Draft Faculty Senate Minutes

June 9, 2020

**Virtual Meeting**

*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

## 2. Call of the roll (via online roster)

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

### 3.1. May 26, 2020 Meeting

Approved as posted

## 4. Institutional Reports

### 4.1. Faculty Senate President’s Report

* Report available on Faculty Senate website.
* Highlights: Senator numbers; campus climate survey analysis; committee report reminder; task force for Program Assessment and Cultural Competency; PURE Insights submission extension

### 4.2. University President’s Report

* Organizing training sessions around Reviewing the results of our own Campus Climate Survey and establishing action steps such as more comprehensive cultural competency training internally and with community people.
* This includes a community forum sponsored by the Mayors of Independence and Monmouth at a future date.
* Reached out to Dean Cassity for faculty who could participate in the conversation.
* Reminder went out to participate in commencement at 10am on Saturday. Virtual ceremony this year with over 700 graduates.

### 4.3. Provost’s Report

* Report available on Faculty Senate website
* Highlights: Statement on stress faced by students; virtual town hall June 23 at 11; OSU recently announced no in-person meetings after November 25th
* **Comment**: I know several CS faculty chose to offer synchronous online classes so we don’t need to make a transition between phase one / phase two / phase zero to make sure students who need to quarantine will be able to do that safely without stress.
* **Question**: What happens to students on campus if there is an outbreak? Do they shelter in place on campus or do they have to leave?
  + **Comment**: We have 76 isolation rooms on campus, most with private bathrooms. We have plans to provide food and check on the students daily as a part of the contact tracing process. We do not want students returning home if there is an outbreak. Although nothing official has been communicated, we have received word from Gov. Brown’s Office, through HECC Executive Director, Ben Cannon that universities could be somewhat decoupled from their counties, with the approval of university plans by Oregon Health Authority and/or county public health partners.
* **Comment**: NSM is planning carefully around one day a week being for labs. Knowing in advance whether we need to revert to a planned no-contact campus would be very helpful.
  + **Comment from Rob Winningham, Provost:** Faculty Emily Vala-Haynes and Megan Patton-Lopes are helping with our approach. Emily, could you talk a bit about this from an epidemiological standpoint?
  + **Comment from Emily Vala-Haynes**: One thing I have been telling a lot of students is that Oregon wasn’t lucky to flatten the curve. That was an evidence-based strategy that we knew worked. This is a similar element/strategy and we really are expecting wave 2 to come in the fall and correspond with flu season, so we want to prepare for that.
* **Question:** It sounds like, given the possibility of a second spike, everyone designing a course in person should do so in a way that means they can transition to online-only if needed. Does that make all courses hybrid courses?
  + There may not be in-person instructional activities if we have a spike in COVID-19 cases in the fall. It is critical that faculty are prepared to move to remote delivery with very little notice. We’ve received briefings from epidemiologists and it is expected that there will be a spike in the fall.
* **Question:** Are we considering moving the start date for fall term earlier?
  + One public university in Oregon is planning to do that. We are still meeting and planning for fall term. If we start a week early we need to do a lot of things, including changing Registrar and Business Office deadlines, possibly some financial aid reporting/deadlines. It also requires us to change every student in Banner. We would have to un-enroll and re-enroll each student manually, which creates opportunities for error.
* **Question:** You mentioned students who have already registered for fall quarter. Do you have updates on the percentages of continuing students who have registered at this point?
  + We will have that data but don’t have the final numbers yet. I expect that will have a report ready in two weeks and presented to the cabinet. I will share it at the town hall on June 23rd if it is ready by then, or during a July faculty senate meeting if you have one.
* **Comment**: The provost’s report has a typo in George Floyd’s name. Can that please be corrected?
  + It will be corrected. I sincerely apologize for the error.
* **Question:** I’m confused why Banner would need to be involved. We were originally planning to push back Spring term to April 8 then, later, April 20th, I think, and Banner didn’t seem to be part of that equation. I wouldn’t mind a bit more clarification from Amy, if she’s invited to add comments
  + **Comment from Amy Clark, Registrar: T**he official start date of spring term did not change, the start date for instruction only was shifted. That seems a minor distinction, but it makes a big difference relative to Banner, Financial Aid, billing etc.... For Fall the actual start of the term would be changed requiring all of the systems that support that to be changed.

### 4.4. IFS Report

* IFS meeting last Friday.
* Other universities are trying to force faculty to return to an in-person model exclusively, so it’s worth considering that when thinking about other universities' actions. WOU and PSU stand out as not doing this.
* A lot of universities are asking for a lot of financial sacrifice from faculty.
* IFS put together a checklist for what should be happening at other universities, and many of those checklist items are already happening at WOU.
* There was also a concern on universities needing to inform faculty more about classroom capacity and social distancing, which WOU has done well on.
* WOU has also done a good job of providing faculty with educational resources compared to many other institutions.
* Providing student outcomes and feedback has also been handled well at WOU compared to other institutions.

### 4.5. General Education Committee Report

* No updates

### 5. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Business

### 5.1. Election of Executive Committee At-Large Senators (Adele Schepige)

* Nominated and approved:
  + Melanie Landon-Hayes
* Previously Self-Nominated:
  + Lars Soderlund
  + Earlene Camarillo
* Nominations from the floor:
  + Cindy Ryan - accepts nomination
  + Aliacia Ibaraki - self-nomination
* **Result of vote:**
  + At-large position two: Earlene Camarillo
  + At-large position three: Alicia Ibaraki
  + At-large position four: Lars Soderlund

### 6. Consideration of Old Business

### 6.1. Planning Minor – proposal to drop (Sriram Khé)

### 6.2 Autism Spectrum Disorder Spec. Certificate – proposal to drop

### 6.3 Early Intervention/Special Ed I Endorsement – proposal to drop

### 6.4 Early Intervention/Special Ed II Endorsement – proposal to drop (Maria Peterson-Ahmad)

* Documents available on faculty senate website.
* **Motion to vote on proposals to drop**
  + **Seconded**
* **Results of Votes**
* Planning Minor
  + Yes - 28
  + No - 0
  + **Motion unanimously approved**
* Autism Spectrum Disorder Specialist Certificate
  + Yes - 28
  + No - 0
  + **Motion unanimously approved**
* Early Intervention/Special Ed I Endorsement
  + Yes - 28
  + No - 0
  + **Motion unanimously approved**
* Early Intervention/Special Ed II Endorsement
  + Yes - 28
  + No - 0
  + **Motion unanimously approved**

### 6.1. Proposed changes to FS Bylaws (Kristin Latham-Scott)

* Document available on faculty senate website.
* Note minor correction to name of Criminal Justice Sciences division.
* Language updated to be gender-neutral.
* Major update is to move the regular meeting from July to June.
* **Comment**: The library and media services division name is changing to Library.
* Motion to amend division name from Library and Media Services to Library.
  + Seconded.
    - Yes: 24
    - No: 0
    - **Amendment Passes**
* Motion to vote on bylaws changes
  + Seconded
    - Article I:
      * Yes: 28
      * No:0
    - Article 4:
      * Yes: 27
      * No: 0
    - Gender neutral
      * Yes: 28
      * No: 0
    - Amendment
      * Yes: 28
      * No: 0
    - **Motion passes unanimously as amended.**

### 6.1. Proposed Moratorium on DPT funding (Kim Jensen)

* Documents available on faculty senate website.
* **Comments**: Following the last meeting, there was a misunderstanding that this was about salary. I want to be clear that I am concerned about retrenchment, and curtailment. I also wanted to comment on the term “moratorium.” That term means that something is a pause on what is already in motion. So this might be perceived as a roadblock in the way of progress. I want to propose a thought experiment.

Imagine in the circumstances we are living in now, with so many unperceived changes. If this came to us today as new business, I think the context for evaluating it would change rapidly. I support the amendment because I think we are not in the position to make this kind of move at the moment.

* **Comments**: A couple of things have come out since last meeting. I would like to look at this as a chance to give everyone a perspective if we were looking at this as a fresh proposal. I would say with the level of retrenchment, this is almost like throwing a lifesaver out to somebody who’s floundering in the ocean. I think this is the reverse of a bad idea.   
   We have problems, including declining enrollment, and I think we can look at this program as a way to improve our financial status as a university. I think we would be short-sighted to not look at how to get out of our situation long-term. Universities across the state of Oregon are getting more competitive. There were a couple questions from faculty members I wanted to address. What’s the market look like? What are the numbers of people who are applying, etc?

On average, for every thirty applicants accepted to a DPT program in the US, there are 495 who apply. We have a number of undergraduate divisions on our campus that could be positively impacted by this. The majority of PT students are biology and exercise science majors. Considering the nursing program, we had a number of people who came here wanting to do nursing and then changing their major after. I believe the same thing would happen with a DPT program. You would see an across-the-board rise in undergraduate degrees and majors.  
 We had 12 students in the past (year?) who went out-of-state to do a DPT program after attending school at WOU. These are students who qualified and got into DPT programs but could not do them in Oregon despite being Oregon residents.  
 Although there is no guarantee, the program should raise money of over 4 million dollars once it has four cohorts enrolled. Considering the starting costs are several hundred thousand dollars, I would encourage people to look at this as a long-term benefit to the whole university, and not a proposal that would benefit some parts of the university at the expense of other parts.  
 Regarding the moratorium specifically, the DPT is a time-sensitive, competitive issue. We don’t currently have another state school would allow in-state applicants to pay less tuition in graduate school in the mid-Willamette Valley. But that could change. Where we get in line for DPT approval is a time-sensitive issue.

* **Comment:** I believe we had a motion to vote, and I would like to second that.
* **Comment:** The library division discussed this proposal at some length, and while we understand and appreciate the intent behind it, we all felt like the proposal is too vague and that President Fuller's memo in response presented key facts about the budget process and the DPT approval process which make much of the proposal unnecessary.  
  **Comment:** I want to be respectful of everyone’s time. This came up in DSPS and we had a few questions.  
   How can we ensure programs and faculty are not being sacrificed for this new endeavor?   
   I wonder if our administration values our work as educators, scholars, recruiting, and advising?  
   What I don&#39;t understand is the argument that having a DPT program at WOU will increase undergraduate enrollment for sure. I understand that having a nursing program does help with that, but does it have to be a DPT to attract undergraduate students? I need to see some solid data or evidence to believe that having this program will definitely help with our enrollment.  
   Also, it mentions in the letter that we need to get 3 full annual cohorts enrolled to get that $$ they are looking for; but it doesn't say what if we don't get those cohorts? What are some financial deficits we will be facing if we can't fill the seats?  
   The schools in Oregon that already have a similar program - what are their cohort enrollment numbers? Are they meeting their enrollment targets?  
   How competitive has it been to get into these programs here in Oregon? Application pool vs admitted students and % of applicants meeting qualifications.  
  Some of these may have already been answered by previous applicants.
* **COMMENT:** NSM wanted to suggest discussion around changing some language with this proposal.  
   Idea 1) “until the Oregon legislature votes to remove the legal barrier for Western Oregon University to offer a DPT program. “

Idea 2) "until the Oregon legislature votes to remove the legal barrier for Western Oregon University to offer a DPT program and, following this, administration provides clear and specific information for how the program startup costs will be funded”

* **Comment**: I believe when this was presented to the legislature originally, some of the arguments were that it would be funded by bonds or grants, that there was no opposition to it, and that it would not displace or replace current programs.  
   In my opinion, I do not believe that most of these are true any more. Rather than the university coming up with money for the program, I would like to see the university come up with funding ideas that will not come out of existing funds. The legislature is holding a special session but there are more pressing concerns and I do not think they are going to vote on this for at least a year. I think it makes no sense for us to discuss or work on something that it is not currently legal for us to offer.

Motion to extend the meeting to 5:15

Seconded

Yes: 26

No: 1

**Motion Passes**

* **Comment**: We had some of the questions around funding and specific funding in the social science division. The presentations from 2018 estimated $319,000 in the next fiscal year and we are not sure if that is accurate. If there is a moratorium on funding for a particular time, what would that be? And if there is a moratorium for the next fiscal year, would that impact the program moving forward? We did not feel that we had the information to vote as it currently is.
* **Comments from Provost Rob Winningham**:
  + Cohort sizes were modeled at 40 students per cohort (120 total once all three cohorts are enrolled). The size of the cohort is set by the accrediting body and we need letters of intent with clinical sites for 150% of the cohort size. Because those are geographically constrained to the Willamette Valley to a large degree, and there is no other state school offering this in that area currently we should be able to secure the requisite agreements. If there was more competition, the cohort numbers may be slightly smaller.
  + The type of undergraduate bump we saw with the nursing program is largely within our control. How large it is depends on the type of undergraduate majors we put forward to draw people to health sciences. Priority admissions for our own students to the DPT program could also encourage undergraduate admissions at WOU.
  + I don’t know of any way to fund this through bonds. Maybe physical space could be, but our health sciences building is doing well with HECC scoring rubric for new capital expenditures and we hope to get funding for a building to support health sciences.
  + Next fiscal year, I do not anticipate any funds going to the DPT because we need to get legislative authority. We do disagree that it would be illegal for us to offer a professional doctorates. Our board member, Lane Shetterly, wrote that the ORS was intended to be descriptive and not prescriptive. It could be that getting this fix in the special session is not highly probably, but it is possible. We will need to wait for legislative approval before sending this to the HECC for final approval. The timing of expenses could change if HECC reinterprets how they respond to the existing legislation, or if it is approved at an upcoming legislative session.
  + The timeline that we laid out with the budget a number of years ago was done before we knew where we would be in the accreditation queue, so it was optimistic. The detailed budget suggested the first year might be $327,000. We tried to err on the side of over-estimating costs. Looking at this again, it seems like the funds required would be considerably lower because we do not need everything included in that. Actually all we need to do is hire a director in the first year to work with accreditors. We initially thought we needed to hire faculty a year before the program starts but we have recently learned that we may only need to have signed hiring contracts for faculty.
  + We have had discussions with donors to help us fund the first year. I don’t think it’s a good time for other reasons to pursue those, but we have on our advisory board people who employ a large proportion of physical and occupational therapists in the state of Oregon and those people want to see this move forward. In the absence of that, I would defer to president Fuller but we might need some general fund dollars to get going. I believe that the program would be good investment for our university and its long term sustainability. Generating $4 million net revenue would help us raise all boats.
* **Move to vote on the proposal.**
  + Seconded
    - Yes: 24
    - No: 2
* **Motion Passes with ⅔ majority**

Motion to extend the meeting to 5:30

Seconded

Yes: 23

No: 4

**Motion Passes**

* **Motion is now up to vote**
  + Yes: 16
  + No: 8
  + **Motion passes**
* **Question:** This moratorium talks specifically about costs. Does that mean that the vote only is specifically about spending, and not about pursuing the program in general?
  + That is the way the original proposal was worded.

## 7. Consideration of New Business

No new business

## 8. Discussions

Comment from NSM for discussion:

In this moment of unprecedented challenge and rapid change, the need for timely, detailed, and transparent communication from Western Oregon University's Administration to its Faculty is paramount. The recent campus climate survey report highlighted inadequate communication as a primary concern for both faculty and staff, and the need has grown even more pressing in the current circumstances.

## We appreciate the promptness and clarity of the memorandum, "Context and Information in Response to the Faculty Proposal Submitted to Faculty Senate," sent from Dr. Rex Fuller and Dr. Rob Winningham to Faculty Senate President Dr. Kristin Latham-Scott, which provided details about the current and future plans for the DPT program two days after it was discussed at Faculty Senate. We request the same clarity and swiftness of communication with regards to proposed program realignment and decision-making involved in budget restructuring. We also request similar clarity and swiftness of communication around contingency planning for Covid-19. Since faculty are the primary student-facing employees of WOU, this information will allow us to more effectively communicate with students to provide them the personalized support of which WOU is deservedly proud.

## 9. Informational Presentations and Committee Reports

### 8.1. Ad Hoc Committee on Certificates (Presenter)

* Document available on faculty senate website containing information on Ad Hoc committee’s work this term and next steps, but no formal proposal.

### 8.2. Library Division Renaming (Janeanne Rockwell-Kincanon)

* Document available on faculty senate website.

## 10. Announcements

* Do we need a special summer meeting in July? There are no specific issues but we might want to have discussions about course modalities or other things.
* Motion to adjourn
* Seconded
* **Meeting adjourns at 5:32 pm**