**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**October 7, 2013**

**SU 313 4:00 - 5:30 p.m.**

**Present:** Jackie Apodaca, Amy Belcastro, Todd Carney, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Carol Ferguson, Steve Jessup, Byron Marlowe, Richard May, Pete Nordquist, Garth Pittman, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Mary Russell-Miller, Kevin Sahr, Larry Shrewsbury, Robin Strangfeld, Jamie Vener, Erin Wilder, and Doyne Mraz (as a substitute for Deborah Brown).

**Absent:** Deborah Brown, John King, Kasey Mohammad

Visitors: (None of the visitors signed in)

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

**Announcements:**

Carter:

* We should have a representative on the student senate, and we can do like we did last year and get a few individuals to rotate every once in a while.
* Dr. Cornel West will be here on the 17th. For more information you can look at the Student Information Center in the SU.

**Comments from President Cullinan:**

President Cullinan was not in attendance.

Liz Shelby gave us an update on governance:

* A task force will work closely with the president through the end of fall term to provide assistance, get the word out, present to other groups. And the folks representing the faculty in this task force are: Dr. Kemble Yates and Dr. Jody Waters.
* There is a website created for SOU’s Governance Options (the link was sent to us in the President’s Monday Message on Sept. 23 and again on Oct. 9):

[http://governance.sou.edu/](http://governance.sou.edu/" \t "_blank)

Some dates that will be held on our campus for governance discussions:

9:30 - 10:30 a.m. Monday Oct. 14 in the Meese Room, Hannon Library

3:40 - 4:30 p.m. Tuesday Oct. 15 in Room 352, Hannon Library

2:00 - 3:00 p.m. Friday Oct 18 in the Rogue River Room, Stevenson Union.

* This last legislative session, there was a senate bill 270 that passed that enabled the larger institutions to establish their own institutional boards and also provide a pathway for the smaller institutions to determine whether or not they also wanted to pursue their own institutional boards. That is the gist of the discussion plus a couple of other options that appear to be on the table but are not clearly defined.

Shelby: I’m happy to take any questions. We are hoping to come back in a couple of weeks for a more full discussion.

Mraz: As I understand OUS isn’t just a board but a whole service office. Are they breaking that up too?

Shelby: There are two different tracks that are happening right now. Legislation essentially abolished the chancellor’s office and merged portions of it into the higher education coordinating commission. Lee Ayers has been appointed to that commission. What will remain in terms of operational assistance that the chancellor’s office provided to us is called “Shared Services”, and there is a group that is studying “Shared Services.” Things like financial reporting, consolidating data, and those types of things that are under discussion by a particular group. Governance is an entirely different discussion. Governance is whether or not you want a board of trustees.

**Comments from Provost Klein:**

The three issues brought up in the SOU planning retreat were academic reorganization, governance, and campus vitality.

Campus vitality:

* We lose a third of our students between their first and second year, and we lose another third of our students from that point on up to graduation. Graduation rate for the last 6 years was 31%. What can we do to keep our students here and engaged?
* One idea that came up was a campus pub.
* There is an advising task force that Dan DeNeui and Matt Stillman co-chair and it will start at the end of this month or first of next month and look at some of the advising issues. Students were very vocal in their comments in the retreat about how we run them around quite a bit in advising. Are there some better ways that we can take care of advising?

Academic restructure:

* There was a lot of information, or misinformation, out about that. Let me tell you where we are with that conversation. At the retreat there were two groups, largely populated by faculty to look at a model or two of ways that we might be able to save substantial amounts of money with the way that we have our academic structure. Right now we have our program coordinators, department chairs, deans, and so forth. Is there a way to flatten out that structure so there isn’t so many levels and save a substantial amount of money? You will have to wait to see what the substantial amounts of money are until Craig shows you the financials of our institution. I’ll comment on those after you’ve had a chance to see where we are with the money savings, money transfers, and so forth.
* Sue Walsh and Karen Stone took the information from the SOU Planning Retreat, tried to synthesize it, and came up with a model that took that feedback, and presented it to the chairs three weeks ago this coming Wednesday. So we talked a little bit about that model and the nonnegotiables that we had in that model. We took another shot at it last week and looked at the negotiables and nonnegotiables. In other words, nothing has really been decided. Is this the best way to go about it? Does this save the right amount of money? We were able to cost out that model at least.
* Over this biennium rolling into the next biennium it would save $1,015,000. Whatever model we adopt, whether it’s that one, or something quite similar, or something quite different, it needs to meet that benchmark.
* We will be having another meeting with the chairs this week to kind of finish that conversation about what’s flexible and what’s not flexible. What’s not flexible is saving money.
* The president also wants us to organize ourselves to be more responsive to students, to promote better retention, and be somewhat more distinctive, or move in that direction.
* We will be having an open forum for faculty and staff at 3:30 - 5:00 p.m. on the 16th in the Arena. This Wednesday with the chairs we will go over what we will present, what ideas have come forth, and things people would like to present to get feedback on. So that’s where we are on academic restructuring.
* We know that we have to save money; we know we need to save at least $1,015,000, but with the enrollment numbers we may need to save more. We do have a pretty aggressive timeline for getting this work done, because we need to save $200,000 of the $1,015,000 this year. So we would like to implement whatever it is by Spring term. That gives us the rest of this term and the Winter term to start moving in that direction.

Prioritization:

* We looked at quintile 5, the programs to be eliminated, restructured, or something that seriously needs to be done with them. About a third of them have been offered up by the individual programs to be restructured or eliminated. I’m meeting with all of the chairs individually, sometimes with the faculty, to discuss the results.
* We are also looking at quintile 4 in the same way, though not as many programs have been offered up by programs for restructuring or elimination. We’re on a fact finding mission, talking to everybody about what their issues are with all of the programs.
* There are 7 majors that are located in quintile 4, so we need to look seriously at what to do with those majors. Is there an opportunity for outsourcing, restructuring, or should we go ahead and make the decision to eliminate it?
* That’s where we are in the prioritization process. We expect that will take another week or two before we have talked to everybody and come back and report to you on where we are.
* I have to keep saying that retrenchment is on the table, and if it takes that to get the work done and meet our financial goals, then we’ll have to do that. We don’t want to, but we might have to.

Questions?

Purslow: I was crunching the numbers and if we looked at the savings from the vacancy left by Rick Wiems, this year alone, we will save $168,000 including OPE. And the salary saving from one of the faculty lines that was vacated, that’s $79,000. So that’s our $200,000, if I understand correctly, that we need to get this year. And I wonder why we can’t have a little slower process in the reorganization process, and I’m concerned that the emphasis has been on the academic side of the prioritization report. As I look at the academic support programs I see a lot of opportunities for resolving inefficiencies, things that would allow us to shift staff in other places. And I think the benefit of allowing the faculty to have a break after prioritization and go through this process slowly, it’s just so great. I feel we are ill advised to jump into prioritization, trying to have something done so quickly when there are just too many other opportunities.

Klein: The minimum gap is $1,015,000. We need to find $1,600,000 to $3,000,000 worth of savings in this biennium. You’ll see that, it’s kind of hard for me to talk about because you haven’t seen the financial report yet. Enrollment and retention are our two grievous errors right now. Our enrollment was down 4% last year, it’s tracking to be down 4% this year, and it was down 8% in the summer. Our retention rates suck. They’re the lowest in the whole OUS. I don’t think I want to give up having somebody minding enrollment and retention, which is what that APB does. We’re almost to the finals, the finals will be here in two weeks. That’s a very critical position for the university. There’s a lot of other places like you’ve already mentioned that we might be able to have some savings. Certainly with the shared services center there’s lots of opportunity for efficiencies there. That’s supposed to roll out no later than July 1st. Completely staffed and providing the services.

Purslow: Would the shared services center include business services?

Klein: Anything that’s transactional. Scheduling classes, paying people, reimbursing payroll, any kind of human resources kind of transactional things are in that business center.

Purslow: So many of those are in quintile 4 and 5 at present, so it seems to me that if given the resources that we have now, if we were able to fix that internally, we would have done that long ago. I just looked at business services and …

Klein: Yeah, but I’ll tell you, academic restructuring is part of that …

Vicki Purslow: Now I’m not discounting the academic side, but I am concerned about issues of duplication of costs and efforts, whether it’s in facilities or purchases and travel inefficiencies. But mission operations, those sorts of things, that would really impact our ability to do some work. And so I would encourage you to look at those areas and lay out that plan so that we can know that’s being tackled. Because at present it feels like restructuring the academic units is going to be all that’s necessary, and I don’t quite see how that’s going to solve all of the problems when we have some serious failings in infrastructure.

Jim Klein: Yes, and I think that we are trying to do all of it at the same time. Do you realize that we restructured some student affairs last year, last Fall? Saved $350,000.

Purslow: Yes, I do. But it came at a price, I think. It came in the price in our ability to serve students.

Klein: I don’t know about that …

Purslow: Yeah, we can agree to disagree, that’s okay. But I am concerned that we need to look at both sides of the house …

Klein: Yes, I think we do need to look at both sides of the house.

Carter: Carol, did you have question? And I think Kevin is after that.

Ferguson: For clarification with prioritization, I was under the impression that going through that process we were going to identify the programs that weren’t generating enough student interest and would therefore be rated lower. But I also thought that the point of the prioritization process was to refocus some of the saved money into some other programs that we wanted to grow.

Klein: That’s exactly what should happen, but we have an 8 million dollar problem that we’re going to have to solve first.

Ferguson: So it’s not going to happen for a while?

Klein: Not this biennium, that’s for sure.

Ferguson: I just think that needs to be clarified for everybody.

Carter: Kevin?

Sahr: I can think of all sorts of models that could save money. So if we do away with chairs there is a certain amount of administrative centralization that could go on, but I don’t see how it actually corresponds to the amount of ELUs being reduced. Most of what I’ve observed chairs doing is troubleshooting and handling individual situations and all those sorts of things and they take a great deal of time. And it’s very important to this retention effort and keeping students satisfied. When we do away with chairs, or reduce the amount of supervisory capacity, have we identified the tasks that we can actually save and actually put values against those? Or are we just saying we need to save this amount of money; therefore we’re going to cut this much? Because from the Union standpoint, the Union has spoken very clearly that we’re not going to accept additional work as faculty members without being compensated for it, and that’s our nonnegotiable. In all these discussions I never hear those things being discussed. Because there’s this assumption that we can do away with chairs, and have less supervisors, and somehow that work is going to disappear, or be centralized. Without numbers I think that’s a false assumption.

Klein: I would encourage you to come to the Open Forum and talk at length about all of these issues.

Sahr: I think it’s important that the Senate talks about these issues because it affects all of us as faculty members. And not all of us can make it to the Open Forums, and not all of our constituents can make it to the Open Forums. We’re *here* to talk about these issues.

Klein: I would implore that they set some time to do that, because we can’t do that in my 10 minutes for today.

Carter: Anyone else? Okay, now for the ASSOU report.

**ASSOU report:**

Max Goldman: ASSOU is working on a lot of cool things right now. We are going into classrooms and doing Class Raps. Something that Tommy (the student body president) and I have been trying to work on last week is speaking with the different stakeholder groups and trying to promote some type of cohesion for all of these issues that are being addressed right now. And what we’re encouraging all of the faculty to do is work together with us so we can address this issue multilaterally and collectively this year.

I look forward to working with all of you this year. Thank you for your time.

Kristi Wright (Director of Communications): One of the ways that you can work with us is to give us 5 minutes in each of your classes; we’ll keep it short. We’re talking about the issues that are important to them and we know that we should work on both here on campus and also on lobbying the state capital. I’ll pass around a clipboard and if all of you could put down your name and email and a time and I will follow-up.

**IFS update:**

Charles Lane:

* Met on the 27th and 28th of September here on this campus. The second meeting is scheduled for 3rd week in November in Portland. I’ll cut to the chase, which is the existential question: the fate and future of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate. The argument could go like this: your Interinstitutional Faculty Senate was a creation of the Oregon University System; the Oregon University System is about set to go away and not exist anymore. Is there a point in having an Interinstitutional Faculty Senate under those circumstances?
* You might be interested to note that some of the strongest voices coming out against that idea are actually the faculty senators from University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University -- the schools that are moving to independent boards and away from OUS, and in essence are taking the force from OUS. And the thinking goes like this: without an Oregon University System as currently configured, perhaps without a Chancellor, within the next few months to a couple years, the opportunity to the voice seeking shared governance is most likely diminished as opposed to improving it. And therefore the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate has gotten to the need for the universities in the state of Oregon to pull together for a faculty voice is more critical now than at any time before.
* And to that end we will continue to work with the chancellor’s office, as long as that structure exists. We decided (this was before the start of the academic year) that we’re going to reach out to the HECC regardless. We were going to make a concerted effort to make sure the HECC understood who we were and that the faculty voice is still an important voice in shared governance as it takes place with public institutions in the state of Oregon.
* We sort of see ourselves as the Creature of the Faculty Senate of these institutions. And with the faculty senates behind us we will carry on with that.
* So I just wanted to put it out there that there may be coming some times, in fairly short order, where you as a faculty senate, should that be your pleasure, to stand up and let us know that you want us to carry on.
* There were some other minor things, but I figure the existential thing is enough.

**AC Report:**

Carter:

* Other than setting agenda items one of the issues Jim had mentioned was the promotion and tenure for each of the departments
* In the document being handed out, if there is a “Yes” that means the entire department has an actual promotion and tenure “checklist” for all of the sections.
* So if your department does not have a “Yes” next to it, check with the current faculty personnel committee chair, Bill Hughes, and he can either give you either the affirm or the negative whether or not your stuff is in and under review.
* But even while we’re making a transition, to whatever transition that we get to, we still need to be able to provide this type of process for the people that are currently going up for promotion and tenure this current year. It would be very beneficial to them to have something in place as soon as possible so they know what they need as far as their promotion and tenure review.
* Again, if anyone has anything they want to come up on the agenda, specifically, if they are not actual action items, but are things that we need to discuss, feel free to send me an email. And then we can bring that up in Advisory Council and then ultimately, if it warrants it, we can get it on the agenda.

**Committee on Councils:**

Jessup: There are just a few seats remaining open.

Carter:

* I’ve stepped off of the FUPC (Facilities Utilization Planning Committee ) coming into Faculty Senate Chair, so we need somebody to fill that role, and it usually meets on Wednesdays.
* The Budget Committee needs a faculty member.

Jessup: There were some other committee changes, and I haven’t found them.

Ettlich: Call me and we can straighten that out.

**Finance Update:**

Finance update by Craig Morris -- this was video recorded and is now available to all faculty and staff.

Adjourned 5:32 p.m.