

Members' Present: G. Hustrulid, B. Idsardi, C. Castillo-Garsow, C. Tyllia, D. Ayers, V. Taroudaki, K. Evans, L. Reeves, C. Hazelbaker, C. Manikoth, M. apRoberts-Warren, S. Steiner, D. Trella, D. Syphers

University Officials: C. Jensen, A. Swenson, T. Jones, J. Coomes

1. The meeting was called to order by G. Hustrulid at 3:10 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 1, 2025. *Hearing no objections, the minutes are approved.*

3. Chair's Report. G. Hustrulid reported: a. the BOT meeting was a bit spicy and what's happening is there is a lot of pressure for us to self-manage specifically low-enrolled, low graduating programs, and there was a lot of frustration directed at faculty. They were kind of alluding to the fact that faculty are resisting this type of big change, even though this team and faculty want to be accountable for where we stand at this institution. The FO Executive Team and members of PRC realized that our PRD policy is nebulous and could harm faculty and programs because it is unclear. They want to revise the policy and create something new that would serve us and create clarity. Art has been in the PRD process 3 times in the last 11 years, and it is on a whim, and we don't want whims to happen to us. The goal right now is to create an intensive timeline to look at new policy for PRC and PRD. Policy revision is extremely important and while it is hard looking at all the legal ease, understanding it, and seeing how it will impact things while other times it is really easy. It is important looking at policy because of what we are seeing in the PRD process. What is locked in can actually do harm in some ways or can prevent things from occurring that really need to occur. She would like to ask everyone as we start voting through policies, read them and if you have questions ask the proper channels. We do have CourseLeaf which we'll be able to utilize more effectively. The first part is looking at PRC. She spoke with the provost during the break, and he mentioned the clock started on November 12, 2025. K. Evans stated she would like to address the last BOT meeting. She was one of the people in attendance and she felt the Board was nasty and offensive. The vitriol and hatred towards faculty is so apparent and she isn't sure where it is coming from. Their attitude was faculty are unwilling to change, and they made a statement that we haven't done any program review at all. We've been doing program review for years; it's called banking programs which she did point out to them. The Board doesn't understand how the university runs, and it's been a problem for a long time with some of the Board members. As faculty, we should push back, and we need to get our policies revised. She had a conversation with M. Baca, and he mentioned we have a healthy amount of reserves and are not in financial crisis so there shouldn't be an urgency to cut programs. L. Reeves stated we need to remind the Board that faculty gave a lot and gave up our faculty development money; we did everything we could to save this university, because we love the university, we love the community, and the students. I think the Board doesn't understand how deeply committed we are to this institution. If someone does write a letter, please remind them what faculty have done to help and save the university over the years. G. Hustrulid stated what she wants to talk to at least two Board members and see where the pressure is, because the shift happened very abruptly from the previous Board meeting to this Board meeting. Something has changed and she wants to gather information to find out where

that pressure is coming from. Ten years ago, we had 12,500 students so the idea of PRD back then was unheard of because we were growing exponentially and needed more hires. The Board did say they were going to respond to K. Evans and she would follow up on that. C. Castillo-Garsow stated he has never seen Board members so emotional in his life, they were angry and afraid. In his experience, when people are feeling overwhelmed, they make these kinds of decisions. If we can find ways to alleviate their fears, then we can make an impact by changing things for the better. He agrees with what K. Evans said they are afraid that the university won't be here in 10 years. They aren't afraid of the current financial issues, but they are afraid if enrollment trends will keep going down. Because it is emotional, they are trying to resolve the feeling of fear. G. Hustrulid stated the Board is very supportive of the Faculty Organization. Know some of the Board members are supportive for us and others it was very clear that there was anger and fear behind that. She gave them all the history of what we have done about the pay cuts during COVID, etc. They need to know if this push is money driven, program driven, student driven, etc.

4. ASEWU Update. C. Jensen reported: today they had their first meeting. The meetings this quarter will be on Mondays from 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. in PUB 207J. Today they opened the hiring for 3 positions; the Senator for the College of Professional Program, the Senator for the College of Science, Technology, Technology, and Mathematics; and the Superior Court Associate Justice. The applications are open until January 20, 2026, at 5:00 and the applications can be found on the ASEWU website: <https://inside.ewu.edu/asewu/asewu-committee-application-2/> G. Hustrulid stated the Board decided not to go with the new meal plan after information they received from students. C. Jensen stated the feedback wasn't good at all. They feel the meal plan idea is good, but it needs to be worked on.

5. Administrative Report. J. Coomes reported: the new Compliance Manager, E. Avecilla, will be key person working on compliance issues on campus. A. Swenson are trying to get CPAC through because they are determined that the catalog will get out by May 15th.

6. Brief Reports. a. Academic Committee for Innovation and Technology. C. Manikoth reported: they had to cancel their last meeting but on the agenda for the next meeting is to figure out how to approach the accessibility certification for Title 2 compliance. **b. Academic Program Approval Committee. T. Jones reported:** we have not met since the last meeting. On the agenda for the next meeting is how to support our outside accredited programs. They are working on the mid cycle review especially the section for assessment. **c. Faculty Values Committee. D. Syphers reported:** they held their first meeting and chose co-chairs; J. Ellsworth and D. Syphers. The biggest task is the evaluation of Deans/Associate Deans. They have a meeting on Friday with the provost. They decided to start with the dean evaluations. They are wanting to make sure those will be taken seriously and able to send out a message to all faculty. The provost asked to be evaluated this year as well. They will need to ask for an exception from Senate in order to add his evaluation. **d. General Education Committee. M. apRoberts-Warren reported:** they have a couple of issues that was brought to GEC from Rules. A Rules member mentioned there was an issue in Degree Works, e.g. there was one particular Film class that looked like it had to be taken as the only option for the Arts and Humanities BACR. Co-chair J. Hyde reached out to Degree Audit to make them aware and to investigate the

issue. They informed us they've adjusted and relabeled the Arts and Humanities BACR to have options next to each option that completes a section. Hopefully that helps with issues moving forward. The other issue that rules members brought up was that there was confusion among students that a lecture and lab course would satisfy the two-course requirement and there was a request for us to consider moving to credit-based requirements instead of course-based requirements. When she brought that up to GEC someone informed her that we do have a credit-based requirement already for our BACRs courses. It is a requirement of 6 to 10 credits in each BACR category which can only be satisfied with just one lecture/lab course, and they must take two separate courses. This week they will be voting to update the submission form for CIM for GE BACR courses. Later this week they will be sending out a message to all chairs to make sure they know they need to use the GEC rubrics for all SLOs. If they don't use that form, they won't get the information they need to access the courses. **e. Global Programs Academic Committee.** **V. Taroudaki reported:** they have not met since the last time. They will meet tomorrow to discuss the Ortiz Scholarship. **f. Graduate Affairs Council.** **D. Ayers reported:** they did not meet since the last Rules meeting. There are a couple of policies in our queue we'll talk about next week around attendance and registration. S. Eubank should have their CPAC duties doled out. E. Avecilla, the new Compliance Manager, will be attending the next meeting to introduce herself. **g. Program Review Committee.** **D. Trella reported:** at the meeting prior to the break, the feedback from the Board suggested that we move forward with the 10-5 initiative. The next step will be reaching out to the programs. There is one they can push through because they are in agreement with that decision. They are also working with the provost to get access to PAMCAM data so the programs can advocate for themselves. At the next meeting they will be figuring out what data they will use for Quantitative and Qualitative data. As a committee they elected to work on clarifying the schedule for PRC moving forward, how programs will be notified, streamlining the process in terms of rubrics they will provide to programs, questions they anticipate having to answer, and data that they will have access to. They will streamline the process to make it easy for programs so no one will be spending weeks compiling information for PRC. They are also working on a calendar and streamlining the process.

7. Council Elections/Selections/Confirmations: <i>Faculty Values Committee</i> – O. Özturgut, Education. Hearing no objections it is approved to go to Senate on 1/12/26

8. Information Item. a. Mid-Cycle Review Self-Study. J. Coomes and T. Jones presented a PowerPoint about the accreditation Mid-Cycle Self-Study report. The presentation can be viewed at:

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1hq9O7RmwGTBSGDMaqr66p1Bx7C-GMFaF/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=101630062858166648088&rtpof=true&sd=true>

b. AP 303-24 Grading, Grade Changes, and Grade Appeals; 1-3 & 1-4 Pass/Fail. G. Hustrulid stated there's no criteria or standard that forbids Pass/Fail grading, but it could cause problems with accreditation. Most universities keep A – F grading as the default and use Pass/Fail in limited, well-defined ways. B. Idsardi stated his biggest concern with the changes, especially thinking about General Education, is if you have a class that is Pass/Fail and another as A – F grading, students might choose the Pass/Fail if it meets a graduation requirement

regardless of the topic or content. He stated he is in favor of the change to 20% but they should let programs decide. Maybe there are major or minor requirements that are appropriate for Pass/Fail, but having the BACR and university graduation requirements be Pass/Fail seems like it would inevitably lead to competition for students with Pass/Fail vs. A – F traditional grading. J. Coomes stated they are taking away the listing of the grades. D. Syphers stated he looked at the NWCCU standards and there isn't anything in there about accreditation, so to B. Idsardi's point there is already competition, because in some disciplines, the median course grade is an A, others it is a B, and in some it's a C. Students already choose classes based on that, and the point of a Pass/Fail would be the A, the B, and the C are all the same. Every discipline thinks their own grading scheme is perfect. There are disciplines that think other disciplines grade too hard, and other disciplines who think that some disciplines grade too easy. This would help get around some of that, but it isn't a blanket thing that would be implemented. It would be course by course and programs would have to go through the CPAC process. There currently isn't any criteria that our current Pass/Fail courses satisfy. B. Idsardi asked if there are any courses with Pass/Fail that are BACRs or university graduation requirements. A. Swenson stated there aren't. D. Syphers stated the department that uses the Pass/Fail in major required courses is the Education Department and there is an argument that it is an okay grading scheme in certain circumstances. C. Castillo-Garsow stated the other thing that stands out and is a little concerning as we're going through this is the way that interacts with the 20% requirement. There could be some kind of complications in terms of interactions if we have BACRs and university requirements that can be Pass/Fail. So when majors are designing their programs, they have to try to take that into account and so the 20% isn't a real 20% because it is based on student choices rather than based on the design of the program. He could easily foresee a situation where Education, since they have a lot of Pass/Fail courses, and suddenly some students who are taking BACRs go over the 20% requirement and have to start retaking courses because majors don't, in all circumstances, control what BACRs students take. A. Swenson stated the 20% would be department determined. D. Syphers stated currently Nursing and Education are the ones that use Pass/Fail the most. If everyone determines that the BACRs are Pass/Fail, then they could run into that problem. K. Evans asked what the issue would be when using BACRs as Pass/Fail. Would that harm students in some way if they do a lot of courses that are Pass/Fail? What would that change overall to the student's education? D. Syphers stated most don't worry about their GE courses. In terms of the benefits, they have students who come in and take BACRs, and a lot of courses are using A's. But when they are taking their BACRs in his department they don't get the same grades. Designating some programs as Pass/Fail would alleviate that. C. Castillo-Garsow stated the students flock to take the courses because they are Pass/Fail, but then they end up going over 20%. J. Coomes stated applying for scholarships and Veteran's may not get their benefits if they take too many Pass/Fail courses. D. Syphers stated they did talk to K. Teeters, and she said there were no Financial Aid implications for of this policy. J. Coomes stated if a student is taking two Pass/Fail courses and one letter grade course, in terms of the impact on GPA, that letter grade course becomes immensely more important than it used to be. How do we define Pass/Fail? Is a passing grade a D and is a fail an F or is passing a C and above and fail as D and below? D. Syphers stated we have an existing policy that states a passing grade is a C or above. There are programs that don't follow that, and some students are taking courses as Pass/Fail and others take them as letter grades. 50% of the programs on campus assign A's as their median grade. That goes up to almost 80% if you include A-.

Students outside of CSTEM are mostly used to just getting A's and A- so when they take their BACRs they are extremely unhappy. There might be a good student who's getting a good grade, e.g. B+ and they think it is the end of the world. B. Idsardi stated he could set his pass rate as 65% or 70% or whatever but students who get 70% have proved they know the material. Every program sets what is passing and what isn't. Passing does give them credit for passing the program. He is thinking these changes are for major/minors and not for BACRs. They can set a D, C, or whatever in their program. C. Castillo-Garsow asked what the advantage is of having a Low-Pass grade for a student. D. Syphers stated a pass is not a failing grade, so Ds are passing grades at our university. The reason for a Low-Pass is because we do have a number of programs that set a minimum, commonly a C, for a requirement class, and if they're taking a Pass/Fail course either the student is not passing, or on track to get a D so they wanted a category where a student getting a D grade could get a Low-Pass which would give them credit for the course as they would currently get a D. He stated he is happy to talk over it if anyone has questions.

9. New Business. a. AP 303-21 Undergraduate Students; Sec 6-2 & 6-3. Due to lack of time, this will remain as New Business at the next meeting.

10. Agenda Items for January 12, 2026, Senate Meeting.

11. Good of the Order. None.

12. Adjournment at 5:03 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled on Monday, January 20, 2025.