Faculty Senate Minutes EOU FACULTY SENATE
DATE
INLOW 201

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

Guests: Sarah Witte, Donald Wolff, Angie Adams, Colleen Dunne-Cascio, David Vande Pol, Peter Giesinger, Heather Cashell, Luke Aldrich, Chris Burford, Chris McLaughlin, Will L, Lacy Carpillo, Dan Mielke, Jeff Dense,

NK	Call to Order	● Called to order at 3:17 PM ● Roll call	
	Agenda Review	● Note: Tim Seydel delayed at last meeting, will return for next meeting	
	Minutes Approval	● SC moves to approve minutes ● AY seconds ● Minutes approved unanimously	
SW	Provost's Report	● Retention from Fall to Winter down from 2017. Currently at 91%, will confirm number in week 4. Last year 93% retention. ● December 14 - executive team went to PDX to deliver HECC conditions presentation. Last and final presentation from 2014. HECC on campus next week to	

		deep dive into finances, academic performance, and strategic planning. ● Good news from end of November/December that Eastern Promise funding has returned for Oregon Teacher Pathway. $289-290,000 beginning any day now. IMESD is fiscal agent for funding. Help us address teacher shortages in Eastern Oregon. ● GOSTEM funded in full. Thanks to Donna Rainboth, Peter Geiseinger, and Julie Kinery. Full presentation tomorrow 1/17 at BOT academic/student affairs and at full BOT meeting Feb 1st.	

David Van De Pol	Additional Provost report	Addressing Revature partnership
		● Revature founded in 2006
		● Free training in software development and coding. No tuition fee for training.
		● Revature works with industry partners who need that skill set and offer free training and pay students and guarantee them a job upon successful completion.
		● Coding/software 2nd most demanded job
		● 2 years ago started University partners division. Selective process. CUNY system, Florida State, South Florida, Davidson, Boise State (only other college in our region)
		● Revature demands we reach out to alumni, telling them of opportunity for retraining.
		● Not limiting opportunity just to CS majors.
		   ○ Tier 1 - non-CS non-STEM majors, online course, then 2nd level if passing. Pass 2nd level - flown to face-to-face training center (east coast). Paid while trained. 10- to 15- weeks in length.
		   ○ Tier 2 - STEM majors. One level of training then f-2-f training.
		   ○ Tier 3 - CS major. Invited directly to f-2-f training. Pass training, guaranteed employment.
		● We've gotten out of the gate slowly. Revature search for regional director failed, so we are behind.
		
		Questions
		● AY - consequences for students not completing class or realizing they want to do something else? Signing agreement?
		   ○ During training there's no contractual obligation. Students cna drop when they choose. Mentors are available in training program. Upon completion and employment, they sign 2-yr contract. Frequently, Revature allows broken contract if corp wants to hire person full-time.
		● CB - criticism of Revature is indenturing students in predatory way. Interested in researching further. What	

		was the process involved in forming this partnership? Was CS program involved? What does that do to CS major? Concerned of curricular partnership with no review by faculty.
		  ○ Hired to reach out regionally to increase brand, charged to do. I came across this opportunity for alumni, not in conflict with current students or programs. Presented opportunity to provost, and then president, then cabinet. Everyone wanted to move forward.
		● SM - is this a minor? Separate degree?
		  ○ Not a degree at all. Training for a skillset that industry requires. This is strictly for alumni.
		● CB - if this is a relationship thats formed between corp and EOU that has an effect on brand and reputation, faculty with expertise in partnership areas should be involved for vetting those potential partnerships.	

NK	BOT Mtg	● Three meetings tomorrow for faculty to attend
		● CB - potentially not available due to jury duty
		  ○ Finance 9-11:30
		  ○ Goernance 12:30-1:45
		  ○ Acad/student affairs 2-4
		●	

	MOE re: Canvas	● We just received documents today from subcommittee, so we'll just have a conversation about them today re: documents
		● Bring comments back to Feb meeting
		● CB - we developed 2 documents over break, collected feedback from faculty from all colleges, following discussion at college meetings.
		  ○ Looked at documents from AAUP and faculty from other universities.
		  ○ Longer response and a shorter resolution
		  ○ Determined to not revise the memo.
		  ○ Issues with academic freedom as well as policies and procedure
		● AY - longer document summarizes most common concerns, not all concerns from faculty. Memo was brought up in COBE meeting with feedback going to dean. Email responses solicited from STEMH and CASSH. Folks might want to add to issues, but what's listed there is pretty concise.
		● CB - subcommittee is looking for anything we missed or anything that needs clarification, issues to consider. Faculty seem unified on this issue.
		● BS - are you asking us which iteration is best, or work with them in conjunction?
		  ○ CB - we could do both. Ideally FS would approve	

- both. We see them working together.
- SW - I read comments forwarded to me today. I do think it's worth talking about some of the premises informing thinking on this. I'd like a fuller understanding of how operational requirements have become conflated with academic freedom issues or surveillance.
  - AY - if by collecting data you're requiring me to take attendance, you're dealing with how I teach, which I could do or not do based on how I teach. Redraft memo without ideas forcing people to teach a certain way. Operational procedures in provost's purview mixed up with how faculty teach their classes. Infringing on our responsibility as educators.
- SW - I'm missing the point
  - NH - scripting how an assignment must be submitted or how grading should take place or that attendance should take place, it's infringing upon how we teach. One-size-fits-all piece about data collection, but we should talk about ways we understand our students. To say all assignments, grades, correspondence go through Canvas is deeply problematic. Doesn't make sense to mandate when we're hired to figure out the best way to assess.
- SW - passage of LMS 4 years ago (CAnvas)
  - Jeff Carman - 2 biggest things collected through Canvas are grades and attendance. Only pulls final grades imports to CRM for retention data. Purpose of that was to retain students. You can have as many sections open as you want. How are students getting their grades?
  - NH - they come to me face-to-face. That attention, touch, is how I keep students in class. They have to come more than once.
  - SC - if an advisor looks at my courses, those grades may not have relevance to how they are actually doing. Highest number of points gets highest grade (curve). This is an instance where people can become penalized when they shouldn't be. Intervention is due to student appearing to not be doing well. The data could be inaccurate.
  - SC - I can't take attendance of 140 students. I try things like iClicker to track attendance, but then I would need 140 clickers or 140 smartphones.
  - AY - a lot of faculty I contacted weren't concerned with Canvas or posting grades. More about fixing due dates, not being flexible, especially in Math. With due dates that can't change, it can ruin

reasons why EOU is wonderful, where instructors know students and can accomodate their abilities.
- ○ AY - Some of memo can be read as "must" or could be "if you're going to take attendance…"
- ○ CB - bigger issue is that a memo issued to faculty mid-year without consult isn't a way to get faculty buy-in. A lot of issues being requested are useful for larger institutions, generating data from eOU that doesn't really mean what we think it means.
- ○ CB - assumption that CAnvas is a neutral tool, but it's not. It also doesn't represent what good teaching is. We have faculty on campus that are more innovative and imaginative than what Canvas is capable of. This memo seems to say that all of that should go away. Not just operational, there are pedagogical implications.
- SW - I hear what you're saying and appreciate it. There's a tendency to cascade an operational requirement into pedagogy, teaching, and quality. It really is just about using the LMS - approve by FS for online environment - and we're extending that to on-campus. If there's language here that is problematic to your input. However, I don't' think an operational requirement to use software the university has purchased (by which we are doing our business) far from teaching quality, activities, pedagogy, etc, -- this is simply about the system we're going to use. We are utilizing it online and extending it to on-campus in its most minimal form.
- SW - students should be able to access syllabus online. They should have reasonable expectation of how they're progressing in the course. You should, as professors, insist on face-to-face meetings. Students have a right to see how they're doing in a course. We have a responsibility to show students how they're doing. If 1st-generation students aren't doing well, we need to know that.
- SW - I can't say that I wholeheartedly agree with premises in final page of document.
- CB - some issues not addressed -
  - ○ Process in the past and how it's been applied
  - ○ Labor issues re: workload
  - ○ I think this is a sweeping memo, concerns academic freedom, and sets us up to do a worse job at teaching.
- CB - Some stuff doesn't make sense in particular teaching contexts. There are so many other ways to have this conversation than to create a rigid set of expectations, etc.
- SW - comments about silos etc aren't connected to teaching. Those are just things we have a difficult time

tracking.
- CB - there's a lot to discuss here to build a healthy teaching environment.
- SW - I think we disagree in number of features you've outlined, and I would be open to looking at this through the lens of faculty. I'd ask that faculty read this through the lens of students and what they have a responsible right to expect. Perhaps we have students and faculty sit down and come to agreement on what it should say without infringing upon
- NK - *reads university policy.* There are things in this memo that are sweeping and should go through process to implement a policy.
- SM - there's room for compromise. Uniqueness of EOU and problems of retention are important. How we get that data is difficult.
- SW - this isn't just about academic affairs. It's about other parts of university supporting what faculty are doing. I'm not convinced that this memo is a policy, it's a set of expectations. This memo is an attempt to take issue of how we deliver our course materials using the LMS.
- NK - we approved an LMS for use, not for mandated use. IF you'd like to mandate the use you'd have to come back and ask for that.
- DB - I think it's important to consider that we have new students and teach them how to use Canvas. I know a lot of faculty tell students that things are on Canvas, but don't cover how to access it. Important to be mindful of what we're delivering, telling students what we're using.
- CB - the converse is that we have opportunities to teach students to maneuver around different technologies they'll encounter outside of EOU.
- CB - memo isn't part of contract, wasn't bargained, and it didn't evolve through shared governance, so what are the consequences of faculty not following it?
- SW - it's what we value. It's everyone's responsibility to make sure the learning environment we've created for students is optimal. I asked for feedback and I'm getting it. I can see where this could come across as too rigid. This is a shared responsibility. MOE is a set of values; we value that students on first day of class know what the planning of activities is, with tentative dates. Students are entitled to us doing our best. I don't' see it as a policy, I see it as a slate of expectations.
- CB - "optimal" isn't static. IT's something we're constantly building together. There are sets of assumptions here I think are overreaching.
- NH - right when this came out, I had a course for 4.5 weeks that was a disaster, and I shifted gears halfway through. Everyone was happy to change. You pay me to

		make that decision and trust my expertise to throw everything out the window and redo a class halfway through. It turned out pretty well; it could've been bad, but it couldn't have been worse than it was. That kind of freedom is precisely the expertise we bring to the class. ● NH - what do students have a right to? I think we're making it up. NOwhere is the student right codified. You trust my judgement. If my evals said "I have no idea how I'm doing in class," then I'd want my dean to come talk to me. Memo struck me and reminded me of academic biodiversity. We want to prepare students for real world, which isn't static, and students need to have good and bad teachers. Their experience should be a little uneven. Give students pliability. The more we cookie cutter student, the more we hurt them. ● SW - that's the disconnect between us. The syllabi should look different. It should have same elements but it should look different. ● NH - so can I continue to teach on-campus courses not on Canvas? Practically speaking? ● BS - no, you're required to be fully online by the first week of class (according to the memo) ● SW - changing course is precisely what I trust you to do. Your dean and the president are trusting you to be prepared on the first day. That you have a syllabus and a schedule for students to see, and if you change you change. ● JKM - issues of academic freedom is more about what we teach then how we present it on Canvas. Issues relevant to academic freedom in my class is how we teach math, which is not prescriptive. ● AY - if SW or deans have feedback from faculty, could you share with subcommittee?	
	Sather stretch		
	Delays	● <mark>Freedom of expression committee moved to Feb</mark> ● <mark>Subcommittee on meeting times moved to Feb</mark>	
Jeff Dense	Constit utional Review Comm	● JD - Change to committee makeup ○ Grievance committee becoming all tenured ○ EPCC change is one rep from each college, as opposed to Ed and Biz sharing a seat ● Big issue - faculty senate distribution ○ 5-5-3-3 format drawn up by Nancy. ○ Doug Briney suggesting 4-4-3-3 format ○ Want equitable representation and that shared gov is valued on campus ● FS makeup	

		○ Re: SCH - colleges are even, but not used to that as an apportionment tool. Usually deal with number of faculty
		○ NK - 5-5-3-3 came from past FS conversation, in an effort to maintain number for subcommittee work.
		○ SM - Doug's take is whether or not we look at number of faculty or SCH/degrees awarded (56% of degrees awarded from COBE).
		○ BS - do we have four colleges or three?
		   ■ Dan Mielke - decision to split made 15-20 years ago. One dean.
		○ JD - if there are four colleges, and colleges should be treated differently, then there should be representation of each college on standing committees.
		○ NH - parsing according to degrees granted is problematic. SCH or faculty # is more appropriate
		○ CB - want to clarify: 5-5-3-3 is most effective. More faculty means more people to appoint to committees. SMT is picking up a seat with PAH move. Biz loses a seat and Ed gains a seat. CASSH would lose a seat in 4-4-3-3.
		○ AY - I support looking at number of faculty. That's who's left to work on any committee, the tenured folks.
		   ■ ==SM moves to recommend Doug Briney's proposal 2 for 4-4-3-3 makeup to CRC for advisement==
		   ■ ==NH seconds==
		   ■ ==Aye - 7 Nay - 6==
		   ■ ==Ayes carry==
		○ JD - this might come back to FS with another vote. Urge senators to bring this issue to constituents for further discussion.	

Jeff Carman	Recommendations	● Additional recommendations? ● CB- Writing faculty are overrepresented in survey and feedback, asking for more classrooms with more computers. We look pretty poor compared to other institutional options students have. Hard to compensate for that even if students bring their own devices. ○ JC - hope is that once we incorporate BYOD classes, that demand for computer lab classes will fall. ● CDC - bring report to Student Affairs ● JC - library has laptop computers for checkout. ● AY - student concern: places to plug devices in. Very few outlets in Loso. ● SM - concerned if laptop requirement is not optional.	

		Studies show laptops can induce dislearning. ● JC - extra tool if instructors want to use it. No requirement to use laptops in class. "Put away your laptops," etc.	
	Next	● Tim Seydel present at next meeting ● EPCC materials at next meeting	
NK	adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 4:57	

Minutes prepared by Michael Sell,
Minutes finalized by Michael Sell
KEY
<mark>Motions + Seconds</mark>
<mark>Motion passes/Vote approval</mark>
<mark>Motion rejected/Vote failed</mark>
<mark>Changes or notifications</mark>