

**EOU FACULTY SENATE
DATE
INLOW 201**

Senators:

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

Guests: Sarah Witte, Chris Burford, Dan Mielke, Jeff Dense, Lacy Karpilo, Jeff Carman, Allen Evans, Luke Aldrich, Donald Wolff, Chris McLaughlin, Nate Lowe,

| | | | |
|----|----------------|---|--|
| NK | Call to order | Call to order at 3:21 (9 present; no quorum. Quorum obtained appx. 3:40) | |
| SW | Provost Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● HECC lifts conditions for EOU and SOU ● Biennial evaluation from here on out ● 1st draft of accreditation report coming soon for input. Rolling out the 19th ● Expecting final draft by mid-July, with a stop at Faculty Senate ● Thanks for producing 2-year schedule for registrar's office. Helps planning students life cycle, create enrollment pipeline and pathways. ● Academic Standards committee - winter to spring biggest return for students on probation or suspension, creating | |

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>action plans with advisors and going before hearing committee. 50% completed plans. Usually much lower.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Winter to spring retention 87%, expected to end in the high-60s going into fall. ● Pre-registration for fall coming soon. Student affairs assisting with registration blitz. 3 months where students aren't registering for classes. ● We want to push that as many students as possible who are returning are signed up for fall classes. This helps predict factors for fall. ● House Bill for open educational resources, deadline looming for grants available through HECC. Through Library Open Stacks or through bookstore. Deadline April 27th. ● Retention, tenure and promotion: looking at language today, FPC handbook. Thanks to the committee and FS diligence looking through documents and aligning them across campus. ● Provost will go back to COBE to talk about pros and cons of hiring two deans going forward. Dan Mielke will retire in June 2019. Will come to FS asking for faculty to serve on committees (either one search or two). | |
| nK | Academic Quality Statement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Donald Wolff: Seeking approval of EOU statement on academic quality. ● Most universities are drafting statements like this. ● Statement is aligned with Strategic Plan Goal 2: Transformational Education. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Authored by CTLA advisory board (composed of faculty), defines academic quality; inputs, outputs, and processes for transformational education. ○ Commits EOU to supporting scholarship of teaching and learning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student interactions, classroom diversity and engagement, effective pedagogies, etc. ● Advocates scholarship and learning in tenure review process. Looking for FPC to begin investigating this next year. ● List of traditional best practices ● ES moves to approve ● JKM seconds ● CB - concerns on Page 7. Discussed at CASSH meeting | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>that these are things faculty “should” be doing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DW - We took “should” out ○ CB - Recommended changing language to “Generic best practices <i>may</i> include.” Especially concerned with bullets 2, 5, 6 that mention Canvas. We wouldn’t want to name a particular company’s name in a document that might outlive our contract with Canvas. ○ CB - Best practices as recommendations? Or practices that we use to evaluate faculty performance? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ DW - separate from Tenure/Personnel review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CB - Concerns on page 6: Characterization of faculty that ignores the antagonist. “Inhibit employing...” The context is leaving out one of the actors in the context. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DW - The whole undertaking is that there can be a retreat from willingness on the part of faculty. This is a supportive and facilitative environment. This isn’t part of the personnel/review process. ○ CB - Institutionalizing language that may paint faculty as resistant to change. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ DW - in this document, faculty are being protected. ● SM - Using NSSE data, some students would prefer to not have meaningful interactions with faculty. They might report that they didn’t have those kinds of interactions; it can be misleading data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DW - If it stood alone, yes. We happen to do well on that, but on interactive pedagogy, we have work to do. These questions are part of our strategic plan, in core theme 1. ● SC - Yes you can look at data, but any time you ask students their opinion, that’s what you’re testing. I don’t think we should put so much emphasis on how students perceive their education, not what they get out of their education. ● SC - What you’re measuring is students’ perception. It’s a poor predictor of the quality of the education they receive. Using “Best Practices” might work well, but is it telling you anything about the effective education of the student? It’s important not just surveys are used to implement policies about how we do our work. ● SW - We have to acknowledge this is not a direct assessment. While there isn’t a direct correlation between their perceptions and their education, there is something there that can influence what we do next time. If they don’t align, there might be a communication problem. It’s important students know you’re employing interactive strategies. | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|----|------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SM - It's like working out or getting stronger. You don't see it happening, but you go to lift something and it's easier. Students taking survey may not appreciate their education until years later. ● NK - That's true with material that is challenging to their beliefs. They may never appreciate that, but it doesn't mean we never do it. ● SM - If we ask students at age 30 about this, it might be more helpful. ● BG - We hear that from alumni all the time. ● DW - These are the measures we're currently using for the Strategic Plan. If after this year we choose to change that evaluative methodology, we can. But we ● CB - Things get misapplied more rigidly the further you get away from people with expertise on the material you're evaluating. There are a whole lot of ways to do things well. <p>● Motion carries, one nay, one abstention</p> | |
| NK | FPC handbook revisions | <p>2 things going on here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Library changes ● Subcommittee material <p>Subcommittee material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● JKM - Are we able to consider the other three issues here? ● NK - We dealt with housekeeping at last meeting, deferring library discussion to this meeting. We named a subcommittee to work on the third part. ● SC - There were revisions discussed re: online adjunct evaluation. Evaluation process for online adjunct is useful to the adjuncts as well as EOU. Proper evaluation will help online adjuncts in their careers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If we remove these evaluations, it's not good for departments because we won't know if program outcomes are being met. ○ The point is to keep this as a simple task. ○ Faculty simply need to provide access to evaluator to their course shell. ● SC - If someone is teaching for 3 years, they have to submit a portfolio. They should have a process similar to fixed-term faculty, so we should review them a similar way. The problem with online adjuncts is that they may only teach once a year for three years and then have to make a portfolio. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Change to submitting a portfolio once they've taught 3.0 FTE. Following this benchmark, it helps EOU determine whether these courses need to be taught adjunct or if another tenure line should be | |

| | | | |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| | | <p>added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CB - Did you talk about fixed-term, part-time instructors? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SC - No, they're handled under contract. We were only addressing adjunct evals. ○ CB - Line about Canvas implies a University-wide consistent structure in Canvas and we don't. ○ SC - We're open to changes. ● SW - Page 2: Stating 3-year repeating course should evaluate to determine if a TT line for the position is necessary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SW - You're stating this as a fact when it's not. ○ SC - It's stated in the contract. ○ SW - But online adjuncts aren't recognized by eht contract. ○ SC - The contract doesn't say fixed-term or anything. It just says that if there is a position that exists for 3 years, however you choose to fill it, it needs to be reviewed. ○ SW - I'm just raising the issue that this isn't a true statement. We shouldn't confuse review with anything in the CBA. ○ SC - This is rationale behind it, not the wording for the handbook. If a position is filled for three years without a tenure line, I would hope admin would look at that position for evaluation. ● JKM - You said online adjuncts need to be evaluated in their department. That seems to put faculty in a position of making a personnel decision. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SC - We constantly evaluate each other. We're not making hiring or salary decisions, this is just an evaluation process. This is just best practices for evaluating one another. ○ SW - I support that as long as it's in the context of making a recommendation to the deans. ● SC - Subcommittee will bring another updated revision to FS and we eventually send it to FPC. ● NK - I suppose we don't need to take action on this today. <p>Changes to Library Language in FPC Handbook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - There's overlap between FPC handbook and constitution, so it's waiting on this language. ● CB - Moves to approve ● TG - seconds ● Motion carried unanimously | |
| | HR Policies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Allen Evans - We have some suggestions where language should be tweaked, but nothing significant. ● NK - Most of the policies could go on a consent agenda. Some concerns: | |

| | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5.10.20 Tenure and promotion policy has language issues to discuss. Is it ok for the policy to list more appointments than the CBA lists? Does the policy map on to CBA? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CB - Discussion earlier this year: what takes precedence? We've thought CBA takes precedence, but we've heard otherwise since then. We need to ensure they are equal. If we're honoring that the contract supersedes these things, that's different. ■ Burford - I have done more inquiry on this and I'm waiting for a work product. The policies as they existed (on June 30) had the effect of law and they still do. They supersede the CBA. I'm not asking this body or expecting EOU to rely on that as final word. We really need to know. ○ 5.10.5 Would like to review in-depth ● AE - We noticed that as FPC looked at personnel things we noticed same things. OAR language is broad statewide things, but we don't do some of those things here. Do we need these policies if we don't do it here? If we want them for future use, we could use them, but we could narrow it down. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Burford - What we're trying to do is get them all in one codification and potential changes are open for discussion. Some cases are urgent enough to make changes now, but just because something is deferred, it doesn't mean it's deferred forever. | |
| STRETCH | STRETCH | STRETCH | |
| nK | Constitution Review Committee | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Thanks to CRC for work on Constitution revisions ● Thanks to Chris Burford for work on additional changes ● UC has decided to come to us and meet jointly on May 1, come to shared resolution on Cons draft <p>Overview from Jeff Dense</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● At the behest of President Insko, he asked for representation and Chris Burford and Danny Mielke joined to help. ● Big thing re: shared governance committees, FS and UC, we asked those committees what they wanted their representation to be. We had committees vote, necessitated by change in structure in academic affairs. ● Preamble is a recognition of all the shareholder groups and that BOT has ultimate authority. ● One sticking point was ad hoc committee language. | |

| | | | |
|----|--------------|--|--|
| | | <p>There is a consultative function to avoid duplication of efforts across committees. President doesn't have to get approval to form an ad hoc committee or task force committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Made sure we had ample communication, whether it's through ad hoc committees, or president meeting with shared gov committees (FS, UC, or ASEOU, etc.). ● What happens in the summer when the president has to take action right away? UC chair and FS president can act on behalf of the faculty. Potential release time for FS president or stipend. These things aren't in document. ● Don't micromanage this thing. Given how much time we have left and the work we have to do re: elections, etc., we worked hard to get the language right. Trust me on this thing. ● Burford - I appreciate the spirit with which the committee addressed the work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern with Article 5, section 11: setting finite lifespan of less than one year on ad hoc committees. President wishes to change that. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ NK - Many ad hoc committees need to last longer than a year. Maybe some long-term committees (like Spring Symposium Steering Committee) should become permanent? ■ CB - Concern isn't length of time ad hoc committees serve, but the transparency and open communication between these committees, and how people are elected to ad hoc committees. ○ Concern with Article 4, section 2: describes makeup of UC, addresses administration as a subsection of employees. Article 2: addresses electorate without mention of administration (mentions administrative faculty). Article 9: vote required for passage comes from UC. ○ Committee didn't have time to talk about these issues. ● JD - These are a set of recommendations, which UC and FS can do what they want. ● CB - Send info or Google Form re: May 1st joint meeting to campus wide. | |
| nK | Old Business | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK reported to BOT, report online ● UC will vote on email use policy and Telework policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern of faculty over email use policy re: intellectual property. Proposed language change have nothing to do with intellectual property or faculty. But we are also working on I.P. policy. | |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Changes being made may not seem relevant to this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CB - I wonder if solution in meantime is to edit email use policy to exclude faculty. We have expectations of how email works on campus, but they're not reflected in that document. If there's a need to get existing policy done for some reason ○ JC - Purpose of revision is to address inactive students. Want it passed to get inactive student issue resolved. ○ McLaughlin - For a group to try to exclude themselves from a policy doesn't make sense. Excusing faculty from policies that have been around for a while could cause a problem. ○ CB - We wonder where policies come from. Whether existing policies were vetted by people they apply to is a good question. There are clear norms that revolve around faculty and electronic communication. There is a lot of work to do to bring it up to standard. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - MOE conversation is ongoing ● NK - OPE conversation is ongoing ● BG - We're still waiting on the president (asked at two other meetings) to find out how we got into this process. We'd like to know when we expect a response from the president so that we can provide input. ● CB - OPE subcommittee is presenting to UC next week. Need information | |
| | Good of the order | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PTO sponsoring art auction at Central Elementary April 19th ● Book sale April 27th, 28th ● Arts for All Saturday 10-2 | |
| NK | Adjourn | Meeting adjourned 5:01 PM | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

*Minutes prepared by Michael Sell,
Minutes finalized by Michael Sell*