Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, February 22, 2021

4:00-5:30p

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

*Absent:* Michael Stanfill

*Guests:*  Sherry Ettlich, Erik Palmer, Alena Ruggerio, Linda Schott, Matt Stillman, Sue Walsh, Jody Waters

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm.

1. **4:00p Approval of Minutes from 2/8**

**Motion & Vote:**

Kurutz moved to approve the minutes, and Phillips/Fedorek seconded. **Motion passed** unanimously.

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

Report:

Governance Structure of Oregon Universities

*HECC*

* + The HECC may reconsider the governance structure of OUS – i.e., having independent governance structures for each university versus having a university system governance.
  + At the last HECC meeting, Ben Cannon (the executive director) noted that commissioners, senators, and legislators are asking/pushing him to look into this.
  + There will be a special meeting on 3/9 to discuss whether this question should be part of their strategic planning.
  + Universities across the nation are under financial pressure and facing impacts from the pandemic, and states are addressing these issues in different ways.

*Oregon Council of Presidents*

* + This includes the presidents of the 7 public Oregon universities.
  + The governor asked what the universities could do to be innovative. This might raise the question of whether a new structure will provide the relief needed.
  + The presidents therefore requested that the state commission a study to look at whether it has what is needed to meet present and future higher educational needs and how we compare nationally. The council has a meeting with the governor on Friday to discuss this further.
  + This will probably not impact anything we are doing in the next few years, and the presidents believe we are facing a funding problem rather than a structural one. There is evidence that changing structure does not really reduce costs.

Financial Uncertainty

*Federal Relief*

* + We are still working out how to use the funds coming from the 2nd federal relief package. This will require some patience as the rules for how it can be used are clarified and we consider the immediate needs of the institution and our students and plan for the next biennium.
  + The 3rd federal relief bill would bring additional funds to SOU, and we are waiting to see what it will look like.
  + The relief bills require that some funds go directly to the students, and we will be getting that to them as we learn more.

*Furloughs*

* + The 3rd federal relief package will have an impact on whether we continue furloughs.
  + On the faculty side, furloughs are set for the year. On the staff side, they are tiresome and may have impacted some services.
  + If faculty have or are aware of problems getting needed services/support because of a furlough, please take that to the appropriate supervisor or VP so that this can be addressed.

*Enrollment and Funding*

* + President Schott stated that she is very worried because of the impact of the fires on our enrollment and because our enrollments are down about twice as much as the other schools.
  + Though there is an understanding that the fires are the cause of the lower enrollments, this will not impact our funding [from the state]. And, unless we can turn enrollments around, our income from enrollments will also be down.

Fall 2020

* + Many are likely wondering about Fall, but the situation for Fall is still unclear.
  + SOU’s brand: Small classes, high student contact.
  + The hope is to offer something closer to what we were offering before the pandemic, balanced against health and safety issues – protecting the health and safety of SOU employees and students.
  + The situation continues to be fluid. There is hope that, with vaccines available, there may be some degree of herd immunity by July, but it might be later.
  + Provost Walsh will work with the division directors and chairs regarding how to describe Fall course offerings.

Discussion:

**Kurutz** asked about the legalities of requiring students, faculty, staff to be vaccinated before coming to campus. **Schott** replied that SOU is not planning to require vaccinations but instead to provide information about the vaccines and to make them available, just as is done with the flu each here. **Walsh** confirmed that this is the status of the current conversation, which Waters and Stillman are also involved in. **Kurutz** asked if SOU requires some vaccinations, such as measles. **Schott** and **Walsh** replied yes, for students. **Stillman** clarified that the MMR vaccine is required and that this requirement is specifically written into state law and that part of the consternation moving forward is to what extent there will be any legislative activity that may/may not occur.

**Gay** asked whether the Tuition Advisory Council (TAC) has been meeting and if there has been any conversation regarding tuition hikes for next year. **Schott** replied that the TAC is convened by Provost Walsh and has been meeting. The TAC is on the agenda for the March Finance Committee Meeting, and they believe they’ll be close to having a solid recommendation that would be considered at the April meeting. **Walsh** stated that the TAC meets each Friday. The TAC website includes a link with all of the minutes and requirements to be in compliance with SB 4141, which governs the process. The hope is to provide a recommendation to President Schott and then meet with her to discuss the recommendation. President Schott will then decide what to recommend to the Board. The TAC just finished the budgetary tutorial, and on Friday, they will begin working with the pro forma to model the impacts of various state allocations and tuition increases. **Schott** added that many people are struggling and this is a K-shaped recovery, with some doing very well and others, such as students of color and low-income families that continue to struggle. We would have to raise tuition 7% just to cover our increased costs for healthcare, etc. We do not want this hike, but we will have increased costs and will need to increase tuition revenue or enrollment. **Walsh** concurred that the projection for meeting costs through tuition was around 7% and added that there are fees that also need to be considered. If the tuition increase is above 4.9%, we would need to ask the HECC for permission for the increase. The TAC, which consists of students, 2 administrators (Provost Walsh, Matt Stillman), and 2 faculty (Dennis Slattery, Leslie Eldridge) takes this very seriously. **Fedorek** asked, in the chat:

*Does the 5% increase that triggers HECC approval include the increase in student fees too? Or does it just apply to a 5%+ increase to tuition only?*

**Schott** and **Walsh** replied that it does not. **Stillman** added, and **Walsh** concurred, that some mandatory fees are accounted for by the TAC, but not all of them. **Stillman** then added, in the chat:

*HECC employs an odd formula that encompasses tuition (resident only) as well as some mandatory fees in establishing the % increase.*

**Golding** stated that courses have been consistently taught for summer abroad programs, and that the course taught in Mexico has been canceled. She asked how we should respond to students who ask about the courses we offer for summer abroad programs. **Walsh** replied that the conversation has just begun and they are considering the different groups and programs involved. There was an initial conversation about this at the Cabinet level, and questions/concerns included which countries would allow entry, whether students would pay non-refundable deposits, and liability issues. They are working with international programs and will get information out as quickly as possible. She added that decisions will be made moving forward, and acknowledged that there is not a big window to make those decisions. **Golding** asked if she should hold any announcements about this for the next couple of weeks, and **Walsh** replied that she would reach out to Golding tomorrow to determine the best course of action. **Schott** stated that study abroad experiences are life-changing for the students who can participate, and we want to give that opportunity to students, but we don’t want them to lose deposits, etc.

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

Report (in addition to topics discussed following President’s report):

Revisit to the Academic Structure Working Group

* + The group held its first meeting last Monday. The group has 2 co-chairs (Dee Fretwell, Jim Rible) and consists of 13 members, including several faculty, 1 SSC, and 2 division directors.

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

Report:

Current Agenda Items

* + AC discussed the bylaws issue for the student learning experience survey (on the agenda for a vote), the P/NP policy (on the agenda for discussion), how curriculum items come to us (on the agenda for discussion), and the academic administrator tenure relinquishment (on the agenda for discussion).

Commencement

* + President Schott discussed offering a more robust virtual commencement this year. If things are safe enough, programs will be able to do their own in-person events.
  + Students who graduate this or last year and would like to walk will have the opportunity to do so once we resume live, in-person commencements. Please share this information with interested students.

EDI Group

* + AC also discussed bringing the EDI group to Senate to make a report. (**Yates** added that they were not available for this Senate meeting.)

Bylaws Change Recommendations (Grad Council)

* + Grad Council would like to make changes to the bylaws. AC wanted to discuss this further, but it will be on a future agenda.

Elections

* + Elections are complicated by the potential restructuring of divisions and programs – if there are any changes, these could have electoral consequences.
  + The Elections Committee (EC) considered every permutation of a timeline for holding elections before the end of the academic year. Using those permutations, it proposed that some elections remain unchanged.

Recommendations *for Senate Elections*

* + The EC will recommend that Senate elections remain unchanged. If there are any changes that affect Senate structure (*e.g*., the numbers of representatives from each division or at-large), the changes would necessitate larger discussions regarding changes to the bylaws, etc. If there are changes to the structure, the process of restructuring Senate and updating the bylaws accordingly could take place over the next couple of years as senators finish their terms or leave.

*Recommendation for Chair and Faculty Personnel Committee Elections*

* + There are fewer of these, and the EC will recommend that these elections be held later in the year after there is more certainty.

Discussion:

**Walsh** mentioned that when she calls a chairs meeting, program coordinators and others managing academic areas attend as well. She wanted to be sure that there would be a clear definition of chair. The recommendation from the academic structure working group has a hard-stop due date of April 16, which will give time to discuss the details of any changes. **Yates** commented that the original timeline suggested the decisions wouldn’t be finalized until the end of the school year in June, and that it is helpful to know that a clearer picture of possible changes will be available by mid-April.

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

Note: There was no report this week. **Schott** shared that there have been some resignations in student government, but that ASSOU will be meeting tomorrow.

1. **4:25p Bylaws amendments (Action) – Constitution Committee**

* Student Learning Experience Surveys (5.254) [Please see Feb 8 Senate folder for wording of proposed amendment]

**Motion:** Marianne moved and Belcastro seconded to approve the proposed new language to bylaw 5.254. **Motion passed** unanimously.

1. **4:35p Academic Policy Committee recommendations**

* Clarifying policy on future P/NP policy changes (Action)

Preface:

**Yates** stated that there are 2 recommendations. The first was introduced at the last Senate meeting, and there was some ambiguity – it was not clear whether a proposed change to the P/NP rules, initiated by the APC, would need to go through an approval process with the Senate and the Provost. The committee has revised the language to clarify the intent. Ruggerio stated that the language now matches the intent – a proposed change would need to be approved by a vote at Faculty Senate and then approved by the Provost. She reiterated that the idea is to have a procedure that we can refer to in the future.

**Motion:** Gay moved to approve the recommended P/NP policy change, and Golding seconded.

Discussion:

**Fedorek** asked if there had been any follow-up on Siders’ study from Spring. Specifically, he asked if the number of students who chose P/NP this Fall had been compared to the number who chose P/NP last Spring and previous terms. **Stillman** replied that he has data on the volume of students who have elected various options but did not bring that with him. He added that he would not speak for Siders regarding the previous study. **Fedorek** asked if the number of students who opted for P/NP in Fall was significant and whether this would be the last term that the P/NP contingency plan would be in effect. **Stillman** replied that he believes Fall mirrored the previous terms fairly well in terms of volume but that he would try to find a more precise number. **Fedorek** then asked what the drawbacks would be if we just reverted the current policy to the original policy. **Gay** added, in the chat:

*Isn’t the policy basically just spelling out that Senate has the power we already exercised?*

**Yates** stated that the original policy is being reinstated for Spring, and the current conversation is in regards to how we would go about changing it in the future. **Fedorek** clarified that his question regarded whether there is a need to plan for exigent circumstances when students have a 30-day period after grades are posted to change a course to P/NP. He shared concerns that the policy change might be a slippery slope, where grades do not matter much any longer, and added that if the pandemic continues or worsens, students will potentially have another year of P/NP grades. **Yates** responded that the recommended change gives a historical record of how and why the more liberal P/NP might be applied again. **Anderson** added that the policy change does not require that we apply any or all of the P/NP changes in the future but that we have options that we could use if we wanted to. In addition, we could always vote this down if brought to Senate. **Siders** stated that students in a current class told him that they are taking his course P/NP and therefore not doing a particular assignment, implying that students are choosing the assignments they want or think they should do. He then agreed with Fedorek, adding that students can choose to take a course P/NP at the beginning of the term or long after the term is over. **Yates** added that in the previous policy, there were additional allowances for students – students could take more than 1 course P/NP, etc., and that we are really considering a policy regarding how we might change a policy.

**Oliveri** asked whether the volume of students who chose P/NP for Fall was compared to previous Fall terms or the previous Spring term. **Stillman** replied that the comparison was between Fall and Spring – the previous terms with this P/NP plasticity. He added that it was his sense that students were electing P/NP with approximately the same proportionality.

**Oliveri** added that the policy change is valuable as a historical note and reminder to future faculty about this event.

**Vote: Motion passed** with an abstention from Morey and a nay from both Fedorek and Siders.

* Raising to 20 credits threshold for students to register without permission (Disc.)

Preface:

**Yates** stated that the current number of credits students can take without approval from an advisor or someone with the authority to grant approval is 18, and this proposal from the APC seeks to increase that number of credits. Senate will vote on this proposed policy in 2 weeks unless someone waives the 2-week rule. **Ruggerio** stated that the need for students to obtain approval from an academic advisor to take 19 or 20 credits was creating a barrier for students who, in general, were not losing GPA points and not persisting in lower numbers by going over the 18-credit threshold. The intent of the proposal is to raise the threshold to 20 credits and thereby remove the hurdle for those students, reduce the workload for academic advisors who go through the process of giving consent, and reduce the workload for Raider Student Services who must process the consents. The registrar provided a study of the persistence and GPA of students taking 19 and 20 credits, and the APC was convinced by the evidence to give the change a trial year. The APC proposes that the policy change go into effect in Fall term and, after 1 year of implementation, a second study be conducted that provides a review of student success and any unforeseen negative consequences.

**Stillman** discussed his analysis, which was shared on the screen and is provided in the Senate documents folder for this meeting.

*Scope:*

The analysis reviewed data from students undergraduate, degree-seeking students taking 15-20 credits from Fall 2018-Spring 2020 in addition to those taking any number of credits 1-25 from Fall 2020-Winter 2021.

*Definitions:*

Average Term GPA - Average GPA of the students for that term.

Base - The number of students that took a certain volume of credit hours.

Retained - Students of the base that persisted to the next term, given as a number and percentage.

*Findings:*

There were no indications that students in the 19-20 credit threshold area persisted at any markedly different rate or had any GPA disadvantage compared to students taking 18 or fewer credit hours.

**Stillman** added that if this proposal were passed he would build in safety mechanisms that would protect the academic progress and experience of students who opt for 19-20 credits. For example, he would review each situation, intervene in cases where a student looks academically marginal, is on academic probation, etc.

Discussion:

**Siders** stated that the averages were helpful and asked if Stillman could provide the standard deviation along with the average values calculated to determine confidence intervals. **Stillman** agreed that the standard deviation would be interesting to see and that he would talk to Chris Stanek in IR to see if this would be possible.

**Fedorek** asked Stillman to clarify whether 91 students required an academic advisor's approval to take more than 18 credits in Fall 18-Winter 19, and **Stillman** replied that there were 91 students in the 19-20 credit area for that timeframe. **Fedorek** reflected on his experience with students who have requested to take more than 18 credits. After reviewing their academic performance and meeting with them, there are students for whom he grants permission to take more than 18 credits and students that he does not. He stated that students who are not given permission (by him or other advisors) are not shown in this data. **Stillman** responded that this was a fair inference.

**Fedorek** asked if APC had discussed granting this ability to increase their credit limit to 19-20 credits to students who meet a minimum GPA. **Stillman** responded that this was not discussed at APC, adding that it is not technically feasible in Banner to have this limitation. In terms of when he would intervene, the approach would be more holistic. He would intervene in cases with students on academic warning or probation, and his sense is that a reasonably minimal GPA would be in the 3.0 zone. He would also likely consider the most previous academic performance of students – there is a tremendous amount of literature indicating that this is more predictive of their success than their cumulative GPA. **Ruggerio** added that, anecdotally, the members of the APC in the room during the conversation did not have a lot of experience of having students who were not doing well academically and wanting to take 19 or 20 credits. Those students were either taking that larger load of credits because they were in credit-intensive majors such as theater or taking a large number of P/NP credits, such as for internships. **Stillman** stated that the most common scenario he sees is the type that Ruggerio described or the addition of 1-2 PE 180 courses. **Fedorek** responded that, in CCJ, there is a capstone that will allow students to take up to 14 credits, which often requires approval. He recounted a recent situation in which a student with a GPA well below 3.0 wanted to take more than 20 credits.

**Golding** asked Stillman about the intervention if a student with a GPA well below 3.0 were to sign up for over 18 credits, and **Stillman** replied that he would contact the student’s advisor and, likely, their SSC as well. In extreme cases, he might try another way to intervene. **Golding** stated that it might make sense to have a minimum GPA. She has had students who have taken an overload and visited her office in distress because they felt they could not handle it. She agreed with Fedorek that she would rather see them first to have a discussion before allowing the extra course load. **Stillman** stated that if Senate would like to set a minimum GPA threshold or any other limiters, that would be fine. However, he cannot program this in Banner. He said that it’s analogous to prerequisite conversations he has had – the prerequisite requirement might be in the catalog, but there is not a way he can enforce it. In this case, we could establish GPA or other limitations, and he would absolutely catch students who have not met a limitation but enroll in over 18 credits as they come in, but he would not be able to preclude them from registering for more than 18 credits.

**Yates** stated that the APC and especially the registrar are open to guidance and that Senate could make additional recommendations in a motion two weeks from now.

**Fedorek** asked whether SSCs can put in an overload, and **Stillman** replied that SSCs have the same prerogative as faculty advisors – they can put in overloads from up to 20 credits. Stillman has to then approve these overloads before they go through.

**Thatcher** shared his observation that students sometimes sign up for a number of classes, sometimes as a placeholder, and then drop them as needed. For OAL, this happens a lot and is problematic because many activity courses are at 10 students initially, but students who never intended to actually take the course will drop them. He stated that it would be helpful if he could talk to the students before they take an overload.

**Gay** added, in the chat:

*Could the policy require that any students with a certain GPA, say 2.5, automatically triggers notification of advisors?*

**Stillman** replied that he could talk to IT, adding that this might be a major modification as a notification trigger. Notification triggers are, however, easier than precluding something from moving forward.

**Yates** requested that senators consult with their constituents and be ready for a vote in 2 weeks.

1. **4:45p Faculty Awards recommendations (Discussion – Possible 2 week rule waiver) – Faculty Development Committee**

Preface:

**Yates** announced that, after holding it to keep the secret for as long as possible, he had just put a document listing the faculty nominees for the 3 faculty awards into the folder for the current Senate meeting.

Recommendations:

**Morey** (chair of the Faculty Development Committee) presented the awardees and added that the document includes a brief bio for each awardee, giving a preview of what will be announced at the end-of-year breakfast.

* *Distinguished Teaching Award*

The members of the committee for this award were Marianne Golding, Nigel Waterton, John Taylor, Precious Yamaguchi, Peter Wu, Elizabeth Whitman, and Robin Strangfeld. The review process took creativity due to Covid. They voted on the candidates and the awardees are Dr. Brian Fedorek, Dr. Andrew Gay, and Dr. Shanell Sanchez.

* *Distinguished Service Award*

The awardees are Dr. David Carter and Dr. Brook Colley.

* *Distinguished Scholarship Award*

This was the toughest of the awards, as there were a number of amazing candidates. The awardees are Dr. Edwin Batistella and Dr. Peter Wu.

**Yates** stated that the customary Senate procedure would be to discuss the recommendations and vote in two weeks, but he said he would entertain a motion to waive the 2-week rule for an earlier vote.

**Motion & Vote:** Golding moved to waive the 2-week rule, and Belcastro seconded. **Motion passed** with 1 abstention from Fedorek and 1 abstention from Gay.

**Motion:** Kurutz moved to approve the recommended awardees, and Golding seconded.

Discussion:

**Yates** stated that, as this was the first year the Distinguished Scholarship Award has been offered, there were many nominees and it was a very competitive race. We might anticipate having something of a log jam on that award for a couple or few years.

**Yates** added that Morey has shared recommendations for aligning the awards’ timelines, etc., and that these will be brought to a future meeting.

**Vote: Motion passed** with 1 abstention from Fedorek and 1 abstention from Gay. The vote was followed by congratulations to all awardees.

1. **4:55p Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council proposals (Discussion)**

Preface:

**Yates** stated that there are several proposals in the Senate folder for curriculum and courses. Most of the Graduate Council proposals included in this package are connected to items approved by the Curriculum Committee. The intent is to bring things that are connected to both the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council at the same time.

A summary sheet from the Curriculum Committee gave an overview of the proposals – the proposals include a new certificate in professional social media from Communication, a new minor in ethnic & racial studies from GSWS, and a battery of new courses from Chemistry, Communication, Ethnic & Racial Studies (ERS), and Music. The Graduate Council proposals include 400- and 500-level courses from ERS and GSWS. Yates offered for anyone present to discuss any curriculum associated with their program.

Discussion:

**Waters** stated that the minor in ethnic & racial studies is not being proposed by GSWS but that Kylan de Vries, Carey Sojka, and Brook Colley worked collaboratively on the proposal and it is really its own minor at the moment. There is an ongoing discussion about where it will reside administratively.

**Fedorek** asked who could take the master’s class proposed by Ethnic & Racial Studies. **Waters** replied that the course came to Grad Council as a split-level proposal, specifically with the future in mind. Some students in the GSWS major may find the proposed ERS curriculum beneficial. In addition, there has been a long-standing concern regarding the paucity of 500-level courses for students working on their thesis or other projects and are looking for interdisciplinary opportunities. Grad Council was fairly enthusiastic to see additional open-number courses in areas pertinent to a number of different programs and student priorities. Kylan de Vries would likely want to make it clear that there are no real personnel and there is no intention to teach these courses in the first year of the minor, but they would like to add these courses to the catalog to provide service to other programs and meet anticipated needs for students entering their senior year in the GSWS major.

**Longhurst** shared that the Oregon Department of Education approved ethnic studies standards for all grades and all subjects last week, after a couple of years of discussion and legislation. While Education does not yet have required coursework that would send students to ERS courses at the moment, this is something that could be on the horizon because Education will now need to do more work in that area by statute. **Waters** concurred that Education had agreed that these additional 500-level courses would be beneficial. **Belcastro** added that students in the Masters of Science in Education take classes that are across different disciplines, including business, health, and chemistry. The 500-level courses across campus provide an interdisciplinary perspective that is highly beneficial to masters’ programs in Education.

**Waters** stated that the courses are not tied to one faculty member, giving many opportunities for a number of faculty to be able to teach in these areas. It would be a good idea to look into additional professional development opportunities for this.

**Yates** shared concerns about having a new prefix and a new program without a lot of clarity regarding who is in the program and who is managing the program. If it is not a GSWS program, it would be helpful to have, perhaps, a coordinator, so that it does not fall victim to not being able to offer courses in the event that people become territorial in their programs about SCH. **Waters** replied that these are important questions and have been under consideration, long before the program was reviewed by the Curriculum Committee. The faculty involved have been clearly identified and a lot of due diligence was done in the development of the proposal. These conversations will continue and the administrative piece will likely be the last item to fall into place, with a lot of participation from all of the right people.

**Yates** asked senators to review the proposals and return with questions. The proposals will be action items at the next meeting.

1. **5:00p Relinquishment rights for Academic Administrators with Faculty Rank Part Two (Announcement--Faculty Senate feedback sought) -- SOU Policy Council [Please see Feb 8 Senate folder for wording of proposed policy change]**

Preface:

**Yates** referred to Anderson’s AC report, stating that AC discussed the proposed alternative tenure relinquishment process for faculty who moved into administration. The alternative path would allow for these administrators to receive a bump in salary and, if retiring early, healthcare benefits without returning to faculty. AC recognized that this could be a hot-button issue, and Yates emphasized that the proposed policy change is not in the purview of the Senate but that the University Policy Council (UPC) wants Senate feedback.

Following the last AC meeting, Yates discussed the proposed change with Jason Catz on the phone and learned that the Board of Trustees is ultimately responsible for these policies; however, the Board has relegated that power largely to the President of the University and to the UPC. Thus, anyone can suggest a policy to the UPC, which then decides whether to obtain feedback on the suggestion, how to obtain that feedback (from whom and when), and ultimately whether to move forward with the policy. If the policy does move forward, it is taken to the President of the University, and the President then has 7 or 14 days to accept or reject the policy change. The 7-day window applies to most policy changes, and the 14-day window applies to policies that have any collective bargaining agreement impact(s).

The task is now to obtain faculty feedback and provide it to Catz and the UPC.

Announcement:

Yates would like to send an all-faculty email that would: (1) contain the current and proposed new policies, and (2) solicit feedback on that change. Yates would then compile the feedback, share the compilation with AC and Senate, and use guidance from both AC and Senate to decide if the feedback should be discussed further at Senate before being sent to the UPC.

Discussion:

**Fedorek** asked about the timeline and **Yates** replied that he would like to move quickly on this so as to obtain feedback before the next AC meeting in one week.

**Yates** stated that Senate could pass a non-binding resolution stating that they oppose the proposed change but that he wanted more constructive feedback from a thoughtful reflection of pros and cons of aspects of the proposal.

**Parker** clarified that when tenured faculty take an administrative position, they still hold faculty rank with tenure. **Yates** replied that this is true and that the argument from their side is that they would have never agreed to take the administrative position if they did not still have the retreat right. The policy change would give them two ways of relinquishing tenure.

**Thatcher** asked about the benefits of relinquishing tenure, and **Yates** replied that the relinquishment provides a pay bump for the final 3 years of work before retirement and healthcare benefits if you are in a certain age range.

**Belcastro** is supportive of the healthcare benefit. She asked if the question is about creating something separate for this population or allowing them to simultaneously reap the benefits of being faculty. For example, if faculty lose the privileges of tenure in a negotiation, would this population lose those privileges too? **Yates** responded that the University President manages employees in the administrative class, so this would be the President’s decision, assuming that the Board is supportive.

**Yates** stated that there are 3 parts to the relinquishment rights that tenured faculty have and that are part of the proposed policy change for administrators who have faculty rank with tenure. One is the relinquishment bump, which is 6% for faculty for up to 3 years and would be 4.5% for administrators. The other two parts relate to healthcare and are the same for both faculty and in the proposal for administrators who were once faculty. Yates is personally supportive of the healthcare benefit, which would provide either coverage or 25% of the cost of coverage for up to 7 years or until the age of 65, whichever comes first. The salary benefit is the part that might not be equal in comparison to what is received by faculty.

**Belcastro** asked to clarify whether this population of administrators would have separate privileges or if they would retain their faculty rights such that when the CBA shifts their privileges would also shift. **Yates** replied that he was uncertain and would need to review the policy more closely. He stated that the relinquishment right has been in the CBA for nearly 20 years and is not something the faculty union would like to give up easily. He agreed that it is a worthwhile question and that Senate could ask that the new policy be hinged to the rights outlined in the CBA as opposed to an absolute right.

**Yates** recounted the phrase that all of us will see things that no one of us could see. The hope is to collect feedback and tease out a coherent set of reasonable reflections that would have a positive impact.

**Fedorek** stated that the policy change seems to have a process question and an incentive question. Both are clearly laid out in the CBA for faculty, but it's not clear what they are right now for administrators or administrators who were once faculty. **Yates** stated that he expressed this well.

**Yates** stated that he will move forward with the plan outlined in his announcement and that he is open to feedback. He asked senators to let him know if they felt strongly that this should come back to Senate for discussion. The compiled feedback will be shared with Senate before it is sent to the UPC.

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

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

Meeting adjourned at 5:33 pm.