

EOU FACULTY SENATE
3/6/18
INLOW 201

Senators:

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

Guests: Raette Newman, Sarah Witte, Lacy Carpillo, Nate Lowel, Peter Giesinger, Chris Burford, Dan Mielke, Luke Aldrich, Sarah Ralston, Angie Adams, Allan Evans, Peter Geisinger, Will Lehnertz, Chris Burford,

	Call to Order	Meeting called to order at 3:22	
	Agenda Review	No call for changes	
	Minutes Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NH moves to approve ● JKM seconds ● No discussion ● Minutes approved, one abstention 	
	Provost Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Legislative session is over ● Provost Council has been dominated by HB discussion ● Sarah asking what FS wants to know about for remainder of year ● 	

	<p>EPCC Consent Agenda</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SC moves to approve consent agenda ● SM seconds ● No discussion ● Consent agenda approved unanimously 	
	<p>Academic Freedom Policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CB moves to approve Academic Freedom language from CBA ● NH seconds ● C Burford: Legacy policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What we said with all these policies with each shared governance committee, we mark places for discussion later. Just trying to get them all into the same compendium at this moment. ○ Distinctions between OAR (U policy) and CBA are small, but I suggest that rather than making substantive changes, we simply move ahead with status quo with this as U policy, and have discussion of how to bring language into line with CBA, U policies, and former OARs at later occasion. It's a bigger conversation that will encompass more policies than just this one. ○ CB - Confirming with SC that CBA language supersedes other language. ○ SC - there doesn't seem to be any logical reason to postpone this specific vote. ○ Burford - OARs, as law of State of Oregon, does trump CBA language. That's been true always. ○ SW - Doug Briney was on Academic Affairs division dealing with legacy policies. When we got to OARs pertaining to CBA, we had a discussion about whether OAR policies be brought in or not, there was consensus that anything in CBA that referenced an OAR still had to be backed by U policy. There would have to be U policy on Academic Freedom that backs and ties it to CBA. I would propose that we're trying to be consistent in how the committee regarded the CBA and the need for there to be policies that back the CBA. ○ SM - I would disagree a little bit. There isn't a reason to have them differ. ○ SW - there's a need to have a U policy. This isn't the meeting to change it and make them align, this is just to bring it in and change it later. ○ SM - A lot of discussion about CBA language, and not sure if this is appropriate time to change the language later. ○ SC - OARs said this is what you need to include, and we include CBA language, why keep delaying the process? Let's just get it done. No reason to try to open up and change what's in eh CBA 	

		<p>outside of bargaining.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ JKM - I've looked at both policies, and it doesn't seem like there's anything in the CBA policy that's controversial. Our colleagues in the union have spent enough time looking at this and it seems appropriate. We should go forward and endorse this.○ Burford - There's a larger set of academic policies that overlap with CBA. We'll present a chart next meeting that outlines differences. CBA refers to specific OARs, in other instances CBA repeats portions and not entire OAR. Language of the CBA and former OARs is a bigger question than just this one. It's part of the reason we deal with housekeeping now and have fuller discussion in context in due time.○ NK - There have been policies coming through PCC that have been blended with existing policy language. This is another instance of a more recent document that is nearly the same. Some other units have made changes and we're not just moving policies in.○ CB - Uncomfortable asking FS to approve language that is in conflict with CBA. We have an opportunity to be consistent here, so we should do that.○ Burford - In the case of things coming under legacy policy project, they come in three categories: put in consistent format, and obsolete references get replaced; obsolete provisions are marked as "proposed for deletion," and when there are redundant things (appearing in U policies and OARs) we attempt to consolidate them if it can be done without invoking a lot of controversy. This is what Nancy might be referring to.○ NK - I've seen policies come through that don't fit the categories we've talked about. IT and registrars office have done this? I don't know that we're waiting in all cases, especially where it's been obvious that we need to be current.○ SW - Is this the format it's supposed to be in?○ Burford - Volume 6 is more general category.○ Burford - When we've had things go beyond the scope of the Legacy Policy, we have flagged that and tried to account for that, we've taken the opportunity to move ahead. When it comes to CBA and OARs and larger context, that's likely to be as controversial as anything involved in the project.	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NK - Except that management and Union have agreed on CBA. ○ Burford - CBA language discussed We agreed to CBA language knowing that we had OAR language as a backstop. CBA isn't the ○ Burford - The existence of this OAR was certainly not conceded. ○ JKM - It seems that we've had a discussion on this item and it seems a relatively straightforward that adoption of CBA language is on the table. ○ Motion carries 	
	Academic Affairs Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NH moves to approve ● BS seconds ● No Discussion ● Motion carries 	
	Freedom of Expression Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● JKM moves to approve ● NH seconds ● No discussion ● Motion carries, 	
	Constitution Draft Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Three things to approve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FS apportionment ○ Fixed-term FS apportionment ○ Draft itself <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ NK met with Jeff Carman and Tom Inkso and Sarah to discussion changes outside of the scope of CRC ■ President concerned with language outside discussion was something he wanted more time to talk about with FS and be involved in. Also had more materials he would like opportunity to discuss. ■ We need to get apportionment piece done so we have elections in spring. ■ Anyone can propose changes to constitution and move it through the process. We can take CRC version and vote on it today saying we recommend this, and then it goes through the rest of the process (vote, approval, etc.). ■ Consider what FS would like to do if we approve as a whole and UC doesn't agree. Are we ok with apportionment going forward without other pieces. Or if UC comes with other draft, are we comfortable 	

		<p>going forward with that draft?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BS - will UC have to approve our apportionment? ○ NK - Constituent bodies in constitution are putting forward their own ideas about apportionment. As FS we would assume our voice carries weight with regards to our own apportionment. Other groups could object to FS apportionment as we move through the process. ○ CB - To clarify: UC or FS can start the clock, but one body has to vote on a draft, and if it passes with 50%, the other body has to approve at 50% or better. It's not the case that we'd vote and approve a draft here and UC would vote on a different draft. They'd have to vote our draft down and vote on a different draft. ○ NK - suppose UC is ok with our apportionment and that's the part they pass and they don't pass anything else we approve. What action would we like to take in that case? ○ JKM - It's clear to vote on apportionment. Are there controversial issues in other changes that we can't vote affirmatively on at this meeting? ○ NK - I haven't heard any discussion of the content of those changes. ○ JKM - I propose we vote on apportionment and vote on other changes to constitution and send to UC. That would be more efficient. ○ NK - FS apportionment that we're voting on will go forward to UC. I assume UC will support us in our view of our apportionment. What is more of an issue is whole apportionment of all committees, all changes we've made to committee structure as a result of CRC work. We may not want to slow that down. ○ SW - Articles 4 and 5 of constitution. ○ NK - There has not been broader conversation about other language. We can vote and approve it, saying we like it, and it could pass through process. If it stalls out, do we want it to come back to us? ○ CB - I think we should follow the process. I don't like the idea of setting precedent of modifying draft that has different portions in different stages of approval. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ JKM moves to approve apportionment vote ■ SC seconds ■ SC - Our college sent out a survey of 5 possibilities, 13 responses. No votes for 5-5-5. 5 votes for 4-4-4-4 and 4-4-3-3. 2 votes for 5-5-3-3. And one vote for 4-4-3- 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>3+2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 15 votes ■ 4-4-3-3 receives top vote (3.64 weighted average) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 2nd: 4-4-4-4 (3.23) ● 3rd: 4-4-3-3+2 (3.21) ● 4th: 5-5-3-3 (3.17) ● 5th: 5-5-5-5 (1.58) ■ Fixed term senator: 80% yes, 20% no <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - We don't have language about how that fixed-term senator will be elected. We need something in the draft for something like that. I'll put in language that f-t should be selected by the vote of the whole faculty. ○ NH moves to approved updated draft of EOU Constitution ○ JKM seconds ○ No discussion ○ Motion carries 	
	<p>PCC Discussion Item</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If we do meet on March 20, it'll be for curriculum and/or constitution. ● CB - Attendance and no-show policy will go to PCC and then Academic Standards? ● NK - PCC gave it to us. Would you prefer it go to Academic Standards first? ● Cb - This is an academic policy so it should go to Acadm. Standards first ● CB - These are not the ones that went to EPCC. And none of these have gone to academic standards? ● NK - We're getting a feel for how policies should move, partly because these have already existed in the catalog. ● SW - Did these come to FS from the PCC? Is there a reason the PCC wouldn't have sent them to the appropriate governance committee? ● NK - We just knew they should come to the faculty side of things. If we decide, they should go to Acadm. Standards first? ● Burford - This is administrative and there were no changes to the language. ● BS - It's just the highlights that are changes? It all looks minor. ● CB - There isn't a consequence to giving Acad Stds a change to look them over? Since Acad Stds is a committee of the senate, can you email the chair and let them know that if they want to weigh in they should let us know? 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - I will. If they decide they're good with this it will come back to us in April. 	
Allen Evans	FPC Handbook Revision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Three documents linked to agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clean revised handbook document ○ 1-page summary, outlining changes (housekeeping, new policies, revisions, etc.) ○ Email to FS president, detailing rationale ● Work begun a year ago with 2016-17 FPC and it came back to us this year for final work, cleanup. ● FPC spent fall term in weekly meetings going through handbook line by line to get it as clean as it can get. ● We haven't done anything else with it since early part of Jan. ● Our recommendation is that FS approve entire package. FPC wants to impress upon FS the need for making a decision by April meeting. Our policies re: changes to personnel handbook indicate that any changes be made by May 1 if they're going to be effective the following year. FS needs to act on this in April FS meeting. FS has a month to look at it and think about it. ● AE - I would encourage FS to look at document as a whole. Many sections are just cleaned up, but it would be better looking at entire document, asking "does this make sense?" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Areas that need discussion are areas involving Library Faculty, which needed change to reflect diversity of what Library Faculty do. Language needed to be more current. Library thinks this is a good piece. ○ Adjunct and online adjunct faculty piece is also important. We took language/process dean's have asked us to use to evaluate online adjunct faculty and applied it to the handbook. ○ SC - We really need to get this done. There are people going up for promotion and the need to have guidance on what to do. This is going to help FPC and CPCs job because they'll have something to look at. ○ JKM - I know the FPC has provided the refinements, but did the union participate in this? Has union approved this? ○ SC - Language in handbook agree with contract, and this is just moving it into handbook. ○ AE - Major driving force behind revision was that old version didn't address elements in CBA, or addressed it in contradictory way. This aligns handbook with CBA. We did not change any criteria related to disciplinary-specific benchmarks. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CB - Question about line 428, changing “teaching excellence” to “best instructional practices.” ■ AE - I don't have a recollection of that change. ■ CB - Language “best instructional practices” sounds like there's a place where you can look that up. ■ JKM - New language is more to the point. ■ AE - “Excellence” is more subjective. Colleagues on CPC can look at “best practices” and know more what they're talking about. ■ NK - Concern might be that research associated with “best practices” is ongoing. We might claim best practice based on one part of research and not another. ■ SW - Excellence is a nebulous abstraction. “Best practices” allows for more concreteness and allows for an evolution over time. ■ CB - This is about commitment to something. I don't have any trouble in evaluating anyone's commitment to being a good teacher. It's different to say you're only committed to doing the best things, because it implies those things can be located or defined. 	
NK	Old Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Call attention to upcoming set of BOT committee meetings March 14. No access for online access. Google Doc is up and you can sign up to attend the sessions. We'll have a report out at next meetings. ● BOT meeting April 12th. We can talk about whether FS wants to bring anything to attention to the BOT in public comment period. ● BG - ad hoc committee on evals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We're coming up on Week 10, so we're encouraging faculty to promote students to respond. ○ We want to encourage people to complete survey rather than decline altogether. ○ Response rates were up Fall term. Faculty should make students aware of evals. ○ Group suggests drawing or award. \$500 scholarship? If someone would pay for it? ○ Or token incentive like gift certificate somewhere. ● NK - HB 2998 re: transfers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DVP came to EPCC meeting with documents. 	

		<p>Does FS want to talk further about them?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Foundational curriculum is 30cr package across Oregon. ○ There is an expectation that a student transferring in with two course in same discipline will complete minimum 6 credits in GEC area. ○ ES - Foundational curriculum will come into EOU and satisfy 30 credits of EOU course. We decide what happens to other 30 credits. Committee will work on what those other 30 credits will look like. We can require additional gen ed. It is up to us. There will be lots of discussion. ○ NK - Transfer committee will come to FS once they hash it out? ○ ES - Yes. ○ Cb - How are they defining cultural literacy? ○ ES - They do not know. There are courses that meet cultural literacy at community college that do not meet DPD requirements here. Different institutional requirement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - Sub-committee on draft MOE is continuing to meet and will come back soon with info. 	
	OPM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CB - I take full responsibility for committee being behind. ● We requested information and questions by email, what all members are ● Google Doc bibliography is open for submission, and I will move listed documents over. ● BG - One thing we can do is lay out a list of categories of things we want to consider. People who submit could include a summary to help categorize. ● NK - Document linked to agenda wasn't fully public. I'll download it, turn it to a PDF and put it back up for folks to see. Committee has moved beyond this document. 	
	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SC - Congratulate chemistry faculty, taking a big load of students to national conference. Great place for students to network, interact with MS and PhD advisors. Faculty do a lot of work so it happens every year. ● CB - It's been an exciting past couple of weeks hearing from students who are getting into grad school. Is there a place to send that so community hears about it and not just departments? ● Jeff Carman - Tech Expo is March 14th. 225 HS students from around region will be here on campus. 	
	Good of the order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - Saturday is student writer's workshop. 180 kids expected on campus. 	

		Meeting adjourned 4:52	
--	--	------------------------	--

Minutes prepared by Michael Sell, 3/6/18

Minutes finalized by Michael Sell 3/28/18

KEY

Motions + Seconds

Motion passes/Vote approval

Motion rejected/Vote failed

Changes or notifications