a fair assessment; if our Gen Ed wasn’t working, we’ve thrown out the baby with the bathwater. Frankly, I would welcome any university curriculum committee to come audit the classes that I teach that are Gen Ed. Because if I’m not meeting the goals I want to know, so that I can fix them. I just don’t understand why we’re saying we’re going to throw them all out because these haven’t been assessed. So we can start assessing them now. And I’m troubled by students not being able to transfer their AP credits to Houses. I feel we’re being asked to solve a problem we didn’t create. And I think if we’re going to change our General Education here at the university, we have to do it much more thoughtfully than it’s been done.

Richards: It seems to me if the motion on the table is approved, it would be appropriate to make a second motion that courses for the existing Houses be approved under a 299, 399 structure as pilot courses, as they were originally proposed to the curriculum committee and approved last year. Rather than with permanent numbers until, as this motion proposes, the faculty senate has approved the House curriculum as a whole.

Purslow: It seems to me that if we approve the Houses then we’re giving approval for a new Gen Ed curriculum. So I don’t know how we could vote on any of the Houses because of the implication that comes with it, that if you do the House, you don’t have to take the Gen Ed. So it feels to me like the logical place to start is to propose a new curriculum from the general education program or a new track. Because we’re doing it through the back door, to go through and approve it at the course level, if all these deals are being made for students to do it in that way.

Ayers: I do not view it as a new Gen Ed, I view it as a deliberate distinctive Gen Ed. It’s following the same guidelines as your music class, for instance. It’s just being put into a model that has more purview over it.

Richards: I would like to call the question.

After some discussion and clarifications Sahr motioned that we the senate table discussion of any hard numbered House courses until we the senate have approved a House program proposal, including a budget. A second was made by Purslow.

The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and one abstention (Vener).

Carter asked when might the House proposal be coming here for an information item for discussion. After some discussion it was felt it would be by the next faculty senate meeting.

Purslow: I think a critical error was made in marketing the program. I think about this document here that I believe came out last December, and it takes months to put together. It advertises Global Studies, Mind and Body, Skeptics, and Siskiyou House. So we’re exacerbating the problem by advertising this stuff and marketing it. I just don’t know how our accreditation would allow us to market something that we don’t even have approval for. And I think this Fall it’s going to exacerbate this issue if we run these four Houses. What I would really feel more comfortable with is suspending all new Houses, or the marketing of new Houses, until we have this squared away. I’m still on the fence about the Houses, to be honest; I don’t have my mind made up. But I don’t think we should be promoting something until we’ve got a program with courses that have been approved. I think it’s disingenuous.

Ayers: It goes a step farther. These Houses are up on the enrollment website that students are self-selecting as being reviewed and being accepted or not accepted …

Purslow: And I think that’s awful. I think that should have never been allowed to happen and we raised that issue here in the senate when those Houses were marketed at the January Preview Day. And those concerns I guess were ignored, or taken into consideration and not acted on.

Richards: The urgency of reviewing the House curriculum proposal is not lost on me. It needs to be done and it needs to be done as soon as possible, and we need to have a legitimate base on which to build the curriculum. That having been said, it’s disturbing to hear, as I understand it, that we could not put through today’s information, put through follow-up courses for the second year for the first two Houses, under a temporary number, because Houses don’t have 299, 399 designations. Is that something we can’t surmount here in senate?

Walsh: I think we probably can surmount that. It is a kind of chicken and an egg kind of thing. Faculty have shared the great deal of enthusiasm students have about the Houses at Preview Days, and we’re working really hard to get a proposal forward, but I feel we get a little sidelined with some conversations that pull it, and kind of make us wait. I think both University Studies and Curriculum Committees are ready to do whatever it takes to satisfy the different needs we have, like we’ve identified tonight, if we could just figure out what that is.

Feist motioned that we consider course proposals for first year students for existing Houses (Green House and Social Justice House) be separated from curriculum proposals for future Houses, for future years of existing Houses. In other words, continue to treat this first cohort as a pilot, and do not hinder their progress.

A second was made by Richards.

After some discussion, the motion passed with all in favor, none apposed, and no abstentions.

Richards: You were talking about the House proposal and you were talking about the Gen Ed realignment proposal. Those are two separate things in your agenda?

Ayers: Very much so, they are two separate things.

Richards: They may be separate conceptually but for all practical purposes they are horribly intertwined. Because whether we have two tracks of the University Studies, whether we commit wholesale to Houses, how we make the transition from a two-track curriculum to House curriculum. All of those questions need to be answered before we have a clear idea on what we’re doing moving forward. It’s going to be very hard to consider one without considering the other.

Ayers: It gets very complicated when you throw them into one bucket. Because right now it’s been assumed that we have to take our current general education as we know it and align it with the House and cut these things down to x amount of credit hours. But there’s some flexibility with this, the way we’ve designed House is the students in a cohort, unlike USEM that spends one year together, the House cohort will also have the second year with Explorations and third year with Integrations. That’s something we can talk about, because we understand Explorations and Integrations. The other thing that’s exclusive to the House is the High Impact Practices, the K strands. One of the things that’s been a tremendous push from the governor on down is to get students engaged in the community to experience the application of learning outcomes and demonstrate this through real world experiences. Why wait until their Junior or Senior year to expose them to the world when they need to start living in it at the very moment? Those high impact practices are also a great retention aspect. Those are part of the aspects of the House. When we think outside of the House, rather than saying this is separate and distinct, they’re just doing it differently. So if we want to align this with the House, then the question becomes is it “You do the House and then you do some extra courses (this addresses the “quantity” of it)” or do we say we’re aligning all of Gen Ed, getting stiffer on it, making sure people are doing what they pledged to do, and align them with assessment. And that to me is a conversation that is very much dependent on the faculty

Adjourned 5:58 p.m.