

Faculty Senate Agenda
Monday, January 28, 2019
SU 313, 4:00-5:30p

Present: Melissa Anderson, Deborah Brown, Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Carol Ferguson, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Marianne Golding, Justin Harmon, Cynthia Hutton, Dennis Jablonski, Marc Koyack, Laurie Kurutz, Charles Lane, Jesse Longhurst, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Chad Thatcher, Precious Yamaguchi, Kemble Yates

Absent: Enrique Chacón, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri

Guests: Linda Schott, Susan Walsh, Craig Stillwell, Elizabeth Whitman, Chad Hamill, Lee Ayers, Alana Lardizabal; Alexander Fitzhugh, Janelle Wilson

Meeting called to order at 3:59 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from 1/14

- Kurutz moved to approve minutes; Fedorek seconded
- Brown, Condon, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Koyack, Kurutz, Lane, Longhurst, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, and Yamaguchi voted to approve; none opposed; Gay and Anderson abstained; Jablonski and Yates arrived late and missed vote. Motion passed.

2. President's Report: Linda Schott

- President Schott introduced ACE fellow Chad Hamill, who will be on campus through June, shadowing her and doing a special outreach project to Oregon tribes.
- He is from Spokane tribe, and VP of Native initiatives Northern Arizona University
- If Hamill reaches out to faculty, please respond as you are able
- Governor Brown coming to area on Wednesday to speak at the Rogue Rotary club and also meeting with presidents of SOU and RCC who will be talking to her about budget concerns, the legislative session, and consortium work
- President Schott is going to Portland Thursday for a meeting with the governor and other university presidents
- There will be a SOHEC meeting beforehand to talk about what kind of a package could be put together; the goal of the consortium is to raise all boats, not sink anyone
- PLCs are finally organized, appointments will going out 1/29; the president tried to give people their first choice but needed to round out PLCs in some cases. There will be a campus expo of the PLC work in early May, similar to last time
- Invites to the Committee on University Ceremonies went out; Craig Wright will be the faculty member on that committee
- The October meeting of the HECC will be here on our campus

3. Provost's Report: Susan Walsh

- Walsh congratulated Gay and his colleagues for their presentation of the Digital Cinema program to the Board. Everyone was really impressed with their comprehensive approach, and this proposal can serve as an exemplar for our institution for putting a proposal forward
- Provosts of the 4 Southern Oregon schools have been meeting and sharing ideas for collaboration with other SOHEC institutions. The focus is on sustainability, rural health, and agribusiness
- They will do curricular and co-curricular inventory, then meet together at a retreat to start brainstorming where the institutions can make connections in these areas.

4. Advisory Council report: Marianne Golding

- Agenda got shifted because things happened; AC appreciated that directors were willing to come today but they have been postponed
- Ferguson asked if directors will be coming in 2 weeks, and Gay responded that that is the intention

5. ASSOU Report: Alexis Phillips

- Alexander Fitzhugh attended in A. Phillips's place.
- ASSOU is deep in student fee allocation and budget setting process
- They are moving the timetable back for this
- Students are strongly against raising student fee
- Student leaders are looking forward to Northwest Student Leadership conference
- They will be training students and taking them to Salem for Advocacy Day
- Golding asked if Fitzhugh could send faculty information they can post on Moodle. Fitzhugh said that he would send a flyer.
- Feb 16 is Advocacy Day; Gay noted that there is also a march for students happening in Salem on Feb. 18, and it will be on the agenda next time
- Fitzhugh can be reached at assoutreasurer@sou.edu

6. Proposed Changes to 5.223 and 5.223c: Laurie Kurutz

- This item is back for a vote since the 2 week rule was not waived last time
- Yates moved to pass changes, Lane seconded
- Fedorek asked if two amendments could be separated. He wanted to discuss the possibility of letting new hires go up for promotion in their first year
- A lengthy discussion ensued about allowing someone to go up for promotion in their first year at SOU, about the difficulty of evaluating an individual if all of their evidence is from somewhere else, and whether or not one year made a difference
- Yates brought up the issues around the process for early promotion, unrelated to YIR issues, and stated that he liked the inclusion of the program personnel committee but process still needs to be clearer about what exactly needs to be presented

- Jablonski recognized all the work that had gone into the proposed amendments and the improvements made to them
- Anderson, Brown, Condon, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Kurutz, Lane, Longhurst, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, Yamaguchi, and Yates voted to approve; Fedorek opposed; Gay and Koyack abstained. Motion passed.

7. New Courses from Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Anna Oliveri

- Oliveri was absent; Gay noted that the proposal for SOAN 493 was being pulled out of the package.
- Lane moved to approve; Fedorek seconded.
- Anderson, Brown, Condon, Fedorek, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Lane, Longhurst, Phillips, Siders, Thatcher, Yamaguchi, and Yates voted to approve; none opposed; Gay abstained. Motion passed.

8. Appreciation Team: janelle wilson

- wilson is working with Yamaguchi and other staff members to help initiate a cultural shift at SOU to be more verbose in the ways we show gratitude
- An link was created for submitting appreciation nominations, and so far there has only been one nomination for a faculty member
- Yamaguchi added that there are faculty and staff we don't see all the time but they do a good job and we want to recognize them; There are 650 FTE staff and faculty; we want to reach people who are overlooked
- Golding asked about the process; wilson responded that someone gets nominated, then once a week a committee decides who gets recognized; something good (but secret) happens
- If nominee agrees, award announcement will be posted on Instagram

9. IFS Report: Donna Lane & Amy Belcastro

- Belcastro reported on most recent IFS meeting, which just finished 1/26
- Many issues discussed, including the governor's budget, elimination of some funding and delay of capital projects, and issues common across institutions that IFS is working on
- Belcastro highlighted main issues and will place summary in Senate drive
- There are concerns about SB 540 (Sexual Assault Reporting) and how it might affect reports we get on incidents
- SB 3 and 4 and the applied baccalaureate degrees might offer an opportunity to SOU
- IFS is looking carefully at the textbook affordability issue to make sure it doesn't infringe on academic freedom
- IFS is watching SB 2651 (Program Redundancy) carefully and at what the addendums will do especially if HECC gets statutory authority--it could be a slippery slope about what programs get cut
- SB 2028 (Transfer Student Bill of Rights) has lots of issues around advising

- There are lots of bills around accelerated learning; some of the bills could clash with careful work being done with 2998
- In discussion are issues at other institutions such as student evaluations. U of O has eliminated them; OSU is piloting a new program using peer feedback; Western uses them but not the numbers, instead they look at the faculty's response to them
- Institutions are seeing some policies land on top of each other around low cost/no cost textbooks, such as accessibility
- Everyone is struggling with workload equity; U of O is dealing with competing mandates; advising came up as a big issue, U of O and OSU faculty do not do advising, TRUs do their own, where to capture advising in P & T is an issue as well
- Belcastro asked for faculty to let her know if there are issues to add for the next IFS meeting
- Ferguson asked for clarification about the governor's budget. Belcastro said that we have the recommended budget, but it will be informed by incentive package
- Longhurst will be proxy for Belcastro at the next IFS meeting

10. Faculty petition regarding Professional track service: Kemble Yates

- Gay read a statement before discussion started; brief summary of main points follow:
 1. The petition, with 67 signatures, was added to the agenda in accordance with the Faculty Constitution
 2. The petition in question calls on the senate to pass a resolution endorsing a specific bargaining outcome between the SOU administration and APSOU
 3. Article 1, section A of the collective bargaining agreement names APSOU as "the exclusive bargaining agent for the faculty members
 4. Article 10, section A of the collective bargaining agreement delegates authority over "all areas related to appointments and evaluation that require the exercise of academic judgment"
 5. While 1 ELU of instruction is a commonly understood unit of measurement, neither the bylaws nor the collective bargaining agreement make any attempt to define 1 ELU of scholarship or 1 ELU of service.
 6. The promotion criteria related to service are published in 5.226c of the Faculty bylaws and require the same standards of service for professorial and professional faculty.
 7. It is the legal opinion of SOU general counsel that if the senate were to pass the requested resolution, it would do so in violation of Article 1, section A of the collective bargaining agreement by inserting itself into a bargaining role that rightly belongs to APSOU and could constitute an unfair labor practice. Furthermore, liability for illegal senate actions lies with the university.
 8. Legal counsel for APSOU disputes the university's position and argues that since no resolution would be binding on the administration, such a resolution could not interfere with APSOU's authority.
- Yates started the petition; he is also on APSOU bargaining team. He believes it is not an unfair labor practice; bylaws and bargaining agreement are in conflict
- Yates gave a brief history: Around 2005, SOU created a promotion track for professional faculty and worked hard to define and assess service and teaching; intent was for instructors to be as much a part of the university as professorial faculty. Along the way

more of this had to be included in CBA, we needed a process for evaluation and promotion

- Yates stated that we have a good set of expectations for instructors if they had time to do it; he would like to discuss this and hear from others
- In response to the statement that 1 ELU is not well defined, Yates stated that 1 ELU can be estimated at approximately 35 hours, given summer contracts etc.
- Stone said that from the Administration's perspective, this discussion is an unfair labor practice and they are concerned about it setting a precedent
- Ferguson asked how many professional track faculty we have; answer is about 40 out of 170 total faculty; Ferguson noted that professional track faculty do serve on a lot of committees; there will be a gap if they do not
- Fedorek noted that there was an attempt to address this issue with program guideline changes for CCJ, History, and Political Science, but even though it passed Senate it was rejected afterwards; the same thing could happen again if we change service requirements
- Gay clarified that the Provost's reason for rejecting those changes was that programs can define what requirements mean in their discipline in their program guidelines, but not negate what is laid out in the bylaws; for those programs to make these changes, the relevant bylaws would have to get changed first
- Brown noted that before changing bylaws relating to service, service would need to be quantified--what committees count for what, and so on
- Yates commented that larger question is do we want service of this type from instructors; if so, it's up to administration and bargaining to figure it out. Yates also explained development of ELUs from previous conception of "credits"
- Deneui commented that the Senate body, and Yates as a senator, do have to answer to the University's counsel, not the union's
- Jablonski asked if the proposed 4-5 ELUs of service for instructors could be more flexible, and used as service or instruction; Yates confirmed that this could certainly be an option, and could be worked out, but it could get very complicated in practice
- Lane asked if APSOU was asking for a letter of support; Yates responded that as a senator, he would like the Senate to support the intent of the current bylaws. Lane then asked Stone to clarify what was wrong with this conversation, and she responded that the Senate is an arm of the University and this is an active bargaining issue--this is an appropriate conversation for an APSOU meeting, not a Senate meeting; there's fine line in the discussion between inappropriate and appropriate when evaluation criteria are discussed, but the line is crossed (according to University counsel) when a vote is held and recommendations go forward
- Ferguson asked if Senate could hear from professional faculty in the room about their experience with service requirements; Brown stated that her program is thrilled that someone is recognizing that they have heavy teaching loads and also do incredible service for the university as well as for their programs. They appreciate the effort to bring expectations more in line with professorial faculty
- Fedorek asked if it would be possible to make a motion saying that we value the voice of professional faculty and value the service expectations

- Gay stated that the time for the meeting was up and asked for announcements; there were none. Gay stated that the conversation would continue next time and that he would reach out to interested parties.

11. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.