**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**November 4, 2013**

**SU 313 4:05 - 4:44 p.m.**

**Present:** Roni Adams (for John King), Marlene Alt (for Robin Strangfeld), Jackie Apodaca, Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Todd Carney, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Carol Ferguson, Byron Marlowe, Richard May, Kasey Mohammad, Pete Nordquist, Garth Pittman, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Mary Russell-Miller, Kevin Sahr, Larry Shrewsbury, Jamie Vener, Erin Wilder.

**Absent:**, Steve Jessup, John King (Sabbatical), Robin Strangfeld (Sabbatical)

**Visitors:** Mary Cullinan, James Klein, Susan Walsh, Anne Connor, Andrea Young, Kim Marsilia-Bauman, Miranda Edwards, Max Goldman, Lee Ayers, Steve Thorpe, Dennis Jablonski

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

**Approval of October 7 and October 21 Minutes**

Nordquist pointed out a typo in the October 7 minutes. The “$1,006,000” on page 5 should have been “$1,600,000.”

Ettlich motioned to approve the minutes with the amendments.

The motion carried with all in favor, no abstentions and none opposed.

**Announcements:**

Carter: I would still love to have somebody be on the Budget Committee. And also to help with attending the ASSOU senate meetings. I can only make it about every other week. It’s very entertaining, and it’s fun to watch them because they are much more efficient than we are.

**Comments from President Cullinan:**

I will be giving my State of the University Address tomorrow.

A lot of my time has been spent on the governance issues, and thank you to those of you who came to the open forums that I held. We’re still doing the communication period. I spoke to the SOU Foundation Board last Friday. The three other small university presidents and I hope to have finished our communication plan by Thanksgiving. We’re just weighing all of the pros and cons of the three different possible models that are out there. And meanwhile our vice presidents are working on the shared services. The seven university vice presidents are working on what all seven of us will share, either for the next year or two, or the next few years, and what we won’t share. And then the four technical regional university vice presidents are looking at what we could share among the four of us, when the larger institutions no longer want to participate in the shared services. Whatever governance model we end up with won’t make a huge difference financially, but what will make a huge difference are the shared services. So we want to have a list of those things that might produce larger costs for us, and have that ready to take forward to the legislative session in February. So that’s a big task, and it’s really unraveling all the tasks that the Chancellor’s office has been doing for us for many years. And for most of us, if not all of us, those tasks have been largely invisible. We haven’t known all of the things that they had been doing. It’s a very interesting process. It’s sort of like Prioritization, first we find out what all of the programs are, and then we figure out if we actually want them or not.

There will be a big presentation from the four small university vice presidents on Thursday. They’re having meetings on this up in Portland, of course, all the time. Ray and I were the only presidents on the phone for two hours today because I couldn’t face another trip up there. There’s a three-hour meeting on shared services up there on Thursday, which Craig will go to and I will not go to. It’s really crazy; they just assume we all can spend all of our weekdays in Portland attending meetings.

So that’s my life. It’s a fascinating political process, but I don’t have much to report. It’s just going forward and I will provide more information as I know more.

Any questions?

There were no questions.

**Comments from Provost Klein:**

The last meeting we talked a little bit about enrollment, and that’s held, at least for matriculated students, about the same as last time. We have seen a decline in the Advance Southern Credit students. About 300 less registrations than we had this time last year. There’s a reason for that. RCC does their form of Advanced Southern Credit for free. They are more of the technical types of courses. We do more of the college level courses for Advance Southern Credit and we charge $40 per credit to transfer those credits. However, last year they experimented with an online system. This was a new way of doing things and we ended up with a lot of people that didn’t pay, so they went back to the old way. So right now we are very similar to where we were in Fall 2011, but Fall 2012 is kind of an anomaly. That affects our overall headcount and FTE. Those numbers will be official in a few weeks.

Any questions?

There were no questions.

**ASSOU report:**

Max Goldman: Right now we are in the middle of a little bit of a predicament with our SFC process. Due to projected enrollment we’re $3000 to $5000 short of our estimated costs for our student fee. We are working out solutions to come up with the additional money to subsidize the programs this coming year. We will have a definite solution by next week and I will update you on what we come up with.

This Thursday we are having an ASSOU academic reorganization forum that is going to be open to everyone, but is primarily intended for students to come and hear about what’s going on with academic reorganization. It will be in the context of the financial situation of the university, some of the things that have occurred over the past few years that have caused us to be in this situation. We’ll talk about the AR adjustment that the state has put on us. I will be there along with another member from ASSOU. We’re asking one administrative personnel … [he then asked Susan Walsh if she would be there and she said yes]. And I would also like to ask for two members from faculty senate to come and answer questions that students may have. This will take place Thursday at 2:30 pm in the Rogue River Room.

One other thing, in terms of governance and stuff happening at the state level, tomorrow, OSA (Oregon Student’s Association) has a meeting with representative Parish, and we will be discussing a few things. The OSA board of directors has proposed three pieces of legislation that we will be asking representative Parish to co-sponsor. These three things are:

1: A student tax break for graduate students who graduate from Oregon public universities and who have outstanding student debt.

2: Legalization of marijuana with an earmark that will be used to subsidize higher education.

3. This is an issue on governance, and we’re proposing a mechanism that would initiate an impeachment process for Board of Trustees members. So if SOU or other schools choose to have their own institutional boards, this mechanism would essentially allow, contingent upon two-thirds student and faculty vote, to initiate an impeachment process, that would then go back to the Oregon Senate to remove board members. Because as it stands currently, the board members are appointed by the governor, and can only be removed by the governor.

And if things don’t work out with representative Parish we’ve also had discussions with representative Buckley.

**OSA Comments from Miranda Edwards**

We are doing a project for our Activist Art class in conjunction with OSA. We are collecting and recording opinions from students, faculty and the public regarding student and secondary education. This is to allow for comparison and awareness of those opinions.

So we’re wondering who could stay afterwards for an interview or schedule some other time for an interview. It takes less than 5 minutes.

Any questions?

Ferguson: Could you pass around a sign-in sheet?

Mary: When you pass around the sign-up sheet could you include the questions that will be asked?

Edwards: Yes, we can do that.

**The Faculty Development Committee - Anne Connor**

Connor introduced herself and gave a short summary of the second round of Carpenter II grants.

Carter: Usually this is more of a pro forma type issue. Individuals in the past have requested that we suspend the two-week rule, to go ahead and vote to approve the Carpenter II grants.

Nordquist moved and Cleland-Sipfle gave a second.

The motion carried with 18 in favor, no one opposed, and abstentions from Belcastro, Carney, May, and Purslow.

**Discussions**:

Carter: The rest of the afternoon is for any continued discussion we want to have for the new compromised model. I sent out a draft letter of support for the skeleton of the compromised model. I asked for feedback, and I didn’t get any. I’m really not that good of a wordsmith, so seriously, if you think there was something that I missed or wanted me to improve upon, feel free to send it.

Does anybody have any questions about the compromised model?

Marlow: Not a question, but a statement. At our faculty meeting we looked at the compromised model, we determined through word of mouth that only one of the six petals is somewhat concrete, because those departments made some sort of oral agreement. What are the rest of the five of us to do? Jockey with each other or …. ?

Carter: Jim, let me know if I’m incorrect, but I believe you guys are going to talk about that in more detail on Wednesday at the Chairs meeting?

Klein: I am. There have already been some people who have come up with alternative “clumps.”

Marlow: We came up with something in our faculty meeting. We just didn’t know what the appropriate way was, besides sending out our Chair and do some negotiation on our behalf. Is that the best thing to do as this point?

Klein: I think so, yes. Or you could send email to the Chairs.

Purslow: To facilitate better communication, could we have those kind of things shared with senate too? I feel that the Chairs are kind of in this “funny status”, and we’re probably going to be the one constant through the year.

Klein: That’s a good point. I can give you the draft proposal that we came up with. On the 13th I will have an initial conversation. The next normal Chairs meeting would be on the 27th, Thanksgiving Eve, so we’ll move it back to the 20th, try to have a more summative conversation. We’re thinking we would start the search process for the leadership roles in December and have that completed by about the middle of February. The initial idea was to have a search committee for each one of those leadership positions. Applications wouldn’t be due until the middle of January.

Carter: Would it be possible that once the time lines are firmed up you could just copy them to me and then I would forward it to the senate.

Klein: Sure.

Ferguson: I have a question for Jim, regarding the Associate Vice President. That position is extremely important for the success of whichever model we end up with that I’m going to suggest that we consider doing a larger search, or a national search, rather than an in-house search. This wouldn’t preclude that in-house applicants could apply. Is this something you would consider?

Klein: Sure. Anybody else have feedback on that?

Purlsow and Belcastro supported the idea.

Ettlich: My only concern with that is that would really stretch out the time. It seems you almost want that position in place as you have the Directors coming on, in February. And I don’t think it’s feasible to get a national search done and completed.

Ferguson: We used to do national searches. We would post them in November and the cut-off was in January.

Belcastro: I think it would help whoever is in that position, just in terms that it was extended outside.

Carney: I think we all went through national searches for our positions here, and I don’t see any reason why administration shouldn’t go through a national search. The reason for a national search is to inject some new blood. I’m also in favor of a national search.

Marlow: I would like to support Sherry in respect to the time on it. Also, what quality of candidate do you really get when you say we have a national search to apply in January to start in February? Whom are you really going to get to leave a post because we need someone immediately? We can’t put this off until next Fall for them to complete their time. It’s just something to think about.

Klein: Remember that these positions don’t start until the beginning of Spring Term, March 31st. It’s not the best timeline.

Carter: Any more discussion points?

Russel-Miller: I wasn’t able to come to the meeting on Wednesday because I had class. But this is the question that I had and some of the folks in my department. In terms of the duties of Directors, it certainly sounds like a key position. And it’s about equity. Is everybody going to get paid the same? I keep hearing that whatever your current appointment is, that’s just going to roll over into a 10 month contract. Is that correct, or is this going to be a set salary for each of these Directors, or will there be a variety?

Klein: That hasn’t been decided yet.

Russel-Miller: So that’s still in discussion.

Marlow: I would like to support that too. In our department meeting we looked at, well, depending upon what rank in which an individual would be at, or their timeline at Southern Oregon University, if you were to put them into a ten month contract, plus a certain percentage, you could have disparity amongst the Directors, with the same responsibilities.

Klein: You have that now, in a way, with the Chairs.

Russel-Miller: That’s “apples and oranges”, I think, a bit.

Belcastro: In terms of schools that have additional external accreditation, for example, in the School of Education, some of the duties and responsibilities to maintain our accreditation aren’t reflected, at present, in the Director’s roles and responsibilities. And one of our program’s busiest periods is in the summer, because we’re a 12-month program. I’m wondering if there’s some way to still maintain the unique differences of some of these schools/centers so that they can continue to do what they do really well?

Klein. Yes.

Purslow: One of the things that emerged from my department is a real clearness that they want the Director to have some kind of track record of experience within the discipline. There’s concern, that perhaps somebody from Theatre might start overseeing Psychology, it’s just illustrative. But some ability to have that disciplinary connection. And then the other thing I want to raise, I mentioned this last week on Wednesday, I would like to see some minimum requirement on this individual, such that an Assistant Professor can’t apply for these positions. And that we really look at the issues of promotion and tenure for these individuals. Because we’re really locking them into a trap by which they cannot be promoted to the full professor without enough teaching. Our own promotion and tenure guidelines are really pretty strict and I think we would be doing a tremendous disservice to our colleagues who are Associate Professors who are stuck there until they return to the classrooms many years later. I think we are already making a lot of changes in terms of promotion and tenure documents this year that I think we have to do our due diligence and protect those Associate Faculty.

Belcastro: This is for you Jim. Would the stakeholders within the center/school have an active role in the selection process of who would be their leader?

Klein: Yes, I would think so.

Belcastro: Could you extend a little bit on what that would look like?

Klein: We have a process already outlined in the Bylaws. We will probably use that.

Belcastro: For selection of Deans?

Klein: Yes.

Belcastro: But we wouldn’t maintain the whole thing. Because right now, for the selection of Deans, it indicates you need to be a rank of Full Professor, correct?

Klein called out to Ettlich for help with that information, which she searched on her iPad and though it took awhile it was found in Section 5, item 1:

Ettlich: It’s 5.134 “Deans, Provosts, and President are normally granted faculty rank and tenure at hire.” But it doesn’t specify which rank.

Purslow suggested that we compile a list of the recommendations that are coming from the faculty senate. Marlow suggested that someone could start a thread, saying “Send me your recommendations, as far as what you think your Director …”

Klein: A week from Wednesday, when we start taking this up again.

Belcastro spoke of how important it was to departments to have a Director that had experience with that department. Sherry countered that the Centers will contain more than one department, and it devalues the group if one department is demanding that the Director can only come from their department. Everyone agreed that the entire Center should have a say in who their Director will be.

May: The Biology department had a concern whether the FTE in Chairs release was offset enough.

Sahr: Is there going to be faculty representation on the Director search committees and will that faculty representation be drawn from that unit where the Director will serve?

Klein: Yes and yes.

Belcastro: What will the process look like and how can we be a part of that in terms of what the configuration of the Centers are?

Klein: Has your Chair not talked to you at all?

Belcastro: We have a meeting Tuesday.

Klein: I gave it to the Chairs to bring back ideas that we could discuss collaboratively on the 20th, so I’m out of it for a little while.

Adjourned 4:44 p.m.