

Minutes
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 13, 2009

Present:

Steve Tanner
Ruthi Davenport
Dan Mielke
Molly Litchfield
Ken Watson
Allen Evans
Greg Monahan
DeAnna Timmermann
Richard Croft
Leandro Espinosa
Jeff Johnson
Peter Johnson
Ted Atkinson
Provost Jaeger
Rosemary Powers
Stephen Jenkins
Jim Tooke
Jodi Varon

Others:

Gary Kiemnic
Dea Hoffman

I. [3:00pm] Call to Order

ACTION ITEMS:

II. [3:00pm – 3:05pm] Approval of Minutes for the [December 2, 2008](#) Meeting

Approval of last meetings minutes moved seconded and unanimously approved

Report from University Council Meeting

University Council approved the wording change drafted by the Faculty Senate for the membership of the EPCC committee The Council is working out the logistics of voting for the constitutional change.

Incidental fee concerns from Student Government. There is a growing crisis of incidental fee units used to fund student activities because of lower on campus enrollment.

Recognized the need for clerical support for both the Faculty Senate and University Council to help keep track of committee vacancies and to manage the shared governance web site assist with online voting and track any paper work. Need a support person to track committee membership and vacancies. This person would not be required to attend meetings or keep the minutes. The Executive Council triennial evaluation is to occur in 2009. The Senate is asked to concur with Council on the support person for both groups.

It is observed that Huber is a terrible venue for Faculty Senate meetings and the need to work toward better venue. The issue is that Huber has internet and projection capability, which is lacking elsewhere. The Provost indicates that Inlow 201 will be available for web casting and Senate Meetings sometime in the future.

A motion is made to concur with Council on the need for a Shared Governance support person. Motion is seconded and passes unanimously.

Establish a protocol for visitors to Council meetings and their behavior.

[3:05pm – 3:20pm] [EPCC](#) (Colleen Johnson)

No Report from EPCC

III. [3:20pm – 3:30pm] Confirming Elections to the Honors Committee (Steve Tanner)

The following will be the representatives to the Honors Committee Business Rep – Steve Clements, Education rep - Ray Brown, Sunny Nilson the ASEOU rep. The Arts and Sciences rep. Linda Reed-Jerofke, the Admin member is in process with a three way tie. Sunny graduates in March ASEOU may want someone else who can serve out the year. The Honors Program is administered by the Provost.

IV. [3:30pm – 3:40pm] Scheduling Special Meeting to Discuss the Strategic Implementation Plan (Steve Tanner)

Special meeting to look at Strategic Implementation Plan issues will be on Tuesday January 27th in Huber Auditorium at 3:00pm. The Senate needs to emphasize to the faculty the importance of this meeting.

Will there be action items or just discussion? The meeting will be focused on the Strategic Implementation Plan in advance of the February meeting. The meeting is for a common purpose and will be specifically focused.

Provost Jaeger will be taking part in the discussion. The administration is looking for the best way to connect with the faculty and recognizes the need to carve out a time to share information and concerns about particulars in the plan.

V. [3:40pm – 4:00pm] Questions About Institutional Planning (Rosemary Powers and Peter Johnson) [Handout](#)

Strategic Implementation plan and the Black report

On campus enrollment is diving and need to increase that enrollment handout

The senate would like a written report from the Provost on where we are see handout

1 and 2 from handout

2 and number 3 from handout on campus recruitment

We need to identify the issues in number 5 of handout because we don't market to our strength adequately.

How can faculty be involved in a recruitment plan?

We are not telling people to come here rather we are saying that you can get your education any way you want. There needs to be a plan that we can all participate in.

We want to have people from Admissions, President, Marketing and Provost to come to the meeting on the 27th for a campus wide dialog

Provost will respond to each point of the handout providing a written document prior to the meeting on the 27th.

VI. [4:00pm – 4:20pm] Discussion of Load and Hybrid Courses (Dan Mielke)

Discuss things ad]s part of the meeting see the discussion points on the Senate page.

The Senate must discuss issues that affect the faculty.

There is currently no consistency between colleges 10 student enrollment floor for lower 7 student floor for upper in Arts and Sciences. There is an assumption of one CRN for on campus and a different CRN for off campus. Hybridization is not natural, the way on line courses are taught and on campus courses are taught is quite different. Combining the two into one is really like teaching two courses different courses.

The administration says we need to change what we do or we go broke.

This is not the change to make it discourages teachers from teaching online and we need to work a lot more in creating these hybrids. An example of a limited solution is the E-Luminate product.

In music the difference between teaching courses on and off campus is huge. There are limited opportunities or approaches to online teaching of music.

Our distance course offerings nationwide are very competitive. The type of institution we are, we are not out of line in the area of online instruction.

For tenured faculty there is a difference.

We are diluting the population through too many options, rather than growing the numbers of total students across the institution.

There are several concerns; some disciplines are better delivered on line than others. The amount of work required for others to go online is not appropriate. How flexible will we be in opening new online sections if on campus enrollment is down? Serious design differences need to be addressed between on and off campus courses. We try and approximate and on campus experience in our online offering.

When merge online and on campus then one group of students will find the easier route. The institution needs to reinforce the priority of increasing on campus enrollment. Don't want to discourage the entrepreneurial spirit of online courses. How do we manage the fixed costs of on campus instruction? The variable cost of on line courses makes a difference, if you have a lot of students then it pays.

Online instruction has been a friend to Eastern for a long time and has brought in students from all over the country.

If there is going to a minimum threshold will there be an upper threshold for classes of say 60? If there can be classes that are too small, can there be classes that are too big? We try and sell the small class model of private institutions. How do we balance the budgetary problem of small classes not paying the freight of running the institution? If it is important that we save the small classes this becomes a pedagogical impediment to the creation of hybrids.

Flexibility is important for some students to be able to take online courses while being on campus. The problem is that students are stampeding from on campus to online courses in one discipline 15-20% are moving to the online option. Should we penalize our campus instructors because we are good at online teaching? Do we short change our students in forcing them into online courses?

Online classes seem unfair to on campus students. Students take classes on line to avoid scheduling conflicts. Online classes have a reputation of being easier than the on campus section. Are incidental fees only collected from on campus students?

The Provost says the plan is for incidental fees to follow the zip code. If a student takes at least 1 class on campus then they pay incidental fees

.
For the English Writing program online courses have ruined the on campus offerings. BART I forced the English lit majors to being online. Students who use blackboard in their online courses experience no feed back from their instructors. Students on line often meet informally on campus. It has been hard to meld the two populations in the English Writing program.

The product we currently sell the best is online or DDE. DDE did a great marketing job. The importance of the personal contact between the teacher and the student DDE purpose was to provide better access to a quality education. Sometimes DDE gets a bad rap. EOU is forced to compete in the market with other online courses. We need to find a way to attract new students to on campus programs.

The Provost and the administration have many sleepless nights. We would all wish for all of the above. As we look at ways to get on campus enrollment to a sustainable level. Some of the options are not the most attractive, hybridization is not the solution for many situations. In the short term to preserve curriculum and programs there needs to be some level of unsettledness. It is not possible to move \$350,000 worth of DDE overload to on campus programs. We can not put the genie back into the bottle. To build back the university to the 1750 may take some patches or opportunity taking. One solution is to move some students from on campus to online and keep the on campus lower cost. The Question is how to get to the long term solution of more students on campus?

When we move the student to online then we erode the campus experience?

The Provost feels we need limit our losses in the short term.

There is a danger to faculty as programs go online, are faculty then adjuncts and how do we pay them? If students find success online then why come to campus at all. It is catch
22

Provost indicates that only 25% of current student population is traditional from high school to college and finish in 4 years. There are some policy things that can be done. Maximize tuition plateau, move it down a couple of credits and it is more efficient for students to take more classes on campus. Market the value added experience of on campus classes. We need to differentiate between the different markets. Flexibility has to run both ways by not upping arbitrary course enrollment minimums. Need to think hard about canceling low enrollment courses. There needs to be a conversation with deans and faculty. There is an OAR?

Provost indicates there needs to be an established criteria for limiting or eliminating courses. Feb 15th courses have to go the registrar to be in the catalog for the coming year Provost will guarantee that there will be timely access to courses to insure graduation success. If it is graduation requirement we must offer it.

The Faculty needs to have sufficient lead time to create appropriate hybrid courses.

Provost says if the course is an elective then approach is different from when courses are required for graduation.

It is possible to game the system in making everything required
Hybrids should only be offered with the agreement of the faculty and the dean or provost.

Motion is made ***“Hybrid courses will only be offered with the free consent and agreement of the faculty and administration. The Senate opposes in principal the setting of minimum class sizes for upper division courses.”***

When we support small programs the whole institution pays a price. Programs need to look at their attractiveness.

Hybrid course involve the teaching of on campus and online courses simultaneously, combining the two. Add to the motion hybrid “in the Senates judgment is not the solution to our enrollment problem, that in our judgment this one small tool.” This amendment fails

Vote on the original motion passes - 1 opposed and 16 in favor

DISCUSSION / INFORMATION ITEMS:

- VII. [4:20pm – 4:35pm] Faculty Senate Bylaw Change Proposal – Senator Responsibilities to their Constituents – Presentation to be voted upon during the February meeting (Rosemary Powers)

Article III Membership adding section 2

- VIII. [4:35pm – 4:45pm] Faculty Senate Bylaw Change Proposal – [RAG committee](#) – Presentation to be voted upon during the February meeting (Chip Ettinger)
Change the wording in the text of the amendment from Faculty Development Fund Committee to Research Development Fund Committee. Rag is happy with the increase in membership.

- IX. [4:45pm – 4:55pm] Faculty Athletics Representative - Academics in Athletics Report (Jeff Dense)

Maybe we need to look at another conference we are isolation challenged that works against missing classes.

- X. [4:55pm – 5:00pm] Good of the Order