**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**October 15, 2012**

**SU 313 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.**

**Present:** Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Mary Carrabba, David Carter, Prakash Chenjeri, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Doug Gentry, Fredna Grimland, Dan Harvey, John King, Mary Russell-Miller, Byron Marlowe, Gerry McCain, Rich May, Kasey Mohammad, Larry Shrewsbury, Jamie Vener, Jody Waters.

**Absent:**  Todd Carney, Robin Strangfeld, Dennis Slattery,

**Visitors:** President Cullinan, Provost Klein, Rick Weems, Kelly, Moutsatson, Bill Hughes, Karen Stone, Alissa Arp.

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.

**Approval of minutes from June 11 and October 1:**

* Dave Carter motioned that the June 11 Senate minutes be approved. May seconded, and the motion carried with all in favor, none opposed. King abstained.
* Cleland-Siple motioned that the October 1 Senate minutes be approved, with one minor correction. Gentry seconded, and the motion carried with all in favor, none opposed. King abstained.

**Announcements (4:05 – 4:10)**

* Chenjeri announced that the Campus Theme of Happiness is off to a great start with last week’s lecture. The series continues next week with a panel discussion on Religion and Happiness. The panel will include Stuart McAllister, a well-known, Scottish-born minister who lectures worldwide. Bill Gholson will provide the non-religious position, and Prakash Chenjeri will be the third member of the panel, which will be held in the Meese Room of the Hannon Library at 6:00, Wednesday, October 24.

**Comments from President Cullinan**:

* President Cullinan expressed her thanks to faculty for encouraging students to attend the Distinguished Alumnus speaker’s presentation. Dr. John Francis, who graduated from Southern Oregon State College in 1981, also received the Distinguished Alumni Award at the President’s Recognition Dinner, which was held last week.
* Cullinan will give the State of the University Address at 4:30 on Wednesday, October 17, in the Rogue River Room.
* The next Distinguished Lecture will feature Dr. Alma Rosa Alvarez and will be held at 4:00 on Oct 23, in the Meese Room of the Hannon Library.
* Cullinan spoke to the Chancellor and Higher Education Board last week, who was interested in hearing about issues at SOU but wanted firm numbers. The Chancellor will visit campus on November 2, and additional board members will visit on November 9. Cullinan will present more specific numbers to them at that time.
* SOU is embarking on the prioritization project, headed by Dr. Dan DeNeui. DeNeui will take nominations and compile a team to move forward.

**Discussion:**

* King noted that the faculty is interested in the OUS board’s visit and asked what opportunities exist for faculty to meet with them? Cullinan assured King that faculty will have opportunities to meet with the visiting board members.

**Comments from Provost Klein**:

* Provost Klein gave an update on the Student Affair searches. Jane Reeder has been hired to direct the Success at Southern program, and the search for a new Career Development director is in the final stages. This position will also coordinate internships and coordinate Community Based Learning. The person hired will eventually be housed in the Learning Commons.
* George Mahaffey from the American Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities will give what promises to be a provocative presentation about current trends in higher education. This will be a lunch event on November 9, from 12:30-1:30. Invitations will be sent out soon, and please RSVP for this event. A facilitated breakout session will follow the presentation.

**House Preview: Karen Stone**:

* Stone discussed two handouts (See handouts). The first was a “Proposal Template for Pilot House.” Proposals are due to Mary Gardner by October 29 and will be reviewed by the Change Team.
* Stone also introduced a Curriculum Map. One side is the current reality, and the other side is the proposed “House Seminar” model. All general education requirements cannot be satisfied in House Seminar, but all lower division would be offered here. Oral and Written Communication, which is now addressed in USem, would be spread through the Gen. Ed. Courses. Current USem faculty would follow students into the Houses. Enlightenment/Cohort would have many possible manifestations.

**Discussion:**

* Ettlich noted that there is a Capstone in the House and wondered if students could potentially have two Capstone experiences, one in the major department and one in the House. Stone notes that it might be a combination of group projects, led by the lead capstone student, in which others participate.

**Discussion:**

* Waters explained that she has heard some discussion among faculty about the Change Group reviewing proposals and wonders if UPB could also review these proposals. Cullinan and Klein both agreed that more voices weighing in on these decisions would be helpful. Stone said the Change Team will address this.
* Waters wonders if folks might be scrambling to be involved in many Houses, and she wondered if people should limit participation to one House. Might it count against a faculty member who wants to go in several directions? Stone said no, and Arp added that nothing has been determined yet. It is important to note that the proposals are conceptual at this point, and no curriculum is required for the proposal process.
* Carter requested that digital copies of these documents be distributed. Stone indicated that after final revisions, she will send them out.
* Grimland indicated that her department is having a difficult time conceptualizing the House idea, and she wondered if a model might exist to help faculty understand. Stone explained that no applicable model exists. SOU is leading in this area. Arp reiterated that it is not necessary to pin down every detail at this stage in the planning process.
* Gentry wondered how we should encourage faculty to engage in the discussion of the House Seminar model, and he noted that in some instances, the credits increase, and Stone noted that the new model does not allow for “double dipping,” so that accounts for the increase in credit requirements.
* Belcastro wondered if a student can still have a minor under the House model. Stone explained that nothing has been decided about majors and minors yet. This will remain to be seen over time. Some majors (EMDA for example) may sit in a house rather than a department.
* Ettlich noted that major coursework is pushed down into the first two years and wonders if sophomores might be taking major courses.
* Chenjeri inquired about how many faculty members can be listed in each House proposal. Stone stressed that the goal with these proposals is quality, not quantity. When asked if staff should also be part of the proposal process, Klein encouraged folks to include key support staff in proposals.
* King noted that proposals should refer to positions, not necessarily specific people, and while Klien remarked that staff can change, Arp added that if there are individuals who are key to a proposal, it would be appropriate to include them by name in the proposals.
* Marlowe wondered who would administrate the Houses and what will be then be the incentive to do so, other than survival. Klein observed that the proposals should include what kind of leadership would be needed in each House.
* King asked if additional Houses will be added after the initial pilot year.
* Stone anticipates adding new Houses as we learn from what works. It’s an experiment.
* Ettlich suggested adding a question about House enrollment to the proposal template.
* Waters notes that the proposals themselves might suggest additional ideas. Stone foresees open sessions for additional discussions of House proposals.

**ASSOU Report – Josh Danielson**:

* There was no ASSOU Report as Danielson was not in attendance.

**Advisory Council Report – John King**:

* King explained that Advisory Council meets bi-weekly with President Cullinan and Provost Klein. The current Advisory Council consists of Waters, Brown, King, Carter, Chenjeri, Gentry, and Hughes.
* AC’s primary goal is to set the agenda for the following week’s Senate meeting.
* King explained that he has found it helpful to compare the proposed House model to the Prioritizing project rather than viewing them as separate projects.
* King also emphasized the need to have the teams report back to the appropriate committees, who will serve as support for the teams, as a “sounding board” rather than just end reports.
* King reported that AC discussed bringing professional development to the campus for faculty to help with the transformation process.
* Finally, King reported that statewide initiatives were discussed, including Degree Completion Credit for Prior Learning.

**Information Items:**

**Enrollment update - Rick Weems**:

* Weems gave an enrollment update. He reported that the calling campaign that took place over summer was helpful. Faculty and staff reached out to over 700 students who were not registered for fall classes. The calling lists were divided into two lists: those with holds and those with no holds. Students were asked why they weren’t returning. Responses were varied. 25% of respondents who planned to transfer were headed to OSU (Engineering majors), followed by PSU and U of O. Others had no financial aid left, a few reported marriage problems, and a few more had moved out of the area. The calling campaign will happen next summer. Weems reported that there was a slight problem with the calling lists becoming corrupted, so this will be prevented for next year.

**Discussion:**

* Ettlich noted that Engineering majors should be transferring to OSU--it is our 3 plus 2 program, so they are supposed to transfer to complete their degrees.
* Dan Harvey asked Weems if any of the students called had reported being dissatisfied with their experience at SOU. This question was not explicitly asked, and Weems said it could be added for next year.
* Gentry asked more about the file corruption issues. The “no hold” file was corrupted. Weems says the tracking was not complete because of this. Ettlich wondered what percentage of the 700 students we reached actually registered. Weems explained that we don’t track that yet.
* Waters was on the calling team, and she noted that considering the lack of accessible advising in summer, the short calls were valuable in encouraging students to return.
* King wondered if we can ask why people are staying. Weems explained that we have data on retention. Athletes retain at 82%. Students who are employed on campus retain at a higher rate, and if they reside on campus, we can add 5% to the retention rate. NSSE or other survey could be used.
* Belcastro noted that she had a Carnegie Grant to look at this information and she could present that again.
* Weems reported that at the end of the third week, enrollment is down. We have 81 new freshmen, 128 new transfer students, and we are up 30 continuing and returning students. Our non-admitted student population is equal or above last year’s, and it includes Advanced SOU Credit. FTE is down 5.8. Without non-admits, we are on track. MIM will begin in winter and increase our graduate student numbers. International students will also increase in winter. We are down 4 students now from last year, but we have 64 new international students this fall. Many graduated last year.

**New Director of Admissions—Kelly Moutsatson**

* The new Director of Admissions, Kelly Moutsatson, introduced herself. She is excited to be on the SOU team and to work with students.

**Prioritization Process - Provost Klein**:

* Craig Morris, Allissa Arp, Provost Klein, and Dan DeNeui recently attended a conference on Prioritizing Academic and Administrative Programs. Klein notes that our current system of program reviews happens on different schedules using different criteria. A better way would be to do it all at once using the same criteria. One team will be established for academic reviews and one for administrative review. Anything that has costs will be reviewed. Evaluation teams will do prioritization work in spring. Results will be ranked by quintiles, and the study will answer some key questions. What do we want to invest in? What should be reviewed? What should be outsourced? What might be eliminated? What should we invest in?

**Discussion:**

* Belcatro asked if the annual reviews will be part of accreditation? Klein explains that the Assessment Committee will remain separate.
* Waters noted that we are purchasing a book about how this process works.
* King wondered about workload and suspending non-essential work for now to not overload everyone. Klein says perhaps winter term could include slowing down and placing some work on hold to allow faculty to focus energy on the planning and prioritizing.
* Waters agreed that lessoning service is the best place to cut back since we can’t sacrifice teaching duties or office hours.
* Klein is suggesting that all tenure-track searching be suspended for now. This is under discussion with department chairs.
* Belcastro asked if the department program reviews will also be suspended, and Klein confirmed that they would.
* Gentry asked about departments with multiple programs. Would they required one review or many? Klein explained that each program and major/minor will be reviewed. The operating manual explains this.
* Ettlich wondered about interconnectedness of programs. Cancelling one might not save money since resources are shared.
* Cullinan notes that the prioritizing model we are using is not a new program. It has already functioned in other places for over ten years.
* Klein will invite folks to a training session with the experts.
* King wondered about different messages coming from different areas. When will key information be broadcast to everyone (suspending committees/reviews/etc)?
* Waters reported that faculty want more all-faculty emails, which will help avoid confusion and anxiety.
* Ettlich wondered about so many “targets.” Which one is essential? She is concerned that she’s not aware of all the targets. Information is coming through variety of places, and meetings often take place while in she is in class.
* Klein explained that once Houses are picked, those committees will work on them. We will take a ten-week break in some committee work during winter quarter to work on this.
* Waters expressed that faculty fear if they are not affiliated with a House, they might be left behind. Klein says it’s a pilot, so fewer participants is actually better. Students must still vote it in. Not everyone needs to be in a House right now.
* Waters stressed that we all have many obligations.
* Ettlich suggested Klien send out an email to reassure faculty. Many fear that if they don’t get on board, they will lose programs, jobs, and majors.
* Cullinan requested that Senators spread the word that this is a pilot that is exciting, wonderful and distinctive. It is not mandatory. Our main focus must be a successful year for our students.
* Marlowe reiterated that current practices are not working, so we must become distinctive and transformative. Fear is not contributing to this positive change.
* Waters noted that the message was linked to the House Model. It is only one part of a larger transformative movement. We are still moving forward, but not only place for change to happen.
* Klein noted that faculty has been focusing on House Model. Waters explained that faculty members were told that they need to participate. It happened fast, and a reassuring email from the President and Provost will help assure people.

**Campus time/scheduling - Provost Klein**

* Klein explained that the Budget Planning Taskforce has been looking at how we create campus community. Campus is basically closed Friday through Sunday, and a change to Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday classes could free up Wednesdays for meetings and activities to build more campus community and keep faculty and students on campus and involved.
* The next step will be to form Focus Groups with students with faculty and staff.
* Ettlich asked if Monday/Wednesday/ Friday classes would still be allowed. Klein explained that different models might be used with different scheduling blocks.
* Mohammed noted the pedagogical value of a more balanced schedule than a two-day class format offers.
* Belcastro cautioned against Wednesdays becoming a “dead” day.
* Cullinan envisions performances, lectures, and other campus events that might happen on Wednesdays.
* King would like to see a “campus engagement day” populated with events to bring students and faculty together.
* Grimland noted that we have many outdoor venues that could be used for public gathering, performances, and meals.

**Discussion Items:**

There were no Discussion Items.

**Action Items:**

There were no Action Items.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:27.