

**EOU FACULTY SENATE**  
**DATE**  
**INLOW 201**

**Senators:**

Daysi Bedolla  
*Cori Brewster*  
 Shaun Cain  
 Joe Corsini  
*Ryan Dearinger*  
 Dwight Denman  
*Teresa Farrell*  
*Theresa Gillis*  
*Bill Grigsby*  
*Nicole Howard*  
*Nancy Knowles*  
*John Knudson-Martin*  
*Scott McConnell*  
*Lee Ann McNerney*  
*Michael O'Connor*  
*Brian Sather*  
*Michael Sell*  
*Emily Sharratt*  
*Amy Yielding*

**Guests:** Tom Insko, Sarah Witte, Lacy Carpillo, Heather Cashell, Colleen Dunne Cascio, David Vande Pol, Jeff Carman, Will Leinertz, Luke Aldrich, Jeff Dense, Kathleen Brown, Chris Burford, Dan Mielke, Donald Wolff, Doug Briney,

NK	Call to order	Meeting called to order 3:17 PM	
	Minute approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● NK moves to approve minutes from Jan</li> <li>● TG seconds</li> <li>● Motion carries, minutes approved</li> </ul>	
SW	Provost's Report	House Bill 4053 - measures articulation of accelerated credits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Moving quickly</li> <li>● Sticking point is data, universities gathering data</li> <li>● HECC needs alignment on "dual credit."</li> <li>● Sampling OR graduates and 1st-time freshman, rather than all graduates and 1st time freshman</li> <li>● Registrars are engaged and responsive to process</li> <li>● Important bill bc interactive with transfer committee work and HB 2998</li> </ul>	

David Vande Pol re: HB 2998

- sent NK curricula
- Last meeting issues surfaced
  - Writing and math
  - Whether foundational curricula contain two writing courses? Should technical writing count?
  - Should MATH 111 be included as recommended course?
  - Should cultural literacy be its own category?
- Recommendation is to break curricula into STEM and non-STEM. Have 30 credits transferable. But one credit would have 43 credits; if one is 43, but we only guarantee they only satisfy 30 credits GEN ED, are we building credit loss into this curricula?
- No official vote yet. Visit issues at next big meeting (2/19)
- CB - can you explain what they mean by “cultural literacy”?
- DVP - that’ll be part of discussion at next meeting.
- CB - how are they defining it roughly?
- DVP - I’m not sure
- CB - can you tell us where the idea came from?
- DVP - came from faculty, but not sure who brought it up?
- CB - are they trying to address issues of diversity, discrimination, and power? Or are they imagining cultural diversity as “cultural literacy.”
- D Mielke - At last legislative session there was another bill that went through regarding culturally responsive practices. I suppose this is an extension of that. Culturally responsive to what we do in our classrooms.

SW -

- CEAD Conference on 2/17. Register now, it’s a wonderful conference.

HB 2871

- Open educational resource bill
- Compliance built into it: identifying for students which courses are no-cost, low-cost, OER courses.
- According to EOU data, we don’t engage in OER very much. Barnes and Noble does collect data and send to legislature.
- In order to completely educate us, Core Beach (working with B&N) will come to colleges to talk about OERs. Brief demo for faculty, show them how to see OER offerings.
- Promised to expect more affordability bills, dual-credit bills, and more low-cost/no-cost ebook bills.
- *Chronicle* published report today about “adult students,” by Goldie Blumenstick. Angie will purchase and circulate copies.

Re: Pearson

- Conversations with Pearson re: underserved populations. Thanks to those participating in conversations with

		<p>PEarson. Process still ongoing. Decision in late-May. Faculty and Staff should continue to be engaged and informed about this opportunity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I hope conversations are productive. I hope we enter into conversations with sense of shared responsibility re: future of EOU, our enrollment base, and transfer student populations.</li> <li>• All of this is very timely. Listen, engage, and ask good questions.</li> <li>• Conversations will occur in Inlow as well as in colleges, so everyone who needs to be engaged is engaged.</li> </ul> <p>4th wk numbers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aiming 96% fall to winter</li> <li>• Today we are at 93.3%</li> <li>• Projected 73% freshmen retention rate in Fall 2018.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for your efforts on behalf of our students</p> <p>Academic Futures Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Productive meeting with OSU and OHSU, focused on partnership potential or strengthening existing partnerships</li> <li>• Notes from meeting will go to colleges for further discussion with deans. See where it moves us along track to find synergy with curriculum and leverage partnerships.</li> <li>• Let your deans know what you think of the brainstorm they bring to you.</li> <li>• Time to make a decision: is this something we need to go forward with?</li> </ul>	
Tom	Presidents report	<p>Bills EOU is involved in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bills to designate EOU as Oregon’s “rural university.” introduced by Greg Smith. Support from some legislators</li> <li>• New tuition bill may restrict avenues for revenue</li> <li>• Field house capital project \$9M, governor is supportive and house speaker is supportive as well. Partnered with UO and OSU on that.</li> <li>• Get in touch with Tom or Tim with questions.</li> <li>• TRUs contemplating RFPs for lobbyists. We have shared needs and we get lost with the bigs. TRUs may pool resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CB - Can you clarify what you imagine being designated “rural university” means, especially with growing online population?</li> <li>○ TI - embracing rural roots and what makes EOU special in that regard. Designation may help with getting grants, demonstrating state has acknowledged that rather than prove through documentation.</li> <li>○</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
NK	EPCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing removed from consent agenda</li> </ul>	

	consent agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CB moves to approve consent agenda</li> <li>● NH seconds</li> <li>● No discussion</li> <li>● Motion carries, agenda approved</li> </ul>	
	Memo of expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● JKM moves to approve resolution to memo of expectations</li> <li>● CB seconds</li> <li>● No discussion</li> <li>● Motion carries, resolution approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CB - two documents to approve, we only just approve response.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● JKM moves to approve FS response for supporting document</li> <li>● BG seconds</li> <li>● No discussion</li> <li>● Motion carries, FS response approved</li> </ul>	
Emily Sharratt	Registrar's items	<p>Academic Calendar revision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Start on third Wednesday in September <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adds Veterans Day holiday</li> </ul> </li> <li>● More teaching days cost EOU more and cost students in dorms more.</li> <li>● OSU partner program makes us align with OSU</li> <li>● All schools are trying to figure out schedules. EOU has calendar committee building 5-year schedules. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CB - were there lab classes that are affected by this?</li> <li>○ ES - since we take Weds, Thurs, Friday for Thanksgiving, beginning the term on Wednesday evens days out.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Attendance Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Course attendance and No-Show drop policy</li> <li>● 1st attempt, sitting as Academic Standards policy</li> <li>● Goes to policy committee next.</li> <li>● No-show drop piece involves financial aid</li> <li>● Registrar's office wants something in place. Currently no policy in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NK - re: attendance are we as an institution mandating attendance? Or just tracking?</li> <li>○ ES - this policy does not state mandate, but it's a start with "what do we want to do as an institution?"</li> <li>○ ES - it would make things easier in financial aid world if we did take attendance. Certain things paid out differently bc we don't take attendance.</li> <li>○ NK - if we mandate student attendance, then our students may have a reaction to being mandated. Students make choices about balancing lives. Pressure of mandate might be off putting. May</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

		<p>affect faculty as well, i.e., students who are required to be there, or are interested in being there. Mandate vs. tracking is important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BS - terminology is “expected.”</li> <li>○ NK - explanation required. Are we forcing students or “requiring” them to be there?</li> <li>○ ES - do we want it to say something like that?</li> <li>○ NH - I don't have a problem with that language (“expectation”). In section about “excused absences,” I tell my students that there’s no excused absence, there’s just absence. There are just reasons to be absent, and I don't like the idea about defining what’s ideal re: absence. I’d like to change that language.</li> <li>○ ES - currently we have process to work with students through absences. Do we want to put in the policy that they go through student affairs?</li> <li>○ CB - it will be difficult to make a universal policy, because content of class may change what it means to be in class. Academic Standards is a committee of the FS, so has Academic Standards approved this?</li> <li>○ ES - No.</li> <li>○ Burford - this should get a policy proposal form. Then PCC weighs in on where it goes in shared governance.</li> <li>○ SW - I can’t imagine our university would mandate student attendance. It’s really about tracking. Section in policy provides coverage for faculty who have more pointed policy re: attendance. If we don’t have a policy re: attendance, it leaves faculty without cover for grade penalties for attendance, for example.</li> <li>○ Colleen - Oftentimes students aren’t comfortable providing student services with documentation re: attendance. Major concern the way it’s written is that info provided by student might be very vague. NOTification to faculty is just notification; at no time am I asking for student to be excused.</li> <li>○ ES - excused absence is an absence where an instructor would allow makeup work when student is gone.</li> <li>○ NK - we might circulate the policy among faculty for feedback.</li> <li>○ JKM - as teachers we determine whether students need to be in class or not. The natural consequence for not attending can mean a bad grade. I’ve always monitored attendance. I’m concerned that we don’t need an attendance policy for entire university. As professionals, we</li> </ul>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>address that and I don't think it's broken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ES - there are a number of classes where a student isn't around and they have an admin withdrawal, so some students are taken out of classes with no penalty, and some students are left in class to fail.</li> <li>○ NK - how we handle no-shows is inequitable.</li> <li>○ CB - can we have a discussion to sort through how to deal with all of these things? Admin withdrawal is complicated process.</li> <li>○ SW - do you see how you could streamline or cleanup the admin withdrawal process?</li> <li>○ ES - process should be solely one where there's an issue with student and student is removed from class by instructor. Then we'd have some other policy on refunding that student. It shouldn't last through 7th week. Admin withdrawal needs to have a reason and codes need to be cleaned up.</li> <li>○ BG - would it make a difference if a class is near, at, or beyond cap?</li> </ul>	
<b>BREAK</b>	<b>BREAK</b>	<b>BREAK</b>	
NK	Legacy Policy Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No more OUS, so we're moving existing policies into new EOU policy legacy. Chris Burford is putting policies into chapters that make sense, and making access to policies possible.</li> <li>● Legacy policies are coming in clusters to PCC who separates them out and sends them to various committees.</li> <li>● Most legacy policies don't have substantive changes in language. In some cases multiple OUS policies are combined into one policy. Most changes involve "OUS," "Chancellor," etc.</li> <li>● EPCC has sent academic policies to FS. Look at them, have some discussion today, then bring them back to next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CB - if we have seen a policy that seems to be misrouted, what is process for addressing that? Ask wrong committee to reconsider?</li> <li>○ NK - I think we have power to talk about anything we choose, but I'm not the same as whole FS.</li> <li>○ C Burford - policy on policies acknowledges bodies to consider whatever they want, but we're trying to cut down on duplication.</li> <li>○ CB - example: Student Grievance Policy has some student affairs language that doesn't mention the Grievance Committee, but it's gone through the pipeline. Might be in conflict with</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

		<p>constitution and should be pulled back out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CB - re: academic freedom piece has language borrowed from AAUP statement 1940. Includes research, teaching, and public discourse. But OUS language (and contract language) eliminated language on research. AAUP does have more updated language. I wonder if this is the moment to look at that language rather than adopt something out-of-date.</li> <li>○ AY - we're just bookkeeping, but if there's a policy that comes up and we approve it, does that mean we think it's working just fine? Can we bring up issues?</li> <li>○ NK - Units are going through legacy policy process with little change, but then we come back to policies for changes. We're bringing into our new system so we can address it.</li> <li>○ CB - we will have a discussion of all of these pieces at the next meeting?</li> <li>○ NK - yes. As an action item. We can vote on it, discuss it, decide not to vote, etc.</li> </ul>	
nK	FOE statement	<p>Freedom of Expression Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What does FS want to do?</li> <li>● C Burford's plan was to have a committee, but FS didn't want that.</li> <li>● Do we want to start from scratch? Take draft and have discussion? Have subcommittee work on it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NH - this is a statement on guiding principles that FS endorses?</li> <li>○ NK - make something the U can point to if we have an instance where freedom of Expression is an issue. Indicates to public reasons why things might happen on campus re: use of freedom of expression. Indicate what we defend, what we support, etc.</li> <li>○ JKM - it doesn't seem useful to invent our own statement.</li> <li>○ NK - I'll bring draft back as an action item to next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Jeff Dense	CRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Openness and inclusiveness have guided the CRC.</li> <li>● Two key issues: FS reapportionment and UC reapportionment</li> <li>● CRC recognizes FS and UC authority to make amendments to constitution.</li> <li>● Time is of the essence, but I don't want to make any unintended mistakes. I urge you to carefully review this stuff but not micromanage recommendations without careful thought.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● NK - I need to see a redline draft, which we didnt' have for agenda today. My preference would be for FS to hold Feb 20th meeting date and comb through draft.</li> <li>● JKM - are changes in reline copy housekeeping changes or substantial content changes?</li> <li>● JD - there are a couple substantive changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Grievance committee should be tenured faculty</li> <li>○ Student affairs add additional member</li> <li>○ Question re; ex officio members of committee are non-voting</li> </ul> </li> <li>● JKM - going forward, separating housekeeping changes from substantial changes might serve us well. Substantial changes could go through vote. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If senate votes down substantial change (like Briney FS makeup change) does that make it not stand?</li> <li>○ JD - it wouldn't' make sense to vote it down. Amend statement instead? CRC is providing recommendations; you can change apportionment on committees, etc.</li> <li>○ JKM - is there a process for an individual to suggest a change to constitution?</li> <li>○ NK - the CRC has asked each committee to make a recommendation about its own structure. FS approving or not approving would be a statement on our own structure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● JD - upon reflection, there are no "housekeeping changes" within a constitution. This is an opportunity for UC and FS to work together for the betterment of the university</li> <li>● DB - this is not me as an individual bringing forth a proposal. I'm on the CRC and I brought a recommendation from my colleagues to the CRC. They were concerned with their voices being diminished, even as our colleges have grown.</li> <li>● NK - based on the straw poll we took at last meeting, what's why this language went into the draft constitution. Does meeting on the 20th sound better than trying to wedge it into a March meeting? We can approve draft as a whole, or vote in parts. My concern is not having seen a redline draft, so we have a discussion on the 20th, then come back to March meeting to actually vote.</li> <li>● SM - encourage FS to be considerate of work CRC and not micromanage the edits</li> <li>● JD - congrats to Angie Weisenfluh on 400th victory; she is undoubtedly one of the best teachers on campus.</li> </ul>	
	Committee update	<p>BOT Meetings - CB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CB - BG and I attended governance committee meeting. Some discussions about</li> </ul>	



	s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Board culture, concerns about bias, potential training about bias</li> <li>○ Timeline and process for evaluating president, ensuring FS president, ASEOU president, and UC chair get questions early enough while constituents are still on campus</li> <li>○ Recruiting new trustees and criteria</li> <li>○ Whether or not to buy trustees tablets rather than use paper</li> </ul> <p>IFS update - JKM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Listened to lots of conversations, no actions taken <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ HB 2998 - SW has committee working on these issues. Discussions indicate this is a big issue for all universities. Legislature wants us to make curriculum and majors uniform across the state. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Legislation expects us to have uniform Gen Ed requirements and major requirements. It's going to be very difficult.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Course evals - discussed whether or not student evals predicted student success going forward. Research found no correlation between students liking classes and subsequent success afterwards.</li> <li>○ Dual Credit - 11 different ways high schools offer college credit. Students go to campuses, HS teachers provide college credit classes, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Various committees - NK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Compiling list of committees not described in constitution</li> </ul>	
nK	Pearson Contract	<p>NK - I'd like to have a robust conversation about this, how to handle it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CB - I'm profoundly concerned that something so sweeping was kept from us until just two weeks ago, with noting that decision can be made as soon as May. Looking at ways in which faculty have been consulted re: RFPs in the past vs this one is problematic. At other U's faculty advisory councils have been involved at the beginnings of their processes. I'm wondering if FS might appoint ad-hoc committee to curate info and immediately request back information we should have access to from the outset.</li> <li>● MS - next meeting just about CRC/constitution and Pearson only? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NK - yes</li> </ul> </li> <li>● SW - I'm curious how this conversation was framed re: contract? We don't have a contract with Pearson.</li> <li>● NK - we're not talking about a contract, just a potential contract.</li> <li>● NK - I can put together a list of documents before next</li> </ul>	

		<p>meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● BS - is there another ad-hoc committee already researching this? And they can bring their information to FS to present?</li><li>● CB - we can't wait. We're talking about a potential 10-year contract. Most important thing is FS has expectation that all information be shared with us.</li><li>● TI - FS can choose to do what they want. There are going to be ongoing conversations within all colleges with this process. It will be transparent, and we do want feedback from everyone. It's broader than just a conversation with faculty; impacts all elements of EOU. I'd caution everyone to determine what is fact and what is interpretation. We don't know what our potential contract may look like. They are usually a longer duration (7-10 yrs). Many of the comments I've heard so far are speculative. I'm making sure there are things I haven't missed.</li><li>● NH - Some of the angst is that it feels upsetting that someone made a decision in August that an OPM was the way to go. In the array of things to do, someone chose that path instead of talking to other people. Not only was that path chosen, but it was walked down with an RFP, with a tight deadline. We're not told about it until January. As a faculty member it looks like you didn't want us to know because we wouldn't like it. It looks like it hasn't been transparent so far, so it feels like it won't be transparent going forward. It's shocking. It feels like I got taken. It's hard to feel like process doesn't have some momentum we can do nothing about. I'm not saying we shouldn't use an OPM, but we certainly haven't been part of this conversation, and this will dramatically change the face of EOU.</li><li>● JKM - I agree with Nicole. This doesn't feel transparent because we were not involved. It seems like there was a lot of process before that that faculty had no input on. It's understanding to not be trusting of the process going forward.</li><li>● AY - It's not the future contract it's what has been decided on already. We had more say in the food contract on campus or the bookstore, both recent things that we had lots of involvement in. This process impacts us more, and none of us was involved in the initial decision. It feels like something we're going to have to do.</li><li>● NK - in the interest of time, I'd like to save this conversation until next meeting.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ CB moves to form an ad-hoc subcommittee to collect all of the available information for faculty to weigh in on this issue</li><li>○ JKM seconds</li><li>○ AY - would it mean the committee reports to next</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BG - I think it would be useful, especially with annotations</li> <li>○ JKM - this issue will gobble up whatever time we give it. I recommend scheduling another meeting where community can weigh in, separate from what administration is presenting us with single choice we have.</li> <li>○ SM - re: committee, since it's a big deal, it would be a good idea for sub-committee to meet with consult with administration to double check information, to ensure no misconceptions are brought forth.</li> <li>○ NK - 2/20 meeting will focus on constitution alone.</li> <li>○ BS - Pearson issue is more pressing so should be given priority if ad-hoc committee has time for material for 2/20</li> <li>○ NK - assuming time left at 2/20- meeting Pearson ad-hoc committee will present and discuss</li> <li>○ Motion carries, committee approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ CB agrees to join committee</li> <li>■ JKM agrees to join committee</li> <li>■ FS will invite additional interested parties</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
NK	adjournment	Meeting adjourned 5:15	

*Minutes prepared by Michael Sell, 2/6/18*

*Minutes finalized by Michael Sell 2/26/18*