Faculty Senate Minutes

May 14, 2019

**RWEC 101, RWEC**

*Primarily paperless, wou.edu/facultysenate*

#  **3:15 - 3:30 p.m.**

*Better Know a Colleague (informal gathering, optional)*

#  **3:30 - 5:00 p.m.**

*Business Meeting*

## **1. Call to order: 3:30pm**

## **2. Call of the roll (by circulation of sign-in sheet)**

## **3. Corrections to and approval of minutes from previous meeting**

### **3.1. 2019-04-23 Meeting**

* One revision made prior to meeting re. Honors presentation
* Otherwise, approved as posted

## **4. Institutional Reports**

### **4.1. Faculty Senate President’s Report (Adele Schepige)**

* Report on Faculty Senate website
* Prior nominations for senators-at-large with consent given by nominees
	+ Emily Vala-Haynes
	+ Leanne Merrill
	+ Leigh Graziano
* No self-nominations from the floor. Elections will be at next meeting.

### **4.2. University President’s Report (Rex Fuller)**

* President Fuller at TRU day in Salem.

### **4.3. Office of Academic Affairs’ Report (Rob Winningham)**

* Report on Faculty Senate website, including updates on ORS 352.011, graduate conditional admittance policy, and a degree partnership between WOU and Linn-Benton Community College. This is WOU’s fourth degree partnership.

### **4.4. IFS Report (Thaddeus Shannon, Erin Baumgartner)**

* OTAC update: completed major transfer maps. Next year there will be Criminal Justice and Computer Science.

### **4.5. General Education Committee Report (Erin Baumgartner)**

* Adding math and writing criteria to the General Education framework. Report available on Faculty Senate/GenEd websites.
* **Question:** Do we have to vote on these, are they a change to the Gen Ed program?
	+ Do we vote on course criteria for other programs? The Gen Ed program is also a bit different from other course criteria, so it’s unclear whether this is necessary. The Gen Ed committee feels that because their committee is representative and faculty from all divisions, and a division meeting was held between meetings of the committee, that is sufficient.
	+ **Comment:** Committees are advisory to the senate.
	+ **Question**: Is this a recommendation from the Gen Ed committee, or is it more official?
	+ **Comment**: Since there is not a new category being added, but just clarified it might not be needed. Honors program updates its courses that populate a specific category each year without ever asking for Faculty Senate approval.
* **Question:** How are the content criteria being used? Are they being used for anything beyond what’s written on the document?
	+ - At this time, writing and math are not open to new course proposals. We would definitely have to come back to senate to add these open fields with these criteria because it would be a major change to the framework.
* **Comment from Erin Baumgartner:** Because Gen Ed is new, this is a question we need to consider more thoroughly. There would not be a problem bringing this back to senate for a vote, if that is what the senate would like.
* **Comment from Adele:** the executive committee could meet to determine this.

## **5. Consideration of Old Business**

### **5.1. Committee on Committees Proposal (Stewart Baker)**

* Amendment and report available on Faculty Senate Website
* **Question:** How is the website updated now?
	+ Currently, the only language in the bylaws about the website states that the president maintains the webpage or their designee. Our proposed amendment would clarify how non-routine changes to the webpage are handled, and who has the responsibility to do so.
* **Question:** It seems you’re suggesting that significant changes would only need executive committee approval. We have in the past had some contentious discussions about website changes, and those needed discussion at faculty senate to give people an opportunity to weigh in.
	+ Right now, one person has complete control over the website, we were suggesting widening it to the executive committee for a larger pool but I don’t think we need the whole faculty senate to vote on the website but I imagine if the change is big, the exec committee would bring it to senate.
* **Question:** What was the rationale for dissolving ARC? I wonder about the capacity of ad hoc committees’ communication, and the selection for committee members for them, as well as how they are held accountable for communication between the divisions. Are they held to the same level as current committees?
	+ It has pretty much already been dissolved, de facto. In the previous years it seems that the ARC has not much to do or anything to do, in part because other parts of their charge have been moved to other committees or groups on campus. As a result, division representatives don’t always attend the meetings. We discussed this with members of ARC and the chair, and they also thought the committee should be dissolved. Ad Hoc committees could bring more passionate and knowledgeable members to work on specific issues.
	+ Ad Hoc committees also don’t make decisions on their own, but bring decisions back to the full senate to be approved.
* Motion to approve all the non bylaw changes
	+ Seconded
	+ Yes - 21
	+ No - 0
	+ **Motion Passes**
* Motion to approve all the bylaw changes in the original proposal
	+ Seconded
	+ Yes - 18
	+ No - 2
	+ **Motion passes**
* Friendly amendment to amendment bylaws change: At end of line, add: “Executive Committee will bring substantive changes to the website to the Faculty Senate for approval.”
* Motion to approve the amendment bylaws change re. the faculty senate website as amended
	+ Seconded
	+ Yes - 21
	+ No - 0
	+ **Motion Passes**

### **5.2. WICHE Proposal (Patty Flatt, Erin Baumgartner)**

* Available on Faculty Senate website
* Motion to approve
	+ Seconded
	+ Yes - 23
	+ No - 0
	+ **Motion Passes**

### **5.3. Chemeketa IS Proposal (Tad Shannon)**

* Available on Faculty Senate website
* **Comment from Rob Winningham:** This is a vote for a change of the site. For future reference, NWCCU requires minutes from a Faculty Senate meeting or other similar body which mark an approval. Additionally, we can make three site changes per year before being flagged by NWCCU for needing to make a major substantive change request.
* **Question:** You’re looking for an endorsement?
	+ Correct.
* Motion to approve/endorse the site change for the IS program in Salem.
	+ Seconded
	+ Yes - 19
	+ No - 2
	+ **Motion passes**

## **6. Consideration of New Business**

### **6.1. Honors Committee Curriculum Reform Proposal (Kent Neely, Jaime Cloud)**

* PDF available on the Faculty Senate website

## **7. Informational Presentations and Committee Reports**

### **7.1. Age-Friendly University Global Network (Melissa Cannon)**

* PDF available on Faculty Senate website
* Make way for an age diverse student body. We would be the second university to join, Portland State beat us to it.
* Is it better to have an endorsement from the senate, or is provost approval fine?
	+ Typically in the past, they’ve asked for a letter from the provost or president saying that we are applying these principles.
* Shall we endorse it?
	+ The endorsement for AFU needs to be from the provost. A Faculty Senate “endorsement” would just show the provost that faculty think his endorsement for this is a good idea.
	+ The process for endorsing items has been a matter of debate. In the past, things have been endorsed at the same meeting they were mentioned, or sometimes they have gone through the old business / new business routine.
	+ Motion to endorse
		- Seconded
		- **Motion passes unanimously**

### **7.2. Suicide Prevention (Tim Glascock)**

* Suicide Prevention Grant: started in 2017 - 2020
	+ How to get involved: Get trained in QPR ( avail. During new faculty week or by contacting Tim, glascockt@wou.edu )
* Information and resources are available online at <http://www.wou.edu/mental-health/> and portal
* Out of Darkness Walk is this Friday 5/17, 4-6pm.
* **Question:** “Dead Week” connotations. Is there any information about suicides or suicide prevention on campus?
	+ There have been efforts, such as work in fall comparing mental health indicators. There are complications in reporting and getting reliable statistics on a college campus. The rate of serious ideation on campus is 16%. The national average is 13%. The number is is 20-23% with depression and anxiety symptoms. We hope that providing tools and skills will help faculty notice and respond to individuals struggling with these issues.

## **8. Discussions**

## **8.1. Student Athlete Priority Registration (Toni Gowen, Gavin Keulks)**

* PDF available on Faculty Senate website
* **Comment**: In my program I deal mostly with nontraditional students, 80-90% are nontraditional, many of them work fulltime or are single parents. I support student athletes but question needing to give them a privileged early registration over non-traditional and other students, who also often have difficulties making it to classes at certain days and times.
* **Comment:** I think the difference is that WOU is imposing time slots on these students for practices and games. I have a little bit more sympathy, it is a little bit different.
* **Comment:** I am concerned about the appearance of putting student groups against one another. We have looked at other ways of accommodating athletes and other groups, such as by putting most of our classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays. It’s my understanding that we used to do pre-registration for student athletes. Student athletes are often some of my better students due to their discipline, and I wouldn’t want to see them disadvantaged because of that. I think that as an institution we need to look at how we can accommodate students within our curriculum.
* **Comment:** As I was reviewing the powerpoint, I didn’t see anything pertaining to the number of athletes in the school. I feel as though there are more athletes than students with disabilities. Afraid that the students with priority registration and athletics will take slots from ODS registered students.
	+ 325 athletes. We are proposing that they would register after students with disabilities, possibly along with honors students and other priority students.
* **Comment:** I see this as a student success issue. At the university I worked at previously, I worked on setting up an Honors Program and found in my research that Honors students often have high academic standing already, and so I’m not sure why we give Honors Program students priority registration. Many of my athlete students end up stuck in my 8ams and continually try t make up the missed classes and or missed assignments. This seems like an issue of student success
* **Comment:** Honors program students get priority registration not because of privilege, but because Honors is a cohort program, so there are times when they need to keep free for classes and can’t. Athletes are similar, in that they are stuck in scheduled practices by their coaches, sometimes at 2 in the afternoon, and this prevents the athlete from getting into classes, especially bio majors with labs where there are a limited number of slots available. We are a data-driven institution and Toni’s presentation did have data and a norm that we are anomalous to.
* **Comment:**  We have/had 89 away trips for our teams this year.
* Move to endorse
	+ Seconded
	+ Yes: 22
	+ No: 1
	+ **Motion Passes**
* Provost Winningham will bring this forward to President Fuller.

### **8.2. Doctoral Programs at WOU (Elisa Maroney, Amanda Smith)**

* PDF available on Faculty Senate website
* Wanted to say thank you, we are going to be looking at some other possibilities. With the current obstacles it seems impossible to move forward with this here. However, should the obstacles disappear we would be happy to have it here. We are looking for suggestions on partnerships or things we should or should not do. We would like you to share with your divisions that we are preparing this in other aspects, we are not sure how yet.
* As a discipline, we need to move forward on this even if it’s not at WOU.
* **Comment:** Thanks for putting in so much work on this.
* **Comment:** I personally felt very offended that dissertation-related doctorate will be ignored, and that it won’t be actionable.
* **Comment:** I am disappointed that we can’t be the first one to offer this as a doctorate, and really would like to see it taken seriously and get past existing obstacles if possible.
* **Comment**: This would contribute to more students and diversity to our campus.
* **Comment:** I think this is such an important program and feel very proud of my colleagues who have worked on this. I would urge all of us, including administration, to work more on a way forward.
* **Comment:** It seems like there are two big obstacles: The accreditation and the law. Could the provost comment on anything faculty could do to help make the case why this should be changed at the state level or to NWCCU?
	+ **Response from Provost Winningham**: It’s currently a -2 amendment to the bill, which would not limit us to offer just degrees through the master degree. HECC expressed reservations about such a general amendment. As far as I know, no regional university has plans to offer research doctorates. It is possible that another amendemnt could be proposed that would allow just professioanal doctorates. President Fuller has stated that he is not interested in offering research doctorates. I understand the need for a nation-wide perspective, but I would encourage us to clearly connect any initiative to our Strategic Plan and Mission . If we did move forward with this, we could stress pathway from a Bachelor to Master to Doctorate.
* **Question:** Is there any place for faculty to have interaction with HECC around getting clarity or anything like that?
	+ **Response from Provost Winningham:** I would defer to Dave McDonald on that. We do have good relationships at HECC.
* **Comment:** I spoke to Paul Evans and mentioned this, and he said that he could not see why something could not be changed.

## **Meeting adjourned: 05:01**

# **5 – 5:15 p.m.**

*Better Know a Colleague* (informal gathering continued, optional)