**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**April 7, 2014**

**SU 313 4:04 - 6:05 p.m.**

**Present:** Jackie Apodaca, Todd Carney, Dave Carter, Carol Ferguson, Byron Marlowe, Richard May, Pete Nordquist, Garth Pittman, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Mary Russell-Miller, Kevin Sahr, Larry Shrewsbury, Robin Strangfeld, Jamie Vener, Elizabeth Whitman, and Erin Wilder.

**Absent:** Deborah Brown (Proxy Craig Stillwell), Amy Belcastro (Replaced Spring Term by Gregg Gassman), Kate Cleland-Sipfle (Proxy Mary Jane Cedarface), Curtis Feist, Steve Jessup, John King (Proxy Dennis Jablonski), Kasey Mohammad.

**Visitors:** Mary Cullinan, James Klein, Sherry Ettlich, Lisa Garcia Hanson, Sue Walsh, Steve Thorpe, Max Goldman, Jim Hatton, Lee Ayers, David Oline.

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m.

**Announcements:**

Carter announced new senator replacements: Gregg Gassman for Amy Belcastro and Dennis Jablonski for John King, who are both on sabbatical this term. And that the last two Senate Minutes will be forthcoming, they got lost in the groups of emails. But we will have them before our next meeting.

**Assessment Committee Report**

Jim Hatton gave us an update on their gathering of senior writing examples; they are hoping to get around 700. The goal is to use these to improve student’s writing.

**ASSOU Report**

Max Goldman told us of their voter registration campaign and that they would like to come into our classrooms to talk with our students to encourage them to vote. A “Class Rap Sign-Up” sheet was passed around.

Also, the students secured $1 million in the Legislature Short Session -- $500,000 for this university and $500,000 for Eastern University. The students are forming a Recommendation Committee that will give the Administration advice on the best ways this money could be utilized to achieve student success.

**HECC Report**

Lee Ayers updated us on their work that’s focused on student success and getting the money that’s “left on the table” in Oregon into the hands of the students. There’s a new JVAC initiative that’s looking at Intermediate Algebra as being one of the best things to have in their background knowledge, so there will be a statewide study on that. There’s hope that in 2015 there will be a pilot for “Pay It Forward”. And there’s pilot projects for “Credit For Prior Learning.”

What we have a big stake in is “What is happening with the Shared Service aspect?”

HECC will be meeting here at SOU on June 11-12; late in the afternoon on the 11th, and we can sign-up to present public testimony for the morning meeting on the 12th. They will have lunch in the Hawk, and will then tour the campus. We want them to feel welcome.

Nordquist requested further clarification on the Intermediate Algebra initiative. Ayers explained that the big question is “Are we giving students the right math skills to be successful?”

In the teleconference that Ettlich attended last term with the other Math Chairs they were not talking about whether or not students should take intermediate algebra in high school. It was more about discussing whether or not all college students should do college algebra, because some of the institutions (not ours) require college algebra. It was felt among the Math Department Chairs that it probably wasn’t necessary, but it is important that they do something like a Statistics course (like our Math 243).

Ayers discussed the problem with high school students entering into an engineering program and being told that their math skills are preventing them from being ready for the coursework.

**Discussion/Information Items:**

Carter explained that to maintain a more conversational tone with the President and Provost we would bring them in during the Discussion and Information Items, and also this way they are not placed way at the bottom of the agenda.

**Discussion with President Cullinan:**

Cullinan explained that the State Board did endorse us having our own governing board, and they endorsed conditions for Eastern and Southern. Cullinan said that this body [faculty senate] will most undoubtedly want to play a part in this process. There will be one student, one staff person, and one faculty member appointed to this Board. Each person would have a two-year term, with the ability to serve another two years.

Cullinan didn’t really have any information on the conditions right now. The Board members were “all over the place” when talking about conditions. We have 45 days, which includes us sending our recommended conditions to the governor and having him approve them, so it’s fewer than 45 days.

Cullinan is working on a matrix for the skills we need the board members to have. We send the governor the list of names and it’s the governor’s decision on who is selected. By the end of May we should have a list sent to the governor. The whole point of these people being on the Board is that they know us, so we will need some kind of transition committees on campus to help these folks get acclimated. We really need to change the way that we have been known.

The Legislation says that the TRU Boards would start July 1, 2015. The press release from the Chancellor’s Office said that might change if the conditions take longer. But they would have to change the Legislation in order to make us start a year later. Cullinan feels it would be bad for both institutions to have to wait another year.

Carney asked for clarification on what the Board approved in terms of the conditions; what are the conditions? Cullinan explained that the Board had three options: “Yes”, “No”, or “Yes with conditions.” They went with the latter, but they didn’t have any conditions. That’s what we have to work out, in *less* than 45 days. It’s between Cullinan and the Board, but she welcomes ideas.

Nordquist asked if there was a process for approving the conditions. Cullinan said it’s not in the Legislation; this hasn’t been done before.

Carter had watched the live feed of the discussion and vote and Nordquist’s question is a question that came up. Carter’s understanding from what was said is that they would have to come back and vote to approve the conditions within the 45 days prior to them going to the governor. Though that was the end result of what they decided, they weren’t exactly sure what they were supposed to do with the conditions.

In response to Carter’s question about the 45 days Cullinan clarified that the 45 days is for putting together our recommendations for people to serve on the Board. We will have to move more quickly for the conditions.

Carter noted that for Western and OIT they started with choice of “Approval without conditions”, but when the vote came up for Eastern and us the first way it was phrased was “Approval with conditions.” Cullinan said that after the vote some of the members told her the only reason they voted “No” was because they wanted an “Approval without conditions”, and they didn’t have the option to vote that way.

There was a discussion about what the conditions would be. Should they be vague or specific conditions? Cullinan thought the Board would prefer that Southern and Eastern have the same, or very similar, conditions. So perhaps the more that we are “on the same page” as Eastern, the better.

Richards said he understood that the governance model would be a hybrid model. Cullinan explained that the Board only has the authority to vote on having individual governing boards, but maybe one of their conditions might be that there needs to be a President’s Council. The four TRU presidents thought that having a President’s Council with the four of us, and maybe someone from the HEC and the Board Chairs that met regularly would be wonderful. Since that idea has been put forward the other three presidents (from the big universities) said “We would like to be on that too.” That brings it to seven presidents, and that’s very different from what we had originally envisioned.

Sahr asked if the conditions were going to determine whether or not we have a Board in July 2015 or are they conditions about 5 years from now whether we get to keep our Board? Cullinan said it was the latter, that we have some conditions that prove that we are capable of being governed by ourselves. So we are going to get our own Board, but they will be watching us.

**Discussion with Provost Klein:**

Klein had a few announcements:

The Innovation in Leadership program was approved by the Board on Thursday.

After a third try we’ve had a successful search for the Director for Instructional Support with Vicki Suter.

Brian Fox has been hired by HECC as their chief financial person.

**Curriculum Committee Report:**

David Oline went over the report that had been sent to us of the catalog changes for 2014-15. These changes were approved by the Curriculum Committee and were brought forward to the Faculty Senate for approval. ED 340 is being brought forward again because the last time it was brought to Faculty Senate there was concern that it had the same number and title as a Psychology course “Child and Adolescent Development”. Oline explained that wasn’t correct, it had the same title, but a different number. The Psychology course has two other prerequisites, and the Education course is part of the cohort experience. And with those differences there shouldn’t be any confusion between those two courses. Russell-Miller also added that for next year they will be giving that Education course a new title.

Nordquist asked about the “suite of courses” for Performing Arts, wondering if that was a “new thing.” Vicki Purslow clarified that they are not calling it a “suite”, but rather an “emphasis area.” So they are not introducing a new term, and she believes there has been a precedence set for this already – where it’s not a program, major, or minor, but we have a suite of classes that they recommend in order to have an “emphasis area.” An “emphasis area” does not show up on the student’s degree.

Nordquist was concerned that we are using the catalog as an advising/marketing tool. He feels the catalog is a contract and filling it with these other things was wasting space and distracting from what we want the catalog to say. Purslow looked at it differently as she sees the catalog as a marketing tool, and we should be looking at class descriptions as a marketing tool – that’s what the students read and what gets them excited about our courses. We are showing them the limitless possibilities they have when they come to SOU. But she agrees that a lack of consistency in how this is done would be a problem. Ettlich explained how different departments have made different use of that front copy that they have in the catalog preceding where their programs and course listings are. That front copy has a lot of things that are “marketing related.”

Carney brought up the concern that since we don’t have the hard copies of the catalog anymore, the link to it should be one of those tabs at the top of the SOU homepage, not something that’s “buried down” like it is now.

These courses will be an Action Item at our next meeting.

**Action Item:**

Ratification of the Enrollment Council

The Enrollment Council (which is under the UPB) sent forward to the UPB material to update the Enrollment Council’s proposed structure along with suggested changes. This was sent from Lisa Garcia-Hanson (Enrollment Services) to the Faculty Senate. This was approved by the UPB, they are now asking for the Faculty Senate to ratify these changes.

Discussion:

Nordquist said he didn’t see any, what he calls, “regulation faculty” listed for enrollment. By “regulation faculty” he meant someone who does not serve in an administrative position. Klein pointed out that on the second page of the document it does have faculty listed.

Richards moved that we ratify the changes, with a second by Carney.

The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions (Ferguson and Nordquist).

**IFS Report**

Charles Lane shared with us the meeting he went to week before last at OHSU, and the Friday afternoon discussion that was with senator Denbrow. This discussion centered around the TRU’s and TRU’s governance. A lot of the discussion was on the situation at EOU (the president and provost are on their way out).

Senator Denbrow asked both Jeff Dense (IFS president) and Charles Lane to come back to our Faculty Senates and express that he would encourage the faculty senates at both Eastern and Southern to take a very proactive role in shared governance in these two elements: helping to “define the Board” (creation and definition of the Board), and in the definition of the appropriate parameters and metrics that will define what “success” means.

Carter said he did email senator Denbrow and asked if he would come down and talk with us about what he thought our role should be. When Carter gets a response he will share that information with us.

Charles Lane said they were told that the goal is to have the Shared Services up and running by July 1, 2014. It’s hoped that it will be pretty seamless to the average faculty and staff members. A lot of this is going to be centered at Oregon State.

In regards to the continued existence of the IFS, Lane has seen far more support for it to continue from the faculty senators of the “Big 3” (Oregon, Portland State, Oregon State) than from the small schools.

The IFS is a little concerned that the HECC is focusing too much on budget issues (which they are tasked to do), and not enough on some of the governance and ongoing academic operations (involving curriculum). Curriculum that’s now handled by the Provost Council that’s still in the State Board structure. But once the State Board goes away is there something comparable out of the HECC where the Provost Council can go to for approval of large programs, curricular offerings, those sorts of things. IFS doesn’t see that as being high up on the HECC radar screen.

**House Experience Proposal**

Carter started off with a summary history of the Houses:

When the idea of Houses first came forward, it was as a separate concept with curriculum that was different from our curriculum, and that caused a lot of concern.

Last Spring the Faculty Senate approved House Seminar 101, 102, 103 as being similar to USEM 101, 102, 103.

The House Experience has now been changed so that it doesn’t have a different curriculum from U-Studies, other than the replacement of one House 201 for an E Strand class, one House 202 for an F Strand class, and one House 203 for a G Strand class (with or without a lab, depending on how the class is developed). And One House 301 for a H Strand, one House 302 for an I Strand, and one House 303 for a J Strand. We are no longer looking at a different curriculum. We are looking at courses that have been approved by Curriculum Committee and University Studies.

The Houses now have the support (that has been missing) from the Director for Undergraduate Studies and from the Director for Instructional Support.

Sahr called a point of order, referring to a motion he had made (and was passed) at the February 24, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting: “That the senate table discussion of any hard numbered House courses until the senate has approved a House Program Proposal, including a budget.” And so he felt it was inappropriate to be having this discussion.

The argument for why it was appropriate is because of the significant changes that clearly reflect listening to and seeking to address the Faculty Senate’s objections:

(1) Doesn’t require a House for all students;

(2) Doesn’t drastically reduce the GE requirements;

(3) Keeps three explorations courses in each major area;

(4) Doesn’t create an alternate Gen Ed path for House students;

(5) In regards to the concern about the Houses costing more, now that we are not moving to delivering the majority of all Gen Ed through the Houses, we have the ability to more closely monitor and control costs by managing the ELU loading per course and the quantity of House courses offered per year. Also note that USEM 101/102/103 courses are fairly uniform in their costs, the exploration and integration courses vary quite a bit.

(6) It no longer proposes a distinct program, but amounts to just seeking approval for one additional course choice under each of the Strands A, B, C, E, F, G, H, I, and J listings – which has been routinely approved by Senate when these came forward from various programs with University Studies recommendation for approval.

So with these concerns addressed, and the curriculum is not different now, there is no need for the House Proposal to go forward now.

But because of the motion that was passed two meetings ago it was agreed to discuss the House Proposal.

Purslow had concerns about the aggressive rate in adding Houses that would lead to reductions of other courses. She read a letter to the Senate:

To the Faculty Senate:

Thank you for putting considerable time and effort in reviewing the exciting new house program and for seeking a process for formal approval. However, the proposed house program currently being considered for full adoption by the University in our view directly conflicts with the Performing Arts programs in Music and Theatre Arts. Currently many students each term work on productions and/or concert practice/rehearsals during the late afternoons, evenings and weekends throughout the term. This is an essential part of the normal curriculum in the performing arts.

Were SOU to adopt the house model for all general education outcomes, all Performing Arts students would be placed in a conflicted schedule almost every term. This does not seem to have been addressed in the review of the house program, or if it were, then consideration was not made for Performing Arts students and we suspect Athletic students as well.

Thus, the Performing Arts Department would like to request that the house plan be reconsidered before adoption and that adjustments be made in the emerging program that would resolve these time conflict issues and would allow Performing Arts students full access to whatever general education programs required for Southern Oregon University. We very much appreciate your careful consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

David R. Humphrey, PhD.

Director of Performing Arts

Eric Levin, PhD

Program Coordinator for Theatre Arts

Jeffery Richmond, PhD

Program Coordinator for Music

Karen Stone explained that there is not a push to do ‘all Houses’; they are looking for a balance.

Ayers explained that the Houses are in conjunction with University Studies, and is not to replace it. And the way Houses are now, students can easily divorce themselves from a House if they decide it’s not for them. And if we have an Acc Bacc student who already has the first year experience done in high school, they can start in House 201 and still have a cohort experience (with instructor approval). There’s a lot of flexibility now.

Whitman felt that by having a different prefix that implies that you have a new program. And if you want to make Gen Ed purposeful it would be better to avoid creating second year courses haphazardly. The reason USEM can work is because we have minimum course requirements in addition to the goals and proficiencies – the goals and proficiencies in and of themselves are not necessarily a shared experience across the prefix for a course. She wants us to purposely plan the minimum course requirements for the courses and then allow the innovative pedagogy to develop around a target that can be assessed. She’s all for a shared cohort, but feels the Houses are being too haphazard in setting their minimum course requirements (“Let’s just use University Seminar 100 level minimum course requirements for our second year House course.”) – that is not how you do curriculum design – curriculum design is developmental.

Ayers said that is something they are looking at and a subcommittee was formed, and when we look at the templates that are used to develop exploration and integration courses, it’s a start. But as we go into those, the foundational goals are expected to be present in all areas, sometimes that gets overlooked; but it will not be overlooked now. This will actually be the first time that we have oversight and policing. And we’re developing the assessment aspect through the subcommittee that will oversee not only Honors and Houses, but will go out and reach into the Explorations in E, F, G, H, I, and J beyond what we’re implementing right now. We’ve learned some lessons from “the skin of our noses” this year, and that will help us as we go into that second year.

Whitman said the reason why the prefix matters to her for University Studies, Curriculum Committee, and for Senate, is that Gen Ed is the only thing we do on campus that is a shared curriculum. And if we’re doing a shared curriculum that implies cooperation, rather than willy-nilly advancement of that curriculum. So in some ways the goals and proficiencies are excellent, but if you really want to develop that cohort and have those minimum course requirements, all of those courses will look different but they will have certain things in common – and we don’t know what those are. The goals and proficiencies aren’t enough to have in common, we already have those in common in GE, and yet it’s a mess.

Ayers: For what we have been allowed to do within the House model and what we’re prepared to move forward with, that larger conversation that you’re having right now needs to occur. It needs to occur with the Divisions and with the faculty on how we want to tighten up and what we want it to look like and the deliberateness we want to have. We do need to shake it up a little, tighten it down, and buckle it up. But the conversation about the House is different. As it stands right now the Houses fit into what we have been practicing, it doesn’t deviate. The only thing we accept from the House is they will implement every aspect of that template, we will let you pick and choose what’s primary or what to address. And we are watching and assessing it starting next year at the 200 level. The 100 level has been assessed for a long time here for USEM, this is a whole different ballgame now, and a whole new measurement next year that they will be walking into.

Sue Walsh, who has ‘traveled’ with the USEM curriculum for quite awhile, said that this is the most purposeful and intentional effort to align the learning objectives with the curriculum, especially at the 200 level, that she has seen in a decade. What will be interesting is when University Studies Committee does an audit of exploration courses and tries to align the learning objectives; which things ‘fall out’ because they don’t align; which things stay in because they do align. And this is just going to be an ongoing conversation over the next couple of years. She’s not sure that we can ‘do it all’, but rather in stages, is what they’re suggesting.

Ferguson said that because things have shifted we are trying to approve a proposal that’s outdated.

Carter asked if it would be possible to have an updated proposal for the next Senate meeting.

Karen Stone said an alternative to that would be to have a discussion on what the edits should be for those who want to approve it.

The biggest thing that Ayers is worried about right now is that we’re running out of time. This is something that people coming to this institution are excited about, and the more that we put up this wall, especially during this time that we’ve gone through so much stuff at this campus. If there’s a hook that going to bring them back next year, get them exposed to SOU and make some decisions for themselves, this is it. But the more we start and stop things, then the more difficult it is to get the interested students to commit.

Ferguson said she understood that, but is opposed to things being advertised before there’s discussion on what they actually are. She’s sorry it got advertised when it did, but that’s a separate issue. But to say we need to move forward just because we have students that are interested – we don’t even know what this is going to look like, we just have concepts -- pushes her the wrong way.

Carney asked Ayers if they have any statistics to support the large number of students who are interested in Houses. He understands the subjective enthusiasm but he would prefer it to be evidence based.

Ayers said in the website that advertised the Houses the students had the opportunity to say they wanted to participate in it. But as she understands it, students can’t do that now on the website because Faculty Senate said to stop allowing students to say they want to be a part of this. There have been local lists for students who were interested during Preview Days.

Sahr asked if we have the enrollment numbers for the Houses this year.

Ayers said she waits until week 4, she’s still seeing students moving around.

Whitman said the Green House has 32 students in two sections (and they started with 50).

Purslow made a motion to go into Executive Session, a second was made by Sahr.

The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

Adjourned 6:05 p.m.