Faculty Senate Minutes

October 29, 2012

SU 313 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

**Present:** Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Dave Carter, Prakash Chenjeri, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Fredna Grimland, Dan Harvey, Gerry McCain, Narcisa Pricope, John King, Byron Marlowe, Rich May, Kasey Mohammad, Larry Shrewsbury, Tracy Templeton, Jamie Vener, Jody Waters.

**Absent:** Todd Carney, Doug Gentry, Mary Russell-Miller, Ellen Siem.

**Visitors:** Craig Morris, Jim Klein, Chris Stanek, Sue Walsh, Andrew Ensslin, Linda Wilcox Young, Robert (Ellis) Cochran, Dan DeNeui

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:01p.m.

**Approval of minutes from October 15:**

May moved that the October 15 minutes be approved with slight amendments. Mohammad seconded the motion. Motion passed with all in favor and Cleland-Sipfle abstaining.

**Announcements**

* Danielson announced event to be held tonight--Rock the Vote. The event will feature food, music, and discussion of the issues. They have over 1000 contacts on their Facebook list. Measure 80 will be debated. Diversions 6:00. Band with 7:00 debates.
* Student Senate is looking for a Faculty Senate representative to attend their meetings on Tuesdays from 6:00-7:00.
* Mohammad announced that the Katherine Wagner Emergent Poem event has been postponed.
* Chenjeri announced that the last event held in the Happiness Campus Theme series was well attended. The venue was full and they streamed the event on television screens in order to let everyone watch.
* The next event will feature Dr. Christopher Bobonich, Professor of Philosphpy from Stanford University. He will speak on Happiness and the Greeks on be held on Thursday, November 1, in the Meese Auditorium at 7:00. Bobonich will speak again on Friday, November 2, at 4:00 in Science 118, when the topic will be Happiness and the Meaning of Life.
* Chenjeri extended thanks to faculty for their continued involvement in the Campus Theme events.

**Comments from President Cullinan:**

President Cullinan was not in attendance.

**Comments from Provost Klein:**

* Our Distinguished Faculty Lecture series continued with Alma Rosa Alvarez’s talk last week. Geoff Mills will speak in winter term and Greg Jones in the spring.
* On November 9, George Mahaffey, VP for Academic Strategies and Change, will speak at a luncheon. Invitations have gone out, so RSVP if you are interested in attending this provocative speaker who will address what’s going on with change in higher education around the country.
* The OUS Board’s visit has been postponed until after Thanksgiving, but the Chancellor will be here Friday.
* SOU sports are doing well. Football, Volley Ball, Cross Country, and Wrestling are all ranked nationally.
* A House “open house” will be held from 2:30-4:00 in SU 313 on Thursday.

**ASSOU Report**

* Ellis explained that ASSOU is working on biographies for its members. These will be published on the ASSOU website. He would like committees listed there as well, and it would be the first time this information would be included on the website.

**Discussion**:

* Marlowe asked about the recent accident involving SOU student leaders. Ellis explained that Jasmine Roque’s vehicle flipped over on the return trip from student leadership workshop in eastern Oregon. Thankfully, nobody was seriously injured, and the group flew back to southern Oregon.
* Waters reiterated the importance of having Faculty Senate representation at the Student Senate meetings. Perhaps several faculty members could share the responsibility of attending at least the beginning of each meeting. Contact Waters if you are interested.

**Advisory Council Report** **– John King**

* Advisory Council supported and thanked President Cullinan/Provost Klein's intent to begin each week with an all-campus email to reassure faculty and give an update about the change process. AC agreed that this would be a good way to get the message out to faculty and staff.
* OEIB was in Medford last Wednesday, and AC talked about how best to represent SOU. The public forum was good but came after the OUS board had made its financial decisions. Rudy Crew was in attendance, along with many students. Steve Thorpe represented SOU and discussed the initiative that affects higher education.
* AC also discussed the possibility of reducing faculty workload to make way for prioritization work.

**Discussion**:

* Waters noted that she has heard some interest in having faculty be vocal on important issues (editorials, position papers, etc.). The Legislative Action team could be involved in gaining better representation in the public sphere. An event for discussing budget after Governor’s budget will be announced for early December. Those interested in being part of efforts to write editorials, letters to the editor, etc., regarding higher education in the state and the nation are asked to contact Waters

**Information Items:**

**Budget Update – Craig Morris**:

* Morris gave an overview of the budget structure of the university;
* Pro forma assumptions and budget were presented: main points are that: 1) we have a balanced budget for this year in spite of enrollment decrease, 2) Still need to cut an additional $1M from our budget for next year, and 3) prioritization process will inform us regarding redistribution of resources (see attached)

**Discussion:**

King asked about previous assumptions. How accurate were the projections? Morris has the numbers but did not bring them. He will come again with this information if needed.

Marlowe wondered about the 7, 5, 3 projections.

Morris explained that the goal is to make tuition more affordable to students.

Belcastro asked if there is any delineation of grad/undergrad. Morris says no—same mix as this year. Belcastro followed up by wanting confirmation that, if we do increase our undergraduate population, we lose money, and Morris said yes.

Harvey wondered about the 3% increase from the state, and Morris said that he does not know what will happen.

Personnel services: Still have one million dollar faculty/staff reduction necessary.

PERS increase.

Marlowe asked about how early retirement affects budget. Morris explained that it depends on who is retiring. Sr. retiree is higher in steps than person replacing. If line weren’t replaced, that’s a savings. Health insurance is about 1250 per month per employee. Marlowe wants to know where Morris sees these cuts happening. Must happen by July, “opportunistic” places. Prioritization process will help us decide where to make resource reallocations.

Vener asks what it means if we go beneath 5 to 4.8%. That would require Retrenchment. The million cut will do that. Without it, we will go negative in three years. Ellis asks if the cuts have to come from personnel. Yes. No room for cuts in S and S.

**Prioritization Process - Provost Klein, Dan DeNeui, and Chris Stanek:**

* DeNeui gave an update on the Prioritization Process. This process will be facilitated through Academic and non-academic teams that are being formed right now. Each team will have 6-10 members. The Academic team will be predominantly comprised of faculty and other staff/administrators. Some folks have been nominated several times, and many nominations were submitted through this process. The list went to President Cullinan over the weekend, and she is extending invitations to selected faculty and staff members and maintaining lists of potential backups.
* Many who were nominated are also involved in other campus responsibilities, chair, UPB and Senate, etc.,
* Committee members should be announced at the end of the week.
* DeNeui previewed the new website that is under construction and available. ([www.sou.edu/vision](http://www.sou.edu/vision))
* He explained that the process is not new and we are not the first to undergo this process. He is pulling from previous universities’ experiences as he goes forward. Experts recommend confining this process to less than one year in order to avoid needless anxiety.
* Teams will take the ten criteria and figure out how they fit SOU. Some stated criteria may not be applicable to our situation.
* The timeline is quick, and much happens over the holidays, quiet and final exam weeks.
* Typically, programs that have costs attached are included in the process and will be evaluated.

**Discussion:**

* McCain asked DeNeui who actually writes the review. DeNeui explained that typically, the Chair of the department or program will write the review or a subcommittee might take it on.
* Belcastro wondered if the process will be reported “as is” or if review opens areas for reform or saving, would that be presented? Should departments include insight about how to improve or just report on things as they are now? DeNeui explains that the goal is to evaluate everyone using the same criteria. If you have information that could provide savings, please report to DeNeui or to team chairs.
* Vener wondered if the criteria #10 (Opportunity Analysis) bullet allows for a place to dream and improve? DeNeui explained that this allows reporters to to make recommendations as if there were more resources.
* Waters added that could be a place to suggest areas of improvement other than just the financial.
* Waters asked DeNeui for points to take back to faculty about how to understand the prioritization process, and Provost Klein suggested discussing quintiles.
* Prioritizing will be organized in quintiles. The bottom two quintiles must be addressed. We do not have a number. Perhaps resources might be shifted or reallocated, but no certain cuts can be predicted. The timeline is aggressive, but the process is tried and true. We can learn from previous participants. We will have no new hires. We must get away from the continual cutting dynamic.
* McCain wondered about other studies—what happened to the bottom quintiles? DeNeui acknowledged that in some instances, programs have been eliminated, but this does not happen right away. Some had reductions but not eliminations. Some did not replace retirements. McCain wondered what the difference is between this and retrenchment. What happens to that faculty? Should non-tenured faculty be scared? Klein says not yet. Our contracts spell out “pecking order.”
* Ettlich encouraged DeNeui to showcase two or three institutions that went through this process and what good resulted from it.
* Klein pointed out that we are “overprogrammed.” We don’t have the students to support the curriculum we have. If departments can do this “housekeeping” themselves, it won’t have to be done for them.
* Mohammad wondered what programs (in other institutions) fared best/worst. DeNeui does not know of quantitative data, but discussion around what makes the process work. Support, faculty buy-in, and trust are essential. Without these qualities, this process will not succeed. Other institutions found that when recommendations were not followed, the results were not positive. Program reports are plentiful online.

**Committees:**

Two new committees need population. Student Success (Retention) and Facilities Planning and Utilization (Distribution of space) Committees. Both report to UPB. No meeting schedule yet. Each should meet once a month. Sue and Craig are forming these groups.

Waters asked for input on the suspension of non-essential committee work while the prioritization process unfolds.

Marlowe: brought to his department. Consensus is that if we suspend one committee, we should suspend all.

Chenjeri: has this been discussed at Chairs’ Council? Mohammad feels that most committee work is regarded as essential.

Ettlich noted that committee work is faculty governance, and shutting down that work is shutting down faculty input.

Waters: suggests that we keep considering how to make this additional work manageable for faculty with minimal impact to teaching and other essential responsibilities.

Belcastro: wondered about ELUs? Waters knows there is not budget to support monetizing ELUs, but that banking or looking at existing banked ELUs could be discussed. Ettlich says to ask committees to curtail meetings and tasks just for the limited timeframe.

Grimland: Faculty don’t mind the work, but they wonder if their time is wasted with work not resulting in action.

Chenjeri wondered if certain things could be “fastracked” to free up faculty to do other things. King agreed that chairs of the committees need communication from faculty on how to proceed. Share thinking of ways to save time and showcase three or four things that could be reduced (such as program reviews).

**Discussion Items:**

**Carpenter II Grants, Faculty Development Committee – Erika Leppmann**

* Leppmann reported on the current round of Carpenter II Grant recommendations made by the Faculty Development Committee. The FDC recommended funding a number of faculty requests. The committee received 36 applications totaling $26,000 and had only $12,000 to award. The total requests, including travel, equaled over $49,000. The committee has forwarded several requests to the Provost’s office since the nature of the requests were valid, but not within the guidelines of the Carpenter II Grants.
* Harvey motioned to suspend the two-week rule, and Cleland-Sipfle seconded the motion, which passed with no abstentions.
* Belcastro made a motion to adopt the Faculty Development Committee’s recommendations as presented, and Ettlich seconded the motion. Motion passed with all in favor, none opposed. King and Pricope abstained.

**Action Items:**

There were no Action Items.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35.