

Faculty Senate Minutes
April 24, 2018
Willamette Room, Werner University Center
Primarily paperless, wou.edu/facultysenate

Please provide your own access to this agenda and to all meeting documents

3:15 – 3:30 p.m.

Better Know a Colleague (informal gathering, optional)

3:30 – 5 p.m.

Business Meeting

1. Call to order: 3:31

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

Adele Schepige; Bob Hautala; Camila Gabaldon; Chloe Hughes; Cornelia Paraskevas; Elisa Maroney; Erin Baumgartner; Ethan McMahan; Gavin Keulks; Greg Zobel; Jeff Templeton (for M Baltzley); Karen Haberman; Kathleen Connolly; Ken Carano; Kimberly Jensen; Kit Andrews; Laurie Burton; Marie LeJeune; Margaret Manoogian; Mark Van Steeter; Mary Harden; Matthew Nabity; Michael Phillips; Paul Disney; Scott Tighe; Sue Kunda; Thaddeus Shannon; Tom Kelly; Zenon Zygmunt

3. Corrections to and approval of minutes from previous meeting

- Minor corrections from Keulks
 - Approved

4. Institutional Reports

4.1. Adele Schepige, Faculty Senate President

4.1.1. 2018 - 2019 Faculty Senate Officer and Senator-at-large Elections

- Remind people: elect any new senators at next Division meeting (May) so new Senators can attend the May 22nd meeting and attend, as senators, during the July meeting
- Will need two Senators-at-Large as well; there is already one candidate interested in the at-large position
- Elections are coming up—they will be held next week
 - Candidates for all Senate officers
 - President: Gregory Zobel; no other nominations from the floor
 - VP: Breeann Flesch: no other nominations from the floor
 - Secretary: Stewart Baker: no other nominations from the floor

4.1.2. Committee Project data charts

- Background information
- Executive committee asked division chairs to provide data

- Charts are based only on data collected during this process
- We do have data on non-tenure track, but most focuses on tenure track
- Review of how project will be presented today
 - Consider this presentation Phase 1: we can't just focus on this project today—we have other items on agenda to discuss.
 - Consider this document a snapshot of service
 - EC suggest that each Division start tracking their own division level work—and it's too much for the EC to track
- [LINK to PRESENTATION](#)
 - [The presentation notes are not included because it was literally sharing or reading what was on the slides. Be sure to review the presentation.]
 - Comments or questions
 - Do you know how many people completed the survey?
 - Made spreadsheets, shared with division chairs and APAs, all said they were complete
 - This was not a survey
 - Question: did everyone complete the survey?
 - All Division chairs were given the forms to fill out
 - Question: did you account for 1st year Assistants who don't serve in the first year?
 - Expected this to show in the numbers
 - Question: did you account for if meetings are once a year or 15 times a year?
 - No.
 - Question: Did you sort for administrative positions that have part time assignments?
 - No. This is a complex positioning, so we did not have time to sort for.
 - Question: You counted for Division Chairs even if though they are not faculty by CBA?
 - Comment: they asked to be included
 - Division chairs' LAS weekly meeting that they have to participate in
 - Example one group that have mandatory meetings
 - Comment: clarify on the Mode slide
 - Reply: Most people don't have a committee but some people are doing a lot of work
 - Comment: Line/bar slide—asked to go back so they could see slide again
 - Question: will we have access to the slides?
 - Yes
 - Question: what is the overall goal of doing this?
 - Comment: Back in Fall, we had problems getting chairs and quoroms for committees. This helps show and explain just how much committee work is taking on campus.
 - Comment: Based on the nature of certain positions, such as FS President and Division chairs, there are committee

- assignments associated with those specific positions
- Comment: Is there a different way we can approach committee work, staff it, do business, etc? Do we need all these committees?
 - Question: are you suggesting that there are people who could serve?
 - Reply: we don't know what people are up to, where and how they are serving. Some people work in surges: a lot of work and then not so much.
 - Question: Were committees like BA/BS, etc. considered?
 - Response: yes
 - Question: what do we do with this now (summary?).
 - Reply: we know we have a lot of committees—what does that mean?
 - Question: is the number of committees we are on normal compared to comparative institutions?
 - Comment: We should follow up and see what our peers are doing at other institutions.
 - Question about clarifying where NTTs are serving even though it's not in their contract but they still end up doing the work
 - Comment: EC hopes that each division will engage/discuss the content; have some possible solutions or different structures.
 - Hope divisions will generate ideas about the workload
 - Comment: what is the purpose of this? We've got someone on all the committees that they are concerned about or need to address.
 - Reply: it is interesting to see how workload is spread among Divisions
 - Comment: unless we start changing up committee structures, there are going to be gaps or shortages.
 - Comment: all senate committees are advisory; not everyone needs to have a seat at every table—every division does not need to guard their seat at any specific committee. Big, bulky committees don't move as much or get as much done and they only meet 6 or 7 times per year
 - Comment on importance of quorum
 - Reply: there is no quorum requirement for/in senate
 - Question: what do you do if you have 5 of the 13 people there?
 - Question: are we creating too many layers of work? Would it be easier to do some of this online or not have meetings if there are no objections to specific items?
 - Comment: online voting and/or meeting allows you to address quorum issues because you have to have electronic votes
 - Question: have you seen any committees that you thought might be worth adjusting, cutting, or revising?
 - Reply: ideas are present on EC but not ready to talk about publicly yet;
 - Comment: it would be good to have specifics to take

back to Divisions to discuss or suggest

- Reply: we're hoping to get some other ideas from folks not entrenched in the committee system

4.2. Rex Fuller, University President

No report today

4.3. Stephen Scheck, University Provost

- Naming of Erin Baumgartner as Director of GenEd
 - Agreed to a three year term
- [Link to the HECC](#) for data/information page for snapshot on any institution and see percentage of accelerated learning, non-admit, student debt, and so on
 - [Link to WOU-specific snapshot](#)
 - At the HECC site, you can get the data for any Oregon school
 - What are some potential improvements that could be added to this document?
- Board of Trustees approved Applied Baccalaureate in Liberal studies
- Has moved on to June review in provost council
- 3 graduate certificates in interpreting also approved
- Gorgeous outside—this Friday is Tree Campus day, meet outside the Woodcock building, and they do a tour of the important trees on campus
 - Comment: request that faculty senate be shown some accounting of the excess funds that were mentioned/discussed at the most recent board meeting—specifically around the \$6 million involved
 - Best way is to have FS President make the request to President Fuller

5. Consideration of Old Business

5.1. AIC proposal, Steve Taylor, AIC Chair

- **APPROVED**

5.2. Committee Charge Page Update (discussion only), Executive Committee [LINK to PAGE](#)

- FS President asks to table this issue
 - Would like to be able to show the pages side-by-side
 - Currently it is a mix of report as well as committee structure, so wants a clear separation of these two
 - If there are going to be committee changes, it makes sense to wait until Divisions can discuss it.
 - Comment: perhaps have discussions with committee chairs on how they spend their time, what their goals are, and how they could best operate and use this to help inform the project
 - Comment: really likes Robert Rules, if it comes up as New Business, then it can linger for a while to be voted on. Multiple concerns about how it's lingering since,

procedurally, it's new business.

- **MOVE** to remove this from NEW BUSINESS
- Some portion of the information is content that Faculty Senate does not have control over—just sharing information there; counter suggestion: keep the part that we can vote on and drop the parts that we can't vote on.
- Comment: there was no discussion, conversation, no data until today, no charts—this is not how things are done. There was no discussion of any possible changes. Wants this addressed.
- **Move to take off of new business and include data for future decisions**
 - Seconded. **Passed.**

5.3. BA/BS Proposal (discussion only), BA/BS Task Force [Link to Recommendation Summary](#)

- More information/follow up to the ten questions that were submitted
- Tied to accreditation?
 - Yes
 - Have a lot of things changing right now
 - Takes a lot of time to examine BA/BS right now
 - Felt provided opportunity to look at
- Why not just BA/BS?
 - Comes back to just accreditation
 - NWCCNU would be accepting of default of one type of degree with rationale provided but not multiple types
- How is this process going to work?
 - Will work in consort with whatever process established to review all of program adjustments that come with 90 credit adjustments programs making
 - In future, be part of regular curricular process if proposing new program or making significant changes to one program
- Clarification/discussion of the document
 - BS outnumber BA 2.5:1 at WOU
 - All majors offer a BA option, but not all majors offer a BS option
 - Question: is this about distinction in the degree vs distinction in the general ed?
 - Question: couldn't the university's default degree be a Bachelors degree and each department chooses BA or BS—and they have to do the write up ONLY if they want to offer both of them to students?
 - Reply: There is nothing wrong with a BA in Physics, for example. Figuring out what is different in the courses for a BA or BS is what is important. BA is a great default degree.
 - Question: are we doing this for the accreditors or for our students?
 - Reply: we have to do it for accreditors. We could try to do it well so that we can speak to the students. It's an opportunity to speak to the students and do a solid presentation.
 - Comment: Biggest change I see is that languages are no longer linked to the BA. Is this commonly happening with comparator institutions?

- Looking within state is different from outside of state.
 - In-state universities do link BA with languages.
 - When you look at comparator institutions, there's a mix. Often it's the institution that determines the degrees.
 - Languages can/could be regarded as a requirement even for a BS degree.
 - Comment: less interested in what comparators do as opposed to what we value as an institution. Seems like we're getting rid of something that we valued as an institution and it is risky to leave it up to Divisions. Encourage us to think about it more deeply before making the change.
 - BS is not just about the science but often about the practice that is involved.
 - Reply: more heavily featured in the LACCs now than before; heard from multiple Divisions that they did not share the valuing of languages.
 - Comment: emphasize the importance of figuring out how faculty can encourage & advise students to do these other enriching courses (language, arts, etc.)
 - Comment: tried to broaden the group that can allow for or require language to be a part—and now BS degrees can do that
- Comment: it takes time to build in second language fluency, and that's why they built in the additional 12 credits
 - At this point, bring back to your divisions and then have a vote next meeting

6. Consideration of New Business

No new business

7. Informational Presentations and Committee Reports

7.1. WOU Draft Policy for Accelerated Learning, Sue Monahan, Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness [Link to Document](#)

- 7.1.1. Working with Willamette Promise, for example
- 7.1.2. Would apply to how we give credits to high school students
 - 7.1.2.1. Want a policy that aligns with HECC standards
 - 7.1.2.2. Soliciting comments—would like it by May 31st
 - 7.1.2.2.1. Want to help improve the policy

7.2. International Education and International Students, Neng Yang, Assistant VP for International Education and Development [see presentation](#); [see responsibilities and functions document](#)

- Neng Yang: thank you for opportunity
 - About 10 years ago, about 30 international students
 - Currently about 300 international students
 - Has been stable for the past 8 years or so
 - Main tasks are Course articulation & Credit transfer
 - Additional duties are study abroad
 - Around 55-60 students/year currently

- About 180 of the international students are Chinese
 - To increase the overall number, maybe meet/contract with agencies in other countries
 - It's a normal process in multiple countries used by multiple universities
- Discussion of multiple regions, attractions, challenges—see slide presentation
- Long term: need more attractive programs like software engineering, health management, and related graduate degree programs
 - References health management degree at George Fox
- Need more staff in order to support increasing enrollment as well as study abroad
 - Funding for scholarships, staffing, and the ability to recruit is needed
 - Apologies for not keeping Senators updated, and hope to report to Senate once/year on the status of the International Office
- Question: can you talk about the scholarships? What's the level? How much?
 - There are 13 slots, and each slot is a 9,000 tuition deduction
 - International tuition is three times the instate rate
 - Question: in terms of recruiting in new countries, all the costs, etc., where is the break even cost?
 - Reply: currently the cost to bring in international students is about \$1,000/student—if the number was increased to recruit, then this number would go up.
 - Can't give a specific number for new markets; in terms of existing markets like China or Saudi Arabia, they know what the numbers are.
- Out of Time—need to adjourn

5 – 5:15 p.m.

Better Know a Colleague (informal gathering continued, optional)