

Faculty Senate Minutes September 18, 2018

HL 107

Primarily paperless, wou.edu/facultysenate

13:30 -15:00

Planning Session

1. Call to order: 13:30
2. Call of the roll (by circulation of sign-in sheet)
Stewart Baker, Earlene Camarillo, Melissa Cannon, Kate Connolly, Ben Coté, Camila Gabaldon, Leigh Graziano, Scott Grim, Karen Haberman, Mary Harden, Ryan Hickerson, Ken Carano, Kim Jensen, Tom Kelly, Gavin Keulks, Melanie Landon-Hayes, Leanne Merrill, Matt Nabity, John Leadley, Brent Redpath, Cindy Ryan, Adele Schepige, Tad Shannon, Emily Vala-Haynes, Mark VanSteeter, Greg Zobel
3. Corrections to and approval of previous meeting's minutes
Corrections to and approval of previous meeting's minutes will happen at regular senate session scheduled for 9 October 2018
4. BA/BS discussion
 - 4.1. Proposal regarding BA/BS and other curriculum matters (Shaun Huston and Breeann Flesch)
 - This proposal is based on conversations with Erin Baumgartner around the implementation of Gen Ed, and larger issues with degree programs and curriculum that created uncertainty for that implementation.
 - Macro-level changes have happened on campus, but these can cause issues for programs which are based on potentially outdated requirements. We want to give programs the flexibility to make changes needed--not just for the BA/BS, but to respond to other macro-level changes on an ongoing basis.
 - The curriculum process is also sometimes burdensome, and there is sometimes resistance to going through it for all changes.
 - Enforcement of the 90-credit limit places restrictions on adaptations that can be made by programs, due to the potential for adaptations to move programs above the 90-credit limit.

- The Gen Ed groups have heard a lot of concerns about languages and the shrinking of programs due to the 90-credit limit, and this proposal is an attempt to address those concerns.

Discussion about this proposal

- **Comment:** Modern Languages and DSPS met with Rob Winningham this morning, and he may have comments to add.
- **Rob Winningham:** Sharing parameters from Academic Affairs for the decision-making process going forward, and I want to share that. One thing to reiterate is that the 30-60-90 structure is very important. If we want to attract transfer students, we need to be able to stick to that 90-credit program limit to remain transfer-friendly. There is a feeling that if we don't stick to this ourselves, the state will require us to do it. One thing to keep in mind with 30-60-90 that will free you up to be creative, is that there only needs to be **one pathway** that fits into the 90-credit option. For example, a program can have a 90-credit version and another option, more comprehensive, which allows students to do more. There is also room for 16-18 credits in many cases, which could be filled in by the program with steps toward a minor, a language, high-impact practices, etc. We do need to be able to move forward with a valid curriculum for the next year. If your program has more than 90 credits, that can be submitted with a rationale--for example, accreditation or other. These will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- **Question:** Is there currently a BA/BS proposal on the table?
- **Chair:** Not currently. One was tabled until November.
- **Question:** Is this proposal meant to replace the prior proposal, or supplement or amend it?
- **Breann Flesch:** This is a superset of the other proposal, so it would replace it.
- **Shaun Huston:** There's not a whole lot that's different in both proposals.
- **Question:** This has accommodated the NSM complaint that BA would be the de facto normal, and programs now self-identify. ASL and ML questions are with a soft 90 limit. Is that right? Is there any other new element?
- **Shaun Huston:** Also, the idea that programs would be encouraged to incorporate languages into the program's 90 credits. If you're a program and are submitting changes to the curriculum process to meet larger changes, then that should be all you need to submit when making a change, rather than additional rationale. (e.g. "We're doing this to address curriculum changes. We will assess as we assess.")
- **Question:** Regarding Rob's comments, one interpretation might be that a program offering both a BA and BS, if the BA went to 108 credits and add a language, but the BS met 90 credits, that would be okay. Right?

- **Rob Winningham:** If the program supports that and believes it would be best for their students, I would support that. If you have one pathway that is 90 credits or fewer, then the other can be more expansive if there's a good reason. However, I still am concerned that when we've been doing this we've required two years of foreign language with a BA, and the numbers have been going down. It's difficult to imagine it being sustainable, but I'm deferential to the academic programs to make those decisions.
- **Comment:** There is some concern that even if a program wants to require one to three years of language within a program, there might not be a lot of motivation to add a language into their programs-- especially given the focus on graduation rates in under 4 years.
- **Chair:** This document, in my opinion, has a more faculty focus and gives people more time to respond and react than the prior proposal.
- **Question:** Where did the terms "Educational Breadth" and "Educational Specialization" come from and why are they applied the way they are?
- **Shaun Huston:** Back when we began this, I spent time trying to figure out why separate BA and BS options existed (in general, not just here at WOU) and read up on the history. My understanding is that BA was the original Bachelor's, which was intended to give people a well-rounded education. When the sciences developed further specializations, the BS was created to respond to that. The other thing reflected here is that whether you got a BA or BS was largely a function of the program of study you chose, and not two totally different degree types with different credit requirements. It is also broadly consistent with the Gen Ed task force's findings on what NW Accreditors look for, minus the language around qualitative and quantitative requirements.
- **Question:** Are you confident that this language would be accepted by accreditors?
- **Shaun Huston:** I'm not qualified to say that, but think it's broadly consistent. Based on review of other institutions, it seems to be the program that makes the decision over what counts towards a BA or BS.
- **Comment:** The idea of specialization is interesting because our field (DSPS) it's extremely specialized, so it seems odd to consider that a BA. The other thing is that Northwest's web page doesn't seem to have language similar to this document.
- **Erin Baumgartner:** <http://www.nwccu.org/tools-resources/glossary/> has the following definitions:
Bachelor of Arts (B.A.), Bachelor of Science (B.S.). An undergraduate degree normally representing about four years (120 semester or 180 quarter units) of college study, or its equivalent in depth and quality of learning experience. The B.A.

degree implies a more liberal education orientation and the B.S. degree implies a more applied educational orientation.

These were the basis for our definitions, and then we on the task force discussed them and arrived at our own. We ran our definitions by Sue Monahan, and our review suggests that we would not run into problems with accreditors.

- **Comment:** Some Social Science faculty met to talk about the strategic plan and mission of the university to train global citizens. There are many paths to do that, but we had a sense that some familiarity with a second language is important to help students see the world and themselves in a very different way. We support proposals that leave the BA/BS decision at the program level, but want to leave a way to ensure that what we think is happening (that students come to us with language proficiency) is actually happening. So a proficiency in the first year of about twelve hours would be our preference.
- **Comment:** I believe language is a life skill and insight that can't be received in other ways. I would like to see a one-year language requirement that's built into Gen Ed so all students get that exposure. Even without fluency, exposure can have a big impact.
- **Comment:** With regards to the idea of a soft limit, what about 72-86-22? [as an alternative to 60-30-90]
- **Rob Winningham:** If it were included, it seems that the AAOT would satisfy that. However, note that the gen ed has already been approved and did not include a language, so that would need to be changed.
- **Breann Flesch:** We want programs to have autonomy. We don't want them to have to offer their students (e.g.) Math 111 if they don't think it's needed. Even if that involves adding languages, or not adding languages, that should be the option. We need to give our faculty the trust to make their own options about their programs.
- **Comment:** I would favour the language of applied and liberal[?] over the language of breadth and specialization in this proposal.
- **Comment:** I agree.
- **Shaun Huston:** That's another way the distinction has been made over time. We should make sure we're not getting too caught up on policing each other, but giving programs guidelines on making choices. We hope the language in our proposal gives that guidance to programs as they make decisions about their own programs.
- **Greg Zobel:** It seems clear that there is no agreed-upon definitions, which makes it so difficult to agree on this. This is an early document which sets forth some of those definitions, but an early draft that could be changed. However, it does provide cover and shared language when dealing with accreditation. To me, this kind of conversation requires time and discussion, and we need definitions we can all agree on for those further discussions.

- **Question:** What times of discussions are you thinking of for revising the Gen Ed or other things? Are these discussions really going to happen?
- **Greg Zobel:** I would like to see the proposal done as it is (with changes for liberal/applied) and put forward, because if we don't do this as faculty then administration will do it for us, and this is the most reasonable pliable pathway I have seen. The only complaints I have heard so far about this is the liberal/applied language and the numbers of credits. For now, there is an urgency to have a shared document, instead of having this
- **Comment:** From the Humanities, point four (the 90 credit cap) is the most significant point. I am very in favour of the 90 credits being a 'norm' rather than a strict requirement, and think the other humanities faculty would be as well. However, the "at least initially" part in this sentences is a cause for concern for Humanities, because it suggests that the 90 credits will expire. Wording is very significant for me.
- **Comment:** A third controversial topic is the idea of including a year of language in gen ed.
- **Breeann Flesch:** Gen Ed has worked two years on putting together a cohesive program aligned to learning outcomes and admissions, and being asked to put 12 credits of language into that right now, after all that, is dismissive of our efforts. If people want to take 12 credits out of the electives, that would be fine, but the gen ed--as a cohesive program--has already passed faculty senate at this point.
- **Comment:** BA/BS was considered through other channels than Gen Ed, and languages seemed to be left out.
- **Breeann Flesch:** There was a humanities rep on the Gen Ed task force, and it was made clear that BA/BS and languages were separate altogether, so people on the committee did know this. While I respect this discussion now about the importance of languages, when language came up in the Gen Ed task force, which it did, the people on the Gen Ed task force did not feel the same way.
- **Rob Winningham:** There seems to be a perception that administration doesn't value language, but I don't think that's true. I want to provide resources to support WOU as a liberal education institution. I would like the language faculty to take the time to market their programs, internally and externally. Academic Affairs would be happy to provide funding for these kind of proposals. The current Gen Ed doesn't have to be the current Gen Ed for the next thirty years. We welcome all faculty to come up with new proposals in the future for revisiting Gen Ed.
- **Breeann Flesch:** I hope that does happen, and that the program does changes. With Gen Ed being passed by Faculty Senate, we did build in assessment for the ground up. So there may not even need to be a new task force, if that assessment data makes the process easier.

- **Question:** Provost, would your office support implementing the 90 credits as a "norm"?
- **Rob Winningham:** Yes, I do think so, at least for the upcoming year, since it does not seem feasible to meet 90 credits. I can't speak for future provosts, though. I want to begin with the assumption that faculty know what needs to be in their program, that they will create a program that attracts students, and that they have students' best interests in mind.
- **Greg Zobel:** We could build in language that things will be revisited in (e.g.) 2021. With the passage of time and these other options on the board, we could then take stock of languages and how they've grown and adjust accordingly. Building this into the proposal could make for more mindful changes.
- **Question:** The gen ed is still in implementation. Would there be room to make the case that languages could be something other than integrative learning?
- **Breann Flesch:** Nobody's blocking languages out of categories other than the integrative learning, if they want to make the case for it. I hope that with a 90 credit norm and no minor, that people can see the room to add languages to their program. We can use all these changes as an opportunity to invigorate the language departments, if we value them. Given that there are few people taking languages outside of programs. With the lack of required minors, there is so much space to add languages or other things we value and have students still graduate in time.
- **Shaun Huston:** Some of our problems in this conversation have to do with silos. When we make changes, we sometimes have trouble thinking about faculty in other programs. We're not used to having conversations about the things faculty in other programs can offer to students in your own program.
- **Comment:** Modern Language faculty are very willing to work with programs and have discussions about current course offerings to meet their needs, or that can be developed to do so. We hope that by having students being more invested in languages (in the future), we could even grow the language program by offering more languages that are of strategic interest to our students.
- **Comment:** In moving to a 30/60/90 model, the student gets to decide on those 30 credits. As an advisor in CS, I tend to suggest business or math classes by default. I don't think these are necessarily the best options, and would love to have more resources about languages or other options, so that I can suggest better things to students based on their interests and their plans, rather than the default.
- **Greg Zobel:** I'd be happy to invite languages to present a 5-10 minute informational presentation at a future faculty senate meeting. It sounds like the three major points of contention with this particular proposal are: Revisit date; Change to liberal/applied language;

possible language proposal from Social Sciences (TBD based on further discussion). Has the discussion satisfied people beyond those points?

- **Comment:** It's difficult for social sciences faculty, since we have not had a formal meeting yet this year.
- **Question:** Could we have a faculty senate forum for discussions that would happen outside of real time without the need to add meetings. I would be willing to set up the Moodle shell for this.
- **Comment:** Students consider BS easier (1 math and 1 CS) than a BA (2 years of languages) which is why they take it so much. It's a problem for Education to add additional language or math/cs to programs, which is a built-in imbalance that should be addressed when we talk about why languages are in decline, nationally.
- **Comment:** I completely disagree that this was the takeaway from the BA/BS task force.

5. Discussion of any other senate business planned for FY 18-19

- **Greg Zobel:** We have the committee on committees, and there will be one or two workshops about Robert's Rules so that things operate more smoothly. (We will invite people from Staff and Student senate as well.) Are there any other issues that people want to see on the radar for the coming year?
- **Question:** Is there a process for Committee on Committees?
- **Greg Zobel:** We need to review the bylaws before talking about this.
- **Comment:** I want to thank Breann and Shaun for revising the proposal, and to Faculty Senate for having this discussion. It was much more productive.

6. Adjourned at 14:43.