

EOU FACULTY SENATE
3-20-18
INLOW 201

Senators:

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

Guests: Luke Aldrich, Sarah Witte, Heather Cashell, Sally Mielke, Allen Evans, Peter Geisinger, Chris Burford, Lacy Carpillo, Tom Insko, Nate Lowe,

NK	Call to Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meeting called to order at 3:16 PM 	
NK	Changes to Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None 	
NK	Draft Constitution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● UC sent back Articles 2, 4, 5, which they approve. ● We can take action on those how we choose. ● CRC will meet with President's office in 2 weeks to fine tune draft <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CB - UC did or did not officially vote down draft we approved? ○ NK - they voted down our draft ○ CB - UC has approved some articles in constitution ● NK - Procedurally we don't have to vote today. It might 	

		<p>make sense to wait instead of ping pong-ing back and forth. Parts of draft are the same as when we looked at it last time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - If we're ok with it, we can let the CRC get together one more time, get finalized draft that has everything in it that needs to be in it, and draft something that will make it past both bodies. 	
NK	OPM Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - We haven't had a chance to talk about OPM ● CB - We put out a call on East Talk, emailed faculty to get as many opinions as possible. People could submit comments on paper anonymously. ● CB - We ended up with an enormous amount of information. Paper/electronic copy is what we've gathered. ● CB - compiled request for information into 5 categories. We started with 40 pages and pared it down to 5. Committee will create an annotated bibliography of resources forwarded to us. ● CB - Potential survey to campus community following review of materials. Potential to have senate take an official position in the future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AY - Are questions addressed on Q&A EOU website not included in this? ○ CB - Not necessarily. There may be some overlap. ● CB - There may be other sets of information that are already out there that we should include in a bibliography. This document addresses our administration directly. What would be the key issues we want to address? ● SW - What would be some of the premises upon which FS would take a position? ● CB - This could be a monumental change w/in the university. Faculty have a primary role and responsibility to academics. We need to have all the information so that we can weigh in on whether this is a good thing for our programs and our students. It's an academic view. We've heard bits of information in different places; what things could look like, what they won't look like, and it's hard to be in control of the conversation with so many generalities. Questions of scalability of faculty; Pearson gives us a model how it's been done with other institutions, but admin says those issues would remain in-house. ● CB - We don't 'have a strong sense if there are particular programs that will be more involved in a partnership. What would this look like for Gen Ed? For Math? For service courses? I'd like to hear from admin what this would look like. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NH - I've looked at this in-depth. This isn't quite in Pearson's wheelhouse. They've traditionally taken outsourced for-profit programs (large-scale, mostly professional degrees). These programs benefit the universities. Pearson doesn't come to schools our size, where primary faculty teach online and on campus. I'm not entirely sure what they're interest is because they're making lots of money other places. But Ocean County College (NJ) for instance took 2 years to figure out it wasn't producing the numbers they wanted. They didn't have success scaling-up online, they're pretty close to us. ● NH - Almost everyone would agree that we should outsource marketing; it's hard to do well. Pearson spent lots of time talking about using Google to target people in the search. If we had someone helping with marketing, give them money up front, and we don't give away 50-80% of tuition dollars. See what happens within a year or 18 months. There are more modest steps we can take. It feels like publicly there is discourse about due diligence but it feels more like "the train has left the station." ● TI - If anyone is saying that, they're not being truthful. ● NH - Attachment for-profit education to a public state university is deeply unethical, especially since students have no idea that it's going on. Our students won't know. ● CB - We understand these same practices came under scrutiny within the for-profit education industry. 36 million adults are really pass-throughs for federal funding that Pearson has their eye on. These companies are readjusting themselves to get into public education where the risk for them is less; the risk is on us. What accountability does Pearson have in this new context? ● NH - EOU gets paid if students graduate, Pearson gets paid no matter what. ● CB - We are at the lowest end of the enrollment threshold that Pearson seeks. How do we hang ourselves out on the line when for-profit ed is pulling the same things on students? How do we ensure there are safeguards in place? 60% of first-year students take remedial/developmental classes on campus. We discourage them from taking online courses. When private company has incentive to get students into online classes, our risk goes way up. ● SW - Can you talk more about transfer population? Students with some community college adn may be a working adult? ● CB - We still struggle with many community college transfers moving to campus or online and ought to be directed to f2f classes. Once you engage PEaron in this process, will students who otherwise would've enrolled in an on-campus classes be encouraged into online classes 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>they shouldn't be taking?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● SW - Students do succeed at other places. Are you suggesting that EOU students are too much like Ocean County students?● TI - Georgia St released study of computer science students, showing online students do better than on-campus and they didn't cannibalize their on-campus community. Online is primarily adult learners.● CB - Yes, there are adult learners who can succeed in college. But that's not the population that meets our admissions threshold. How do you prepare as an institution for the possibility of students who can't do those things online? Higher admit standards?● TI - We have our current admission standards and we do a good job. Are you suggesting we're failing our online students?● CB - The way we operate with regional centers, students are coming from locations where they could access f2f classes, when students would be better off. We're talking about a modality that's better designed for students who can already function online. We want 8-10,000 more people online, dealing with a company that wants those people there, how do we address what's best for students. What incentive does Pearson have to encourage a lower-performing student to go to a local community college?● TI - Getting in the door is where the cost is. Pearson is paid by students taking classes through us. They have no incentive in not seeing students succeed. They look to us to set our admissions standards. The money to attract a new student is much more than it costs to retain a student.● SC - It's not a difference between Pearson not wanting students to succeed, but that they don't care whether or not they succeed. We can see that in their past practices by recruiting people who shouldn't have been placed in certain programs. Pearson can still make money from a student taking one year of classes, racking up debt, and falling out.● SC - There are things that bothered me in the presentation. David VdP showed graph of funding increases from non-traditional students, should've shown the differences in total number.● Burford - What we're doing talking about this is expressing concerns, and putting us on notice when negotiating a contract. We're not going to make a deal that doesn't serve our best interests. If we can't get the promise we want, we don't do the deal.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ BS - Who will negotiate this? Who is at the table making the contract.	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TI - Ultimately me, and ultimately the board will have to make the decision. Determining what we would consider proprietary/non-proprietary. ○ BS - Who's there making the call on that language? ○ TI - That depends on Pearson's process and what I find out from them. As I start seeing more details, I can decide who to involve and who not to involve. I mean it when I say that getting this feedback is valuable because I'm using it, contemplating it going forward. ● CB - This points very clearly to the importance of having faculty involved throughout the process and on this team. Who on this team has taught an online class? How long ago? What discipline? Who's worked with adult learners? Faculty have expertise in these areas. This isn't a discussion that can only be had at the cabinet level. ● AY - I've been talking with colleagues, and asking them if there's anything positive from this. The one thing they say is the marketing component of this is positive. People feel that things aren't as clear as they should be is because they don't understand why some other options were tossed out. Why OPM when other options might cost similarly. Most faculty I spoke to agreed marketing and 24/7 IT support were great ideas. Faculty spoke of concerns of loss of quality across EOU. It would be a shame if those qualities of EOU were lost because we're trying to ramp things up. ● NH - Pearson presented advising like it was a favor for us, but it's a big part of what we do, and we want to do it. It speaks to the fact Pearson usually deals with really big schools. If you're under pressure to ramp up, the scalability involves adjuncts. And when an adjunct faculty wants to use a Pearson module, all the answers are online, every class, everywhere. ● AY - It's our habit to back up everything with information, not an unwillingness to change. It's in our nature to ask questions and be concerned. ● TI - Re: fee for services. Downside is what I'm worried about. The state may end up going over the next biennium. How do you plot a path forward where we take some bold actions to distinguish ourselves as an institution? When I think about bold investments, I worry about the downside. Does an OPM agreement limit the downside? ● CB - Re: EOU's rural designation. Are we squandering an opportunity to develop capacity of our region by creating more professional level jobs, keeping money in the community, etc. It's hard to imagine sending money that's needed in the region to this large educational corporation. 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Was there any consideration of what our niche is in being an economic driver, doing this work in-house and doing it well?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ TI - If there's an option to drive a job locally, that's what I want to do. We create a model that drives as much to La Grande or the region, that's my motivation. That doesn't mean to me that we would never consider someone outside of here because there's the possibility of growing more local employment while leveraging outside sources.● CB - If marketing were it, that seems like the most valuable piece. I don't have any interest in getting instructional tech from Pearson. What is the value added of anything Pearson offers beyond the initial marketing?● LM - My question is how Pearson approaches ESOL classes if they aren't f2f? Currently, all our undergrad classes are f2f.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ NK - Does education have to deal with different departments across states? Is scaling up difficult because there are state-level differences?○ LM - There could be.○ SW - COE had a recent conversation revealing there are no differences between states when going with a national accreditor.● CB - We don't have a lot of details. Sarah, could you talk about how you picture this?● SW - Pearson came to talk to programs that have online degrees. They've produced Program Readiness Assessments, which has been shared with deans, who will share with programs after spring break. We're only now discovering what is possible in different programs. What would EOU's scalability look like? What approaches do we need based on certain programs? What are thresholds that are different program by program? EOU is in full control of the details.● SC - Rob told us that if we contract with them they won't pick and choose which programs they work with. Pearson will be all or none.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ SW - EOU is looking for a niche, and that's why Pearson is looking at us; undergrad education remains a niche.● CB - Can you share details about Pearson's "learning coaches"?<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ TI - There is some info they've provided us re: student success coaching that we need more details about.○ CB - Students need to know that too. They're worried about a third party engaging in their education.	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MO - Western Governors had a model with multiple mentors. ○ ES - I asked about that. Pearson said they'll be recruiting students and students will know they'll be in the high-touch cohort. ○ CB - So they will know they're involved with Pearson employees? ○ ES - Yes. ○ NH - We could stipulate that in contract. Past examples show students being contacted and they don't know the person is from Pearson. ○ ES - Pearson would have EOU people. They become a partner with EOU, so they abide by FERPA laws. ● AY - Pearson was shocked that faculty email students with questions on a frequent basis. It would be great if we could piecemeal student support services. Students wouldn't be able to opt-out of support. How much is a sales pitch from Pearson and how much is how it's done? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TI - How we're handling this evaluation with Pearson is different from what they're used to. ● CB - We're talking a lot about a duplication of services. Their model makes sense for big schools. But our classes are so small that most of us know who most of our students are. Are we sending money away for services that aren't really meaningful? ● SW - If I were putting up millions of dollars to market an institution, I'd want some toe-hold in protecting my investment. ● CB - I don't the largest education corporation in the world thinking of students only as investments they're protecting. Are there no revenue sharing models with marketing firms? They don't have their grip in the education but there still is some accountability. ● TI - Not that I'm aware of, in terms of just marketing. No one's ever approached us suggesting that, other than an OPM approach. ● CB - So we haven't approached any marketing firms asking if that would be a possibility? ● TI - I have not. I doubt Tim [Seydel] has. The structure of that outcome of revenue sharing is essentially a nuance of fee-for-service. ● TI - I urge us to be thinking about what things do we need to do to set ourselves apart and move us down the path to achieve strategic outcomes? Maybe there are components of this that work with an OPM. It's not going to get easier out there. OSU and what they're doing, they're moving aggressively to grow. ● CB - Are we really using the regional centers to the best of our ability? How do we distinguish the regional centers 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>and what they do compared to OSU and competing with them?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TI - I think forcing ourselves to be competitive is good, and higher ed has to change with the times and respond to needs. We all have different visions of that. There is political pressure to grow OSU Cascades. They have brand and clout. We have taken huge strides to position ourselves differently in Salem. ● CB - Who is our target market in that environment? Who is the niche that we're positional ourselves to be in? How does partnering with OPM connect to that? ● TI - OSU has no niche in online over us, and when we rested they moved into that marketplace. How you get in front of those who are looking to purchase your degree. That's what OSU has done regionally. We're going to leverage our rural values. We're a small institution and how will we better provide those elements we've designated crucial. ● SC - Because we are small we have professors teaching classes. OSU doesn't do that. This convinces parents and students to come here. A partnership with OPM forces staffing with graduates and adjuncts, and i have no distinguishing qualities. 80% of Univ. presidents say their goals is to grow robust online programs, and that worries me. ● BS - What's the overall end goal? ● TI - I believe that the status quo will not work. The challenges the state brings ot higher ed, for us to have control over our own destiny, we have to do something meaningful, and that means grow. This campus is sized to feel like a small, private school of 2000-2500 students. That allows us to retain our small feel. From the online side it opens up keeping us connected to what's emerging in the education marketplace. Schools that have relied on organic grown (HS grads) are now going through what we're going through. Online offers an attractive options. ● MS - If status quo has to change, what if we don't do this OPM partnership? ● TI - If it's not an OPM we will identify something else. My goal is to limit the downside, and an OPM option is, right now, the best potential way to limit the downside. ● CB - There was a time where online classes weren't allowed in-load. It would've created iniquity among students. How do we not go back into the model where they're treating online students to funnel income into on-campus programs? I don't think that's ethical; giving access to one student to fund a different experience for others. ● NK - We really appreciate the president attending this 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TI - No recommendation will be made before BOT meeting in April. ● CB - We have three FS meetings before BOT meeting in May, so we need information back soon. 	
NK	Good of the order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SC - 3 companies have come in with new technologies in STM. ● TI - Governor Brown will be here in late April. Board of Forestry coming in as well, re: construction of new fieldhouse. 	
NK	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 4:51	

Minutes prepared by Michael Sell, 3/20/18

Minutes finalized by Michael Sell 3/28/18

KEY

Motions + Seconds

Motion passes/Vote approval

Motion rejected/Vote failed

Changes or notifications