**Faculty Senate Meeting 10/26/10**

**I: Roll Call: Present**

Zenon Zygmont, Michael Freeman, Tad Shannon, Kevin Helppie, Tom Rand (for H. Hughes), Katherine Schmidt, Jason Waite, Cheryl Beaver, Mike LeMaster, Kristen Latham (for P. Poston) David Foster, Doug Smith (for T. Gingerich), David Doellinger, Bob Hautala, Gay Timken, Cheryl Davis, Mark Girod, Tracy Smiles, Gwenda Rice (for M. D-Whitney), Janeanne Rockwell-Kincanon

**II. Call for Corrections to Minutes**

Correction made to 12 October minutes concerning the music proposal. Minutes stipulated a C *average* requirement while in fact the proposal was to require a C *minimum* in required courses for music majors.

Action: Minutes approved with amendment.

**III. President’s Reports**

**Gavin Keulks, Faculty Senate –**

Executive Committee approved slight changes to the master’s degree program in teaching ASL interpreting, which was approved by the senate last year. Over the summer, the faculty identified some refinements to names, credits hours, and course descriptions, which are what the executive committee approved in their last meeting on October 21st. Specifics include the following:

* Program title: from Masters in Teaching Interpreting to Masters in Teaching Interpreting with an Emphasis on Teaching Interpreting
* INT 603 – from 1-3 variable credits to 3-6 variable credits as well as title change from “Thesis” to “Thesis, Professional Project, and/or Field Study”
* INT 615 – from 4 to 3 credits and title change from “Communication Studies for Interpreters” to “Communication for Interpreters”
* INT 618, 670, and 675 – from 4 to 3 credits
* INT 625 – from 4 to 3 credits and title change from “Interpreting as a Practice Profession I” to “Interpreting as a Practice Profession”
* INT 630 – from 4 to 3 credits, title change from “Interpreting as a Practice Profession II” to “Communication in a Practice Profession”; also expanded course description.]

Announced the need for faculty representation on the Bookstore Committee, the Student Media Board and the WOU Finance Information Committee.

**Kent Neely, Provosts’ Council –**

Student enrollment has reached the number of 6233. This is an all-time high number and represents a 10.2% enrollment growth percentage.

Reported on an article in the Oregonian concerning the fact that poverty is on the rise. Also wanted to ensure that rumors were put to rest about any plans to eradicate faculty sabbaticals. Absolutely not the case. Administration recognizes that faculty sabbaticals are crucial to the function of its faculty in its teaching, research, and service. Administration has also begun meeting with Scott Beaver, chair of the union bargaining team, on this issue, as it is part of the contract bargaining agreement. Clarified that no changes have been made to this year’s sabbatical application process. However, the University does need to be prudent about how sabbaticals are accounted for, especially given the possibility of a less friendly legislature and OAR regulations. This includes ensuring that faculty submit required sabbatical reports, and that is why oversights or omissions have been identified to division chairs.

**Staff Senate President’s Report –**

Memorials have been established for Larry Bentley and Dick Webber, two faculty members that have recently passed.

**IV. Old Business**

**Academic Excellence Showcase:** request faculty support for the Academic Excellence Showcase being held May 26th. (See article b.)

Action: Motion made in support of AES.

Action: Motion to support approved.

**C minimum requirement for music majors:** Music department is requesting to implement a C minimum requirement in core classes for music majors. (See article c.)

Question raised about if students can retake courses if they do not earn the necessary grade requirement.

Answer: Yes the courses can be taken over again.

Question raised about how many students this change will affect.

Answer: Only about 5 % of the music majors will be affected. Most students are able to maintain an A or a B in the required courses.

Question raised about if a C- grading would become an F and why simply issuing the student an F isn’t sufficient enough.

Answer: For non-music majors a letter grade of a D would be a sufficient passing grade for LACC requirements but this would not be true for the music majors.

Question raised about how many students that struggle with the necessary courses will eventually make it all the way through the music major program.

Answer: Most students who struggle do make it through the program but often have to retake classes or take a longer amount of time than four years to complete their degree. There is not a large number of students who fit in this category but the music department in concerned with maintaining a certain level of excellence.

Question raised about if there is still a jury used in the music majoring program that the students have to get past in order to graduate.

Answer: Yes this jury is still present and the student will be required to perform at a certain level of standard.

Question raised about if this level and jury are graded areas.

Answer: No these areas are not graded but academics are taken into consideration when in deliberation.

Question raised about if there are any departments at WOU that require above a C- minimum for majors.

Answer: Computer science major requires a C minimum and biology major requires a C average.

Question raised about if there are courses that are not sequence based where the C- wouldn’t be considered struggling and would be an adequate grade.

Answer: The majority of courses that are required for music majors are sequential and most classes would be affected by a low grade. Difficulty in first term almost always means difficulty in the second and third terms.

Action: Motion made to accept the proposal as written.

Action: Motion seconded.

Action: Motion approved.

**V. New Business**

**Proposal, new gerontology major:** The Psychology division is proposing a new major entitled Gerontology, consisting of 36 hours of required courses and 20 hours of elective courses. Seven different departments will contribute to this major and will have components such as business, nursing, psychology, lobbying, etc. Practicum is not a requirement. Courses marked with \* are the new classes being proposed (See article d.) The Psychology division has already received 14 letters in support of the new gerontology major.

Question raised about if the gerontology program would be the only one like it in the state.

Answer: No, there are many similar programs in the state but none are quite like this one. There is a program in Corvallis but this specific program has more long term job opportunities than any other offered.

Question raised about details of the program at Oregon State University.

Answer: OSU offers a family studies major that is not a branch of the psychology department.

Question raised about if conversations concerning this major have been had with the health department because they have their hands full with the nursing majors, etc and might not have the manpower to handle more major requirement courses.

Answer: Yes, conversations have been had with the head of every department that would be involved. As of the first quarter of the major being offered, there are ten students already claiming it. Everyone is hoping that it won’t burden any particular department but as of right now, no one can predict exact numbers of students that will partake in the program.

Question raised about who would teach the courses.

Answer: The program would be housed in the psychology department and there is a need for new teachers.

Question about if the new faculty would also act as advisors.

Answer: If the new teachers are tenure-track, then yes. If not, then possibly, if they wanted to move that direction, it could be done over time.

Question raised about who is necessary to hire.

Answer: Tenured and non tenured faculty would have to be hired.

Will be first item of old business on Nov 9th.

**PEBB Resolution:** Oregon State University passed a resolution concerning having to go through the Public Employee Benefits Board open enrollment every year. There was irritation about having to go through the PEBB open enrollment every year when conflicts arise including travel, sickness, etc. Then, if faculty missed the open enrollment their families’ insurance coverage is removed.

There is discussion about the consideration of just replacing the words OSU with WOU and not necessarily having to completely reword the resolution. Most likely WOU will not be the only campus to take this into consideration because a meeting of faculty senate presidents has already occurred where this same item was discussed. WOU has union representation but it is more locally based and would not potentially cover what a resolution for faculty would. WOU faculty needs a resolution. (See article e.)

Question raised about if this item is passed would that automatically mean WOU has a resolution intact.

Answer: No, because the Faculty Senate does not have the power to do that.

Question raised about if the resolution is accepted, does the Faculty Senate have information about people who have made the said mistakes and fell back on their default coverage.

Answer: There is not information like this yet. It will come out in January.

Question raised about if Faculty Senate knows why not having insurance is the default when a mistake is made during open enrollment.

Answer: Not sure, would have to ask a PEBB member. Speculation about if saving money is behind this. For the employee, their default is the insurance they had before. It’s for their families that the default is no coverage.

Clarification about if this will become a voting item and will it get to PEBB board.

Answer: Item is best handled by formal vote. Senate president will send to PEBB board. Will amend the resolution as needed, either modifying OSU resolution or crafting our own.

Will be second item of old business on Nov 9th.

**VI. Interinstitutional faculty senate report**

Voiced concerns about flat performance and wants to ensure faculty support across campus. Asked to get IFS and Reps to go back to faculty and request items of support (not necessarily compensation but guidelines). Request made to take this back to departments and brainstorm faculty support guidelines and principles and solicit things such as maintaining sabbatical guidelines.

Question raised about if Joel Alexander could bring a handout with some of the feedback he got to the last November meeting (Nov 23) to share with the rest of the Faculty Senate.

Answer: Yes, he will do that.

**VII. Committee Reports**

None.

**VIII. Meeting Adjourned**