Members Present: G. Hustrulid, B. Idsardi, C. Castillo-Garsow, C. Tyllia, K. Taylor, J. Hyde, D. Ayers, V. Taroudaki, D. Bachand, K. Evans, L. Reeves, C. Hazelbaker, C. Manikoth, N. Jackson
University Officials: C. Jensen, T. Jones, D. Trella, A. Swenson

1. The meeting was called to order by G. Hustrulid at 3:01 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes of November 3, 2025.** V. Taroudaki stated they discussed the Faculty Led Study Abroad program rather than the PITAK scholarship. ***Hearing no objections, the minutes are approved as amended.***

3. Chair's Report. G. Hustrulid reported: a. PRC/PRD have been the main points of communication and discussion over the last week.

4. ASEWU Update. C. Jensen reported: i. last Thursday, CAAR and ASEWU co-hosted the Advise-a-Thon event. She is still waiting on the numbers back from CAAR regarding attendance. The event was held from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. however by 1:00 p.m. they were booked out for the rest of the day. They discussed having this event next quarter, and with the numbers they had from this last week, it will likely be a two-day event. **ii.** Last week's ASEWU Senate meeting, they discussed the dining hall revisions for the All-You-Care-to-Take dining hall plan. This was discussed with the Director of Dining Services last week and senators were encouraged to send in their thoughts on the revision to Dining Services. Dining Services has scheduled meetings with residence halls to get first-year student input. G. Hustrulid asked if she could expand on what the All-You-Care-to-Take dining concept is. C. Jensen stated it would be basically a buffet style. Currently, a la carte allows students to purchase food in the Union Market, Panda Express, Einstein's, and other areas on campus. What she gathered from this is that they would up the pricing of the a la carte funding to allow for the All-You-Care-to Take plan from the dining hall however, that would not count anymore for restaurants on campus. They would also have different stations set up to check out so if you have the Eagle Card and are on the All-You-Care-to-Take meal plan, they wouldn't have to pay at the window. They can take as much as you'd like throughout the quarter. If there is a student not on that plan, they would check out at a different spot and those check out areas funnel out to different dining halls that will be split down the middle. It sounds like the food will have to stay in the dining hall if you are on the buffet plan so they wouldn't be able to take it back to their dorm. They did receive a presentation from Dining Services regarding these proposed plans. K. Evans stated she heard the price was going to be going up. Instead of having the different options of pricing, it's going to be a higher price. C. Jensen stated right now, the a la carte is $1425.00 per quarter with $100.00 added to Flex every quarter, the unlimited all-access plan would be $2340.00, and the unlimited plus plan would be $2540.00 and that allows for unlimited access to Union Market, and then $200 a la carte for other dining locations on campus. So, $2340.00 roughly jumping from $1425.00. K. Evans stated the food insecurity on campus is huge and we need to do something about that for students. **iii.** Today marked the last ASEWU Senate meeting for the quarter. For winter quarter, their first meeting will be Monday, January 5th from 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and that will continue for the quarter. **iv.** B. Idsardi asked if they have received any input from students regarding the Pay-One-Price Canvas eBooks program. C. Jensen stated they haven't

had an official meeting on that, but she has talked with J. Curtis as well as some of the Justices, and they think it is a good idea. Every college is different and with STEM they won't be as textbook heavy, and some majors will have more.

5. Administrative Report. J. Coomes reported: 1. Please watch for a message from your chairs about grading updates and clarifications, including: • Grades are now due by 2:00 p.m. (previously 5:00 p.m.). • For Lecture courses with Corequisite Labs, instructors must enter grades for both the Lecture and Lab sections, and the grades must be identical. • Additional clarification will be provided on grading Incompletes and Y grades. **2.** Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires public entities to ensure that all programs, services, and communications—including digital materials such as websites and course content—are accessible to individuals with disabilities. Over the next several months, all EWU websites and Canvas courses will receive coordinated support to achieve compliance. Faculty and staff will be provided with guidance, tools, and training to make course materials and online information fully accessible. **3.** Faculty Affairs Update: The Faculty Commons Committee has been tasked by FO to recommend a more consistent and robust syllabus template. Faculty Affairs continues to advance professional development initiatives, including leadership development for department chairs and programming in inclusive and transparent teaching (by demand) to strengthen instructional effectiveness across online and hybrid modalities. **4.** The Joint Transfer Council (JTC) continues its work with other transfer collaborations in Washington state, to revise the statewide Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA), with a final version anticipated by spring 2026. The revisions aim to better align transfer pathways with guided pathways and improve outcomes for transfer students. EWU faculty and staff have been actively involved in these statewide efforts, including development of a possible **Pre-Health Professions DTA** and updates to the **Biology DTA** currently underway

6. Brief Reports. a. Academic Committee for Innovation & Technology: *C. Manikoth reported:* the Poll Everywhere update should provide better attendance tracking via Canvas Medium. They are trying to figure out whether or not some kind of smart scheduling to forecast enrollment. It's just in discussion right now for something that could be potentially pretty big. They have accessibility guidelines from the federal government that we need to meet university wide so IT is putting in place potential rubrics. If faculty need help, IT will help walk them through that. This is all due in April 2026. **b. General Education Committee. *J. Hyde reported***: they are updating the language in the Breadth areas and that they will be voted on at the next meeting. Once that is approved by GEC, they will bring it to Rules and then Senate. They are trying to improve clarity and improvement of submissions for general education. They are actively working with M. Ward in updating the submission form in CIM and to also provide a more streamlined and clear way of capturing submission for general education courses that ties in directly to assessment. They are trying to tackle assessment but there's some things that they need to work on before assessment is successful. **c. Global Programs Academic Committee. *V. Taroudaki reported:*** they met two weeks ago, and they talked about the advertisement and the application for the Fusinkusaka program. The plan is to finalize that at the meeting tomorrow. **d. Graduate Affairs Council. *D. Ayers reported:*** they mostly did CPAC stuff. They got the list in, and S. Eubanks is cleaning up a few things. It has to go through some deans before it gets

to them, and he is currently compiling the list to put into the system. They kind of went over everything they will need to do. A. Swenson attended to give an update on the CourseLeaf system for policy changes. They cancelled the next meeting and put a new meeting on the calendar for 5/13/25. **e. Undergraduate Affairs Council.** ***D. Bachand reported:*** they did meet and moved one policy (AP 303-23 Classroom Attendance) forward in the workflow. Another policy revision was brought up by the subcommittee, AP 303-24 Grading, Grade Changes, and Grade Appeals, and they are recommending some changes she would like feedback on. The first proposal pertains to the Pass/Fail system. The subcommittee is proposing adding a third tier called Low Pass. Currently a C is required to record a Pass, and Low Pass would be a grade of D which is passing at the university. The subcommittee was thinking the rational is that it might encourage students to take classes that they perceive might be more difficult to pass. Another thing they are recommending is changing the performance equivalent of C to C- to receive a passing grade. Apparently, that is standard at a lot of other universities including Washington State. C. Castillo-Garsow stated he looks at the difficulty of how the assignments are and who should be passing the class. From his point of view, if a Low Pass option does any work or if lowering the passing grade to C- does any work he would just have to adjust his formulas a little bit when he figures out how to convert scores to letter grades. The counterpoint to that is one of the things that some of the faculty in the Math Department have been asking for is the opposite. That is essentially some sort of High Pass option, essentially, they've met the minimum requirements, and they feel like there should be some option within Pass/Fail to highlight students who are truly exceptional. Not only did this student pass, but they are also superstars, we recommend them for jobs, awards, etc. and something fancy that would go on the transcript. C. Jensen stated she believes a High Pass is a good option. Lowering from C to a C- or a Low Pass, the students wouldn't try as hard if they had something like that. Lowering would lead to fewer students dropping out of classes but by getting some High Pass it would encourage them to try harder. B. Idsardi stated if they are concerned between a C or a D, most programs have an average of C, but students can still get credit for the course. For example, you can set it as a C or if the department feels a C is too high, they can set that up as a D. That is a university wide solution so this proposal may not be needed. C. Castillo-Garsow stated if the university tells me a C is what it takes to go to the next class, then that is what it is. K. Taylor asked how many Pass/Fail courses there are at the university. D. Bachand stated there is quite a list. UAC decided to limit student designated Pass/Fail to 20% of the program. Mostly the clinical does have a lot of Pass/Fail and those programs set their own cut-off. Maybe the university doesn't need to set a list if the programs can determine that themselves because of accreditation or state requirements. A. Swenson stated the policy currently states you can't designate classes within any major program as Pass/Fail however seminars, field study, etc. are not able to be designated unless approval is done through UAC. There are a lot of courses designated as Pass/Fail but there are approximately 100 courses that aren't adhering to that policy. It has been a hard policy to re-write and Senate did request that the MOUs are matching. A point of clarification there is still standard grading, they're discussing having up to 20% of a full degree program can be Pass/Fail. C. Castillo-Garsow stated he doesn't think they should use both the Low Pass and High Pass, but they should use what is best for our students.

7. Council Elections/Selections/Confirmations. ***Research and Scholarship Committee:*** K. Islam-Zwart, Psychology. **Hearing no objections, these are approved.** They will be sent forward to Senate for approval.

8. Unfinished Business. a. One Calendar Ad Hoc Committee, Adding IT. ***Hearing no objections this is approved***. It will go to the Senate on 11/24/25.

9. Information Item. a. PRC Presentation. N. Jackson reported they drafted a Report to Senate regarding status of PRC and Program Review/Discontinuance. They were trying to determine what the difference is between regular PRC review and PRD review. L. Smith met with them, and he talked about the 10-5 standard. Any undergraduate program, over the past 5 years that has less than 10 graduates or any graduate program over the past five years that has 5 or fewer graduates, are up for PRD review. The Program Discontinuance process is very serious. He stated that L. Smith articulated which programs that will go through regular review and then 11 programs that will go through PRD review. AP 303-35, Program and Course Management, lists the steps that are required to follow from A – J and they have concerns. The provost has given them 11 programs, but he must specify the mechanisms to protect students currently enrolled in the program to allow them time to finish their programs, and a declaration of intent, including a rationale for either discontinuing the program or dissolving the department altogether. He has not given them the three things in A, B, and C. He has admitted that he has not done those yet in his conversations. They have to comply with the CBA, and that's actually Article 15 that references the policy and process for program discontinuance. It also talks about as union responsibility to protect faculty and their jobs. The other part if the Faculty Organization and actually abiding by policy, AP 303-35. He talked with J. Smith, and she said that she had reached out to all the programs during the summer and got the information they needed so PRC was ready to go in the fall. They talked with the broader community in addition to the faculty and students and interviewed graduates. It was a very labor-intensive process because she was so organized, and she had all the programs on a list, so they were ready to go. They were nowhere near that. F. is simply dealing with OIR, getting data about graduation rates, FTES to FTF ratios, etc. and then they decide whether or not the program has merit, and they forward the recommendation to the provost. If they find it has no merit, they forward it directly to the provost. With proposals having to considered new business and then unfinished business, they would want to talk about it twice and then vote at a third meeting. If they actually follow the timeline of the four meetings in AP 303-35 there isn't enough time to review and vote from the councils in order to meet the June 9th deadline. D. Trella stated this 10-5 directive is very cut and dry, and while the provost did indicate that he expects the 11 programs that have been identified to provide additional qualitative information about the nature of their programs and how they fit within the university. It's a starting point, considering the nature of program sizes, the number of faculty in those programs, what could feasibly be possible for a smaller program to produce in terms of students in seats vs. a much larger program. As the committee moves forward there needs to be part of a broader conversation about how academic programs at Eastern are assessed in the normal review process as well. The 10-5 directive is happening at the same time they are being tasked with reimagining the nature of program review in general and having a clear idea of how the 10-5 is not what a traditional review would be like. Provost Smith

is calling it a discontinuance review and that's not a thing that PRC does but having a clear understanding of the nature of the review, how this may or may not differ from what a traditional review would look like and being very sensitive to those points that was just brought up. In the past, when they've been tasked with reviewing programs under the guise of a financial emergency, the notion of discontinuing smaller programs, does not necessarily result in any kind of cost-saving results. Whether or not we're all being honest with what this discontinuance process is really about, is it about programs and their health and how they fit within the EWU ecosystem or is this about cutting costs. If that is the case, it's not going to do much for us to remove these smaller programs. N. Jackson stated they will move forward in good faith in shared governance, but it is up to the provost, president and BOT. That is also a political issue for them because if they cut something and it isn't considered bargaining in good faith that can lead to a vote of no confidence. C. Castillo-Garsow stated that is where in both in policy and also within these various bodies, these faculty have some power where they can slow it down or not. They can submit documents that says this has no merit or has some merit and that is in open records. Votes of censure and no confidence that rest on documents that are viewable. N. Jackson stated he would prefer to use the slowdown. He realizes the provost is under enormous pressure from this BOT to expedite a discontinuance process but that is unreasonable. They should have had the information well before October before PRC even met they should have had that information. D. Trella stated if the BOT is going to hold firm with the June deadline, they should be able to ask why. They did acknowledge that he is working in an institution that is coming down from the SRA process and there is a lot of distrust. N. Jackson stated if the FO leadership was to approach the BOT, to ask if they can just put this off a year and they still held firm with the June deadline, then something else is going on. Why try to move this forward so quickly. We just went through a massive SRA process and two years ago we went through a PRD process so where is the motivation. His recommendation at the next Senate meeting to request from the BOT that this discontinuance process be delayed for one year. During that time the FO can work with the provost to determine what programs would actually need a Program Review. C. Castillo-Garsow stated if there are other motives for this to be done by June are there other ways they can work together to get that done. If it is to save money, are there ways that the provost and the departments can work together to reduce the catalog. There are a lot of situations where it doesn't have to be through an adversarial process. Even in one of those systems, there should be ways where we can talk about, the motivations for these to reach some sort of settlement. N. Jackson stated that requires a meeting between the University leadership and the FO. That is one way to have this kind of resolution or motion to approach the BOT to ask them to wait one year. I would really like to not have the PRC to scramble to do the PRD process. I would like to go through the entire process. K. Evans stated she fully supports this. One of the things, by keeping us constantly in fear is a method of control. Because the university is to remake ourselves by being Polytechnic and getting rid of tenured faculty through cutting programs. All the SRA staff was gruesome, and we can't continue to work this way. The faculty are spending all this time fighting for our programs and then the admin makes another plan. It is important that we push back. We live in a state that is strong, and we can't let the fear tactics work. G. Hustrulid stated in under 7-4 it states they must include the intent for program discontinuance. N. Jackosn stated the provost has admitted that he has not given a formal proposal to PRC. G. Hustrulid stated they have one hour to present at the BOT so let's get our bearings of what we want to do to slow down the process. This conversation will continue.

10. Agenda Items for November 24, 2025, Senate Meeting.

a. One Calendar Ad Hoc Committee – Add IT Position

b. Community Engagement – M. Estes

11. Good of the Order. a. L. Reeves stated her students were able to attend a presentation by the Art Department.

12. Adjournment at 4:56 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled on Monday, December 1, 2025.