 Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, February 8, 2021

SOUSEN, 4:00-5:30p

*Present:*  Melissa Anderson, Amy Belcastro, Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Marianne Golding, Justin Harmon, Laurie Kurutz, Jesse Longhurst, MerrilyneLundahl, Brendan McMahon, Matt Moreali, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Michael Stanfill, Chad Thatcher, Precious Yamaguchi, Kemble Yates

*Absent:*  Jeremy Carlton

*Guests:*  Lee Ayers, Jason Catz, Douglas Daley, Sherry Ettlich, Niko Hatch, Terry Longshore, PavlinaMcGrady, René Ordoñez, Michael Paddack, Alena Ruggerio, Linda Schott, Karen Stone, Sue Walsh, Jody Waters

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm.

1. **4:00p Approval of Minutes from 1/25**

**Motion & Vote:**

Golding moved to approve the minutes, and Kurutz seconded.  **Motion passed** unanimously.

1. **4:05p President’s Report – Linda Schott**

Report:

* AASCU Award and Webinar
* SOU won a major award from AASCU for its comprehensive sustainability efforts a couple of years ago.
* President Schott was asked to be on a webinar with 3 other AASCU presidents to discuss sustainability on campus.
* SOU’s recycling program diverts 50% of SOUs’ trash from landfill, saving SOU $60-70k per year.
* Solar energy, which generates about 7% of campus needs, saves another $50k per year.
* Testimony for Legislative Hearing:  Impact of Wildfires
* President Schott and Jeanne Stallman are working with local legislators Pam Marsh and Jeff Golden to organize testimony for the hearing.
* SOU and RCC are working together to document how fires impacted enrollment.
* Will argue that SOU should be held harmless from budget impacts from the wildfires in the same way that K12 is held harmless.
* Not certain that this will be successful because many people and operations were affected by the wildfires.
* Coronavirus Relief Packages
* The first relief package gave $14 billion to higher education.
* The second relief package, passed in December, gives $23 billion to higher education.
* The third relief package has not yet been passed; however, $40 billion to higher education is currently proposed in this package.
* This would provide significant relief to SOU as we face enrollment and pandemic challenges.

* Exec Council
* President Schott stated that the pandemic has involved sacrifice and hard work.
* In the most recent Exec Meeting, the members made an effort to look for silver linings, taking a moment to reflect on things that we have so far learned through the pandemic.
* Questions asked included:  What changes have we made that we are better off continuing once the pandemic is over?
* President Schott emphasized that this was in the effort of finding the good, and what we’ve learned, in what’s been a very difficult year.
* She would like to open this to all of campus to collect wisdom or insight from anyone who has made a change that turned out to be better.
* Enrollment Webinar
* An enrollment webinar is scheduled for 12:30 pm tomorrow (Tuesday, 2/9).
* It will provide information and attendees will be able to ask questions.

Discussion:

**Yates** acknowledged that our budget is a moving target, with new relief packages and headcount.  He asked if SOU would have an update to the campus community in terms of how we are getting through this year and how things are going?

**Schott** replied yes.  She stated that there was an update in December, and the enrollment webinar will provide important information.  She added that there are HECC meetings this week, where changes to the SSCM will be finalized and SOU will await more information from the next relief package.  She stated that once SOU is at a point where things are stable and predictable, there will be another update.

1. **4:10p Provost’s Report – Sue Walsh**

Report:

* ASCCU Academic Affairs Conference
* Provost Walsh attended the conference virtually last week.  Others from SOU also attended, including Paul Condon, Andrew Gay, and Melissa Anderson.
* It’s a big conference with many universities and administrators.
* Faculty resilience was a theme at the conference, and many conversations addressed lessons learned, silver linings, and things we hope we never have to repeat.  Nationally, these seem to be common themes.
* There was strong agreement among provosts and other administrators that the relief money used for professional development was critical in advancing technology and pedagogical tools on campuses.  Provost Walsh thanked everyone who participated in professional development through CATL and other sources.
* The word “grace” came up a lot in the conference sessions she attended.  The ability to be graceful to each other and ourselves, and to accept each other in the ways we have were appreciated.
* Faculty Panel (1/29)
* Provost Walsh thanked everyone (such as Chad Thatcher and Anna Oliveri) who participated in the panel and reported on their experiences with in-person and hybrid teaching.
* It was well-attended and very informative.

1. **4:15p  Advisory Council Report – Chair-Elect Melissa Anderson**

Report:

* Agenda
* AC always discusses the upcoming Faculty Senate agenda.
* Graduate Council and Curriculum Proposals
* Discussed proposals from the Graduate Council and curriculum items moving forward from GSWS and music.
* Discussed a change to the MBA program proposal.  Because the change is minor, we might waive the 2-week rule.
* Changes to the Bylaws
* Proposed amendments to the bylaws were discussed at the last Senate meeting.
* This includes an amendment that addresses the new Student Learning Experiences Survey (SLES). Since the last Senate meeting, new issues that are not addressed by the SLES amendment have been identified.
* Anderson took the AC discussion of this to the SLES Committee, which has offered an alternative proposal.
* Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee
* Discussed the challenges involved in coordinating proposals from the Graduate Council and the Curriculum Committee.
* It would be easier for everyone if proposals from both groups came to Senate at the same time.
* Academic Policies Proposal:  P/NP
  + Discussed the Academic Policies proposal for P/NP.
* Post-Tenure Review and FPAR Task Forces
  + Before the Post-Tenure Revew Task Force (PTRTF) recommendations are brought to Senate, they will be reviewed by the FPAR task force.
  + AC discussed the PTRTF recommendations and the intricacies involved.
  + Provost Walsh said that some of the recommendations align well with and address some of the issues in national conversations about faculty rewards in general and different ways of looking at scholarship in particular.
  + There has been a lot of conversation about this for several years, and Provost Walsh sent articles and references to some of the work that’s being done in this area to AC.  This information will inform our discussion once the recommendations come to Senate.

Announcement:

**Yates** stated the Bylaws regarding the promotion expectations for instructors have been successfully changed, and their promotion criteria is up-to-date on the web page.  However, some program personnel committees have not been using the most current information and are requiring that instructors rate themselves as acceptable, preferred, or exceptional.  Yates will send an email out to remind everyone to review the Bylaws before assessing promotion for instructors.

1. **4:20p ASSOU President’s Report – ASSOU President, Niko Hatch**

Report:

* Interviews
  + Today, ASSOU completed final interviews for positions left vacant after the turnover in Winter.

* Student Fee
  + Last week, ASSOU approved the student fee proposal, which has now been sent to the Allocations Committee.
  + Once it is approved by this committee, Hatch will review it, sign it, deliver it to President Schott, and present it to the Board of Trustees.

1. **4:25p  New Graduate Programs and courses (Action) – Graduate Council**

Preface:  Senate will vote on these in 3 parts.

* GSWS [Please see Jan 25 Senate folder for materials]

**Motion (Approve Proposal):**

Kurutz moved to approve the GSWS proposal as outlined, and Golding seconded.

Preface/Discussion:

**Waters** stated that the curriculum changes from GSWS are primarily to create some upper division courses that can also be offered as 500-level courses to allow courses for graduate students.  They are intended to be placeholders and, as faculty will need to be aligned to teach these courses, GSWS does not intend to put them on the academic calendar schedule for the foreseeable future.  However, GSWS would like to have the opportunity to offer these courses through irregular registrations or to address extraordinary circumstances for students who are completing their degree. Graduate Council (GC) thought these courses would be good additions to courses offered at the 500 level and good options for interdisciplinary collaborations for students doing a project or thesis in another program.

**Belcastro**(a member of the GC) commented that the School of Education was very excited to see the 500-level offerings in the proposal, as they would give more opportunities for students working towards a Masters in Science in Education to take electives.  It is a particularly rich addition to these electives in that it addresses underserved populations.

**Vote:**

**Motion passed** unanimously.

* Music [Please see Jan 25 Senate folder for materials]

Preface:

**Yates** stated, and **Longshore** verified, that the proposal from Music contains new/altered courses, with some offered at a split level.

**Longshore** added, in the chat:

*A quick comment on the MBA changes - MUS 515 and 516 are being changed to 3 credits, so that should be reflected there as well.*

**Motion & Vote (Approve Proposal):**

Kurutz moved to approve the Music course changes as proposed, and Stanfill seconded.  **Motion passed** unanimously.

* MBA [Please see Jan 25 Senate folder for materials]

Preface:

**Yates** stated that the proposal has a minor change:  one elective has been added to the proposed new concentration.  **Ordonez** clarified that the proposal package contains a new MBA concentration in business sustainability and small changes to the MBA concentration for the arts, making it more open to OCA students.  The day after the last Senate meeting, Gay proposed that COMM 524 (Creative Entrepreneurship) be included as one of the elective choices for the MBA for the arts.  Ordonez stated that the MBA program agreed that it would fit well and subsequently contacted David Humphreys (OCA Director) and Erik Palmer (Communication Chair).  Humphreys thought it would be a great addition and Palmer stated that Communication would have the capacity to serve students from this MBA concentration.  Ordonez presented the addition to the GC and it was approved unanimously as an addendum to the MBA proposal.  Ordonez requested that Senate add this new elective and waive the 2-week rule.

**Motion & Vote (Waive 2-Week Rule):**

Gay moved to waive the 2-week rule, and Stanfill seconded.  **Motion passed** unanimously.

**Motion (Approve Proposal with Amendment):**

Belcastro moved to approve to pass the proposal with an amendment to add the additional elective to the MBA concentration for the arts, and Kurutz seconded.

Discussion:

**Siders** shared a concern that he had discussed with Ordonez prior to the meeting.  With multiple concentrations in the online MBA, the associated classes often have very small numbers.  For accounting, in particular, a professor is given a full release to teach a class with just a handful of students.  Siders then asked whether the MBA program really needs all of these concentrations.  **Ordonez** replied that the electives in the concentrations are not taught in-load but are taught either in overload or with an adjunct.  Two of the concentrations (accounting and finance) in the online MBA have lower enrollment, and that these concentrations average about 7 students, which just breaks even in covering the instruction cost.  However, the students in these concentrations are also taking 10 core classes, which adds to the SCH.  **Siders** responded that these concentration courses are currently taught in overload but that they wouldn’t have to be, that he could teach one of the classes with 6-7 students in load. [Ordonez indicated that he would like Siders to teach in the online MBA program.]  Siders stated that having 10-15 students in a class creates a dynamic that very small classes do not.  **Ordonez** responded that they are looking at enrollment numbers and trying to offer concentrations that could be more in demand.  For example, the concentration in healthcare administration was added in Fall and is now the most popular MBA concentration.  **Siders** agreed that students not in the concentrations would not be taking the 10 or so courses in the core.

**Fedorek** asked whether the suspended course BA 579 was being removed from all concentrations.  **Ordonez** replied that it is removed from electives and does not affect any other concentration, and **Siders** added that it is a course tied to an instructor who will no longer be available to teach it.

**Vote:**

**Motion passed** with 1 abstention from Siders.

1. **4:35   Bylaws amendments (Action) – Constitution Committee**

* Emeritus faculty (5.510)  [Please see Jan 25 Senate folder for materials]
* Student Learning Experience Surveys (5.254) [Please see Jan 25 Senate folder for materials]

Preface:

**Yates** suggested that Senate not vote on the proposed change to the Student Learning Experience Survey bylaw but instead discuss an alternate proposed change that takes into account new information.  He added that there had been no change to the bylaw that would permit the University to bestow emeritus status to professional track faculty.

**Motion (Approve Amendment to 5.510):**

Oliveri moved to approve the amendment to Bylaw 5.510, and Yamaguchi seconded.

Discussion (5.510):

**French** asked if Senate would address a full-time eligibility question brought up by Jennifer Longshore, adding that only full-time faculty would be eligible for emeritus status.  **Yates** responded that the use of the word “ordinarily” in the bylaw would allow the program and provost to override this condition, as it reads “...ordinarily have at least 10 years of active full-time service to Southern Oregon University.”  He added that a situation could arise where the provost and program disagree on whether to override the condition, but that Senate could pass the amendment as written and later address this issue.  **Walsh** added that she had not seen the question from Longshore but that, when the faculty chair makes a recommendation that a faculty member is granted emeritus status, the full-time eligibility piece is usually not brought up.  Rather, the faculty chair cites other qualifications for putting the recommendation forward.  In the past, professorial faculty who were not all 1.0 FTE have been recommended for emeritus status.  For her, not having full-time status would not disqualify someone who is recommended by their chair and program, as that the recommendation must be unanimous from the chair and program and would highlight more important aspects.  She added, however, that faculty with less than 0.5 FTE would not likely be permissible and granting such faculty emeritus status has not been noted.  **French** stated that Longshore respectfully requested “that the full-time requirement be amended to including deserving faculty members who may not fit the full-time classification.”

**Yates** suggested that Senate vote on the amendment as proposed.  He will discuss this with AC before bringing it to the Constitution Committee, which will soon review another package of bylaws amendments.

**Vote:**

**Motion passed** unanimously.

Discussion (5.254):

**Yates** stated that this past Fall we began using the SLES to obtain feedback on our teaching, and the intent of the bylaws proposal shared 2 weeks ago was to make clear that courses that did not meet enrollment minimums would not be assessed.  Since then, we have learned that some divisions have chosen to exempt certain courses for not completely unreasonable reasons.  The decision to exempt these courses likely predates current administrators.

**Waters** provided background.  After the SLES was administered in Fall, some instructors did not receive evaluations for all of their courses.  Waters found that there was a Banner attribute that had exempted these courses from evaluation.  An inventory of courses with this attribute showed that there were quite a few of them.  Some were courses for which there is no credit, some were for courses that are highly experiential or applied with, *e.g.*, supervision rather than a high degree of instructional contact.  However, the reason others were exempt was unclear and, in most cases, the attribute was applied in 2012-2013, which may have been when the original online course evaluation system was built.  There is not much institutional memory about this.  The largest number of exempt courses are in education, and King explained why it would be advantageous to continue the exemption for these courses.  In other cases, directors and programs do not know why courses they offer have been exempted.  It would be worthwhile to consider adding language such as “unless the program or the division has determined that the course is unsuitable for evaluation” to the bylaw.  It would be prudent to explain to students in an exempt course why they will not be evaluated in that course.  This issue was discussed last Friday at the SLES Committee meeting.

**Anderson** added that, at the SLES Committee meeting, they discussed the issue and agreed that the structure or nature of some courses would make its evaluation by the SLES inappropriate.  The members of the committee then discussed who should be able to make the decision to exempt a course from the SLES, and they decided that the division director would be the correct person to exempt a course, as they would have no nefarious reason for exempting a course from evaluation and they would have knowledge regarding the course’s structure and other things that might make it inappropriate for evaluation by the survey.  The committee proposed an amended amended bylaw that is in the folder.

**Yates** stated that the amended amended bylaw is in the current (2/8) folder.  He added that it would be unconstitutional to vote on that version now, but that he does need to determine if it's the will of the Senate to move forward with the amended amended bylaw.  To give Senate a clearer idea of why it might make sense to exempt certain courses, he asked that Phillips (in Education and on AC) share an example.

**Phillips** said that in the Education Leadership program there are courses that, each term, are taught in 3 separate 1-credit modules.  Because it is a cohort program, there is typically 1 instructor for those 3 modules, and before she arrived to SOU, the practice was to have students complete 1 evaluation for all 3 of those courses, likely to simplify the process for students who had a single instructional experience and a single instructor with 3 different core topics across a term.  In recent history, they hired another faculty member to work alongside Phillips in the Education Leadership program, and, as a result, at least 1 of the courses had an instructor that did not receive an evaluation this year.

**Yates** emphasized that input from the AC and the SLES Committee indicated real reasons where administering the SLES would not make sense, and the recommendation is that the exemption be determined by the division director.

**Longhurst** is the instructor of record for every MAT secondary student teaching experience.  These students are in classrooms with mentor teachers and have SOU-provided supervisors.  As the instructor of record for is experience, which is a credited course, it would not make sense for her to receive course evaluations based on their experience in their public school classrooms with people who have hosted them; their evaluations would not reflect an experience with her.  **Waters** added that receiving a string of evaluations that do not seem to make sense could impact the quality of the evaluations provided for other classes, depending on the order in which they created them.  So, exempting certain courses from evaluations could protect the integrity of the process and make it more meaningful for the student and instructor.

**Yates** asked that senators take the amended form back to their programs and constituents.  Without an indication otherwise from senators, Yates will put the amended amended bylaw out to the faculty this week for a vote in 2 weeks.

**Fedorek** asked how many classes have been exempted or that we are trying to exempt.  **Waters** estimates that the number is in the 70s.

**Anderson** added that the committee felt strongly that their proposed amendment was the right solution to the problem and that the committee wanted to recommend that the division directors review exempted courses to verify whether they absolutely need to be exempted, should still be exempted, or never should have been exempted.  Phillips gave an example where a course probably should not have been exempted.

**Gay** stated that it would be useful to have a paper trail in case a division director or faculty member leaves and asked Anderson if there would be clear reporting structures for exempt courses.  For example, did the SLES committee envision that division directors would report to the committee to explain why a course was being exempted?  **Anderson** replied that she was not sure, adding that committee turnover would likely lead to situations where members of the committee might not know why a course is exempt.  **Waters** stated that the question seems to be whether this is an oversight function or just a record-keeping function.  If it’s the latter, it could probably be maintained on the Banner side in the registrar’s office.  If it’s the former, considering those requests from directors might not be a reasonable amount of work for the committee given their charge.

**Yates** said that the new version of the bylaw is in the current folder and that he will send an announcement to all faculty this week.

1. **4:45p  Clarifying policy on future P/NP policy changes (Discussion) – Academic Policy Committee**

Preface:

**Yates** stated that the proposal is meant to guide future faculty groups and administrators on when and how to change our P/NP policy.  **Ruggerio**(Chair of the Academic Policies Committee) added that the idea behind this policy is to codify the process we went through in response to the virus so that we will be prepared for the next exigency.  The exigency could include extreme weather, another virus, war, social unrest, etc. The proposal lays out who can change the pass/no pass policy, under what conditions they can do so, how they can change the policy, and for how long the policy can be changed.

Discussion:

**Gay** commented that the proposal states that “this policy may be temporarily suspended upon the recommendation by Academic Policies Commitee to Faculty Senate and Provost.”  Technically, it doesn’t require that Faculty Senate or the Provost concur with the recommendation or vote to approve it.  It currently just says that upon the recommendation the policy is suspended.  Gay brought this up at AC and recommended that this be clarified to require an approval vote from Senate and sign-off by the Provost.  **Yates** asked if that would materially change the intent of the proposal, and **Ruggerio** replied that she did not believe it changed the intent, that it was assumed that AC was laying out a process in which every step would require approval.  **Yates** suggested that Ruggerio work with he and Gay to determine the correct language.

**Yates** shared that if not read closely, it might seem as though we are considering changing the P/NP policy again for next quarter.  He clarified that Senate took the advice from the Academic Policy Committee to end the current P/NP policy and revert back to the normal P/NP policy in Spring.  That is unless something were to happen and the committee brings a proposed change to Senate and the Provost, but that is not anticipated.

1. **5:00p  Relinquishment rights for Academic Administrators with Faculty Rank (Discussion-Faculty Senate feedback sought) – SOU Policy Council**

Preface (Yates):

Karen Stone and Jason Catz would like feedback on a proposed policy change made by the University Policy Council (UPC).  The UPC is not a Senate committee and Senate will not vote on the proposed change.  Stone and Catz had asked to present the change at the 2/22 Senate meeting, but due to a relatively light agenda today, Yates asked if they could come today.  The two documents for this agenda item are located in the 2/8 Senate folder.

Presentation (Main Points & Discussion, Catz):

Background.  When the State Board of Higher Education dissolved, our board was established, and our board established the UPC.  To increase transparency for policy adoption on campus, many people on campus are involved with writing and shaping policy.  Obtaining feedback from Senate on policy changes related to faculty and academics is part of this increased visibility.  If adopted, the policy change will be posted to the University’s public website.

Overview of Change (Policy Number AAD.037)

* The policy title was changed from “The Return to Faculty Status” to “Administrators with Tenured Faculty Status.”
* Tenure is a property right, meaning that when a tenured faculty member begins working in administration, they still hold their tenure and can return to the faculty.  The policy originally described what will happen when someone leaves administration and returns to faculty.

Tenure Relinquishment

* Faculty have a tenure relinquishment right when they leave the faculty, which allows faculty to exchange tenure for up to 3-years of a modestly high salary.
* This exchange increases the base of their PERS benefits, which uses the highest 3 years of the faculty member’s salary.
* The exchange also gives up to 7 years of healthcare between the ages of 55 and 65.  Because Medicare benefits begin at 65, this would allow a faculty member to retire up to 7 years prior to the age of 65 without losing healthcare benefits.

Issue Addressed w/Policy Change

* Tenured faculty who join the administration leave the ability to exchange their tenure for these benefits.  These individuals have the ability to return to the faculty, relinquish tenure, and work as faculty for three years before retiring.
* However, this makes obtaining the benefits of tenure difficult, as these individuals may have become assets as administrators but would have to plan to leave the administration 3 years before retirement to return to the faculty.
* In addition, the necessity of returning to faculty to reclaim the benefits of tenure relinquishment also makes it more challenging to recruit administrators from faculty.  This is a loss because many faculty who might otherwise join the administration are more familiar with and better connected to the University and University employees than the alternative – administrators hired from the outside.
* The policy change would give faculty a route to entering administration without giving up something of substantial value.

Goal in Presenting to Faculty Senate

* The goal is to gather comments and feedback to bring back to UPC and incorporate before the policy change is posted to the community website.

Section C. Policy Statement, Part A.

* Details how an administrator with tenure might return to the faculty.  In the document shared, darker text indicates clarifying comments whereas lighter text indicates original language.
* As an example of a non-substantial, clarifying change, lighter text in part 3 states that there will be an adjustment of $1000 for each year of service for up to 7 years.  Darker text clarifies that this will amount to a maximum of $7000 and that this addition will go into effect on a particular date when they return to faculty.

Section C. Policy Statement, Part B

* Addresses retirement by administrators with faculty tenure rights.
* This part intentionally attempts to mirror language in the CBA.
* B.1. states that administrators who return to faculty can relinquish their tenure as faculty.
* B.2 states that administrators can waive their right to return to faculty, relinquish tenure, and retire as administrators.  Like faculty, they must submit an application at least 90 days and no more than 3 years prior to retirement.  This gives notice that their position will be vacant at a specified date and maps to the PERS-based 3-year period prior to retirement.
* B.2 parallels the CBA.  On the date of their retirement, administrators must be at least 55 and have been employed at SOU for a minimum of 5 years.

Discussion:

**Yates** asked whether the policy change was drafted by the UPC and if it was drafted at a recent UPC meeting.  **Catz** responded that he and Stone drafted the policy change. He added that there are hurdles in the transition to retirement for long-serving administrators.

**Yates** asked how the policy would apply if an existing administration agreed to an administrator’s request to relinquish tenure in 3 months and retire in 3 years but, in the interim, a new provost is hired and asks the administrator to step down. **Catz** replied that there is language further down in the policy that addresses this, stating that if the termination is for cause or if there is an investigation (*e.g.*, for embezzlement), the administrator cannot claim relinquishment benefits.  However, if the situation is such that the administrator is not terminated for cause but stepping out of the role for other reasons, they would have the choice of returning to the faculty or, if they are of retirement age, relinquishing their tenure and retiring.  **Yates** clarified and **Catz** agreed that if the administrator steps down early from their original plan, they would have to return to faculty to stick to the timeline they had planned.

* B.4. is unique to administrators and states that “[a]dministrators who received notice of non-renewal or termination shall upon receipt of the notice, be deemed to have submitted a timely application for relinquishment upon delivery of the notice.”  This addresses the situation for which an administrator receives a notice but does not have 90 days to plan for their benefits.  The administration still retains the discretion to deny relinquishment benefits to those who have received notice of non-renewal or termination for cause.

Discussion:

**Belcastro** asked whether the policy changes would be discussed at UPC.  **Catz** responded that the changes were discussed two meetings ago and will be brought back to the UPC after obtaining comments and feedback.

**Belcastro** asked whether the salary adjustments (addressed in B.7.) are the same as those in the current CBA.  **Catz** responded that he will address that after quickly covering B.5. and B.6.

* B.5. is similar to a provision in the CBA.  It allows the president and provost to exercise discretion when the number of applications for relinquishment has a potentially unaffordable budgetary impact in the current budget cycle.
* B.6. requires administrators to sign an agreement when they relinquish tenure.
* B.7. addresses the difference in contract lengths between faculty and administrators.  Faculty are on a 9-month contract and, according to the CBA, receive a 6% rate increase when they relinquish their tenure.  To obtain the same pay increase for the same pay rate, this translates to 4.5% for a 12-month contract.  This part has incorporated feedback so that it now reads that the administrator will receive the greater of two things:  (1) 4.5% on their 12-month administrator contract or (2) 6% of the 9-month faculty salary they would have received as faculty.

Discussion:

**Siders** asked whether administrators who hold tenure are part of the post-tenure review process.  **Yates** replied that he wasn’t clear on the premise for this.  **Siders** said that, according to the presentation, the administrators will be entitled to something they have earned.  Faculty will be held accountable for post-tenure reviews to collect on what they’ve earned.  Siders suggested that similar/same/different standards should apply for those administrators who claim tenure.  Have they demonstrated that they still earned that tenure?  Tenure is not forever.  **Catz** replied that the question is interesting and worthy of discussion, and he welcomed adding it to the agenda for a future meeting.

**Yates** requested feedback from senators as to whether to invite Catz and Stone back to obtain more input or to provide them with input outside of a Senate meeting.

* B.8. addresses retirement benefits that are in parallel to those offered to faculty.
* B.9. gives an administrator the option to collect 25% the value of projected healthcare costs (instead of healthcare benefits), but to do so they must provide 12-months notice of this.  This gives a retirement incentive while retaining the employee for another 12 months.  In the end, it is also less expensive to the University when compared to covering an additional 7 years of healthcare costs.

Discussion:

**Yates** requested feedback from senators as to whether to invite Catz and Stone back to obtain more input or to provide them with input outside of a Senate meeting. **Catz** stated that he is open to returning to Senate for more discussion and would welcome written comments, emailed to them or compiled and emailed to them.

**Yates** encouraged senators to provide direct feedback to Catz and Stone and to share individual or program concerns or requests for more discussion to Yates.  He stated that he will discuss this at AC, and AC will think about how to move forward with any feedback received.  He emphasized that Senate has only been asked for feedback and will not negotiate the terms or vote on the policy.

1. **5:25p  Announcements/New Business**

Due to the late hour, no announcements/new business were shared.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.