**Faculty Senate Minutes
November 18, 2013
SU 313 4:04 - 5:42 p.m.**

**Present:** Roni Adams (for John King), Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Carol Ferguson, Byron Marlowe, Richard May, Pete Nordquist, Garth Pittman, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Mary Russell-Miller, Larry Shrewsbury, Jamie Vener, Elizabeth Whitman, Erin Wilder.

**Absent:**, Jackie Apodaca, Todd Carney, Steve Jessup, John King (Sabbatical), Kasey Mohammad, Kevin Sahr, Robin Strangfeld (Sabbatical)

**Visitors:** Mary Cullinan, James Klein, Susan Walsh, Steve Thorpe, David Oline, David Humphrey, Max Goldman, Hannah Howell, and Sam Wheeler (the Medford Mail Tribune reporter).

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m.

**Approval of Emergency Meeting Minutes**

Walsh: For this 17-page document, it was difficult for me, as the person doing a lot of the talking, to go back through and see if it was accurate. Is there a way to help with that? Almost everything I said was literally stated, and what other people said was sort of paraphrased in some places. Could it be paraphrased more?

Shrewsbury: It’s a skill I need to develop. I’ll try and do a little more consolidating. For the Emergency Meeting there was faculty unable to attend so I thought I would be a little more elaborate and thorough. But for our other meetings it certainly isn’t necessary to be that extreme.

Purslow motioned to approve the minutes.
The motion carried with all in favor, none opposed, and one abstention (Russell-Miller).

**Announcements:**There were no announcements.

**Comments from President Cullinan:**Cullinan summed up the shared services discussions taking place among the seven OUS institutions. It’s still a work in progress. One of the difficulties in talking about this is that, at the beginning of the process, most of us couldn’t even list many of the services the Chancellor’s Office provided to the universities. When we had the list, we had to prioritize. What do all seven institutions want to keep? What do the large institutions want to keep? What do the small institutions want to keep? What are the costs associated with different models? In addition to a state allocation, much of the Chancellor’s Office budget has been supported by assessing indirect cost recovery monies from grants won by the three larger institutions.

SB 270 required that a work group for shared services be composed of the seven presidents, who would develop a model for how to deliver administrative operations effectively and efficiently. The presidents gave much of the financial analysis to their VPFAs, who have now presented the presidents with a model and a financial plan that the presidents are discussing. Only three services, according to legislation, are mandatory for all seven universities through January 30, 2015: employee benefits, risk management (insurance), and bargaining for SEIU.

The technical regional universities, who are much more interested in sharing than the big universities, are looking at what we can share in order to save administrative costs. The VPFAs, in consultation with their respective cabinets and presidents, are looking at how we can continue to provide a variety of necessary services when the system breaks up. For example, there is a tremendous amount of reporting that has to be done for the feds and for the state. Perhaps there could be a shared IR service for the four of us. Contracting is another one. Now we are working out the final details of a plan. I will be in Salem this week and will be talking about this with legislators and the other presidents.

**Comments from Provost Klein:**Provost Klein: There are two more open forums on the budget (time and locations were announced).
For CPL (Credit for Prior Learning): HEC has put together a group to put together a set of standards, and now it’s up to us to review these standards, and comment on these standards. The end result is that every campus will have their own policy that’s consonant with these standards. We are trying to put together a group that includes faculty, administrators, service personnel, and others as appropriate to comment on them by December 20th. I’m here to enlist your support, and see who would be interested in this sort of work.
Steve Thorpe volunteered. Purslow said Jeanne Stallman should be on it. Ettlich said she would like to get one of the math faculty to do this.
Klein: See if any of your colleagues would be interested in this.

The discussion that followed was on which areas we needed faculty from: University Studies, Business, Criminology, and Foreign Language.

**ASSOU report:**
Goldman: We will be having another Open Forum tomorrow and we’re going to be talking about retrenchment and the overall financial situation of this institution. And we would like you to encourage your students to attend this.
I forwarded to Dave the committee list which many of you are chairs on. And we do have student representation on those committees because of the shared governance that was passed as of last year. A lot of the students told us that they don’t know where the committees are meeting, and they haven’t been reached out to by the chairs of these committees. So I don’t know if you all knew that you have student representatives on these committees, so I sent Dave the committee list and he will forward it on to you so that you can contact those students.
We haven’t seen much faculty senate participation in our student ASSOU senate meetings. Dave can’t be expected to be showing up at every meeting, so it would be great if we could have at least one member from this senate at each meeting. These meetings are every Tuesday at 6 pm in this room.
Carter: If there were four of us, we would each be only doing this once a month (so far only Pittman and Shrewsbury have offered to participate).
Max: We are looking to take some action in the Capital this February for the betterment of the institution. I don’t want to elaborate too much on what is going to be done there; we’re still working through things. But we will keep you updated.

**Curriculum Committee:**
David Oline highlighted some of the new courses and programs:
ES 104 (required sequence for the ES degree is ES 101, 102, 103, 104); AOL 476; Native American studies has two new courses, 331 and 375 (formerly taught as 399 courses); Dance Movements Study program is part of the Theatre Arts department (it promotes dance in support of theatre – they are not starting a program to train professional dancers). Departments that did a lot in cleaning-up, changing prerequisites, clarifying things: Business, Sociology, Environmental Studies.
 There were two minor corrections:
The Sociology requirement for Sociology courses in the Winter is a minimum grade of C+.
The Native American Studies lists 480 as a prerequisite, but that doesn’t exist yet (it has to go through some modifications).

Richards pointed out a spelling correction in the first paragraph of the cover letter for the Performing Arts new program proposal: “compliments” should be “complements”.

**Request from UPB:**
Carter: I got a request from UPB about updating our Bylaws to include Diversity and Oversight Committee to be one of the subcommittees under Student Success.

Klein: It’s actually a subcommittee of UPB. The president created a committee for inclusion and oversight six or seven years ago, and it has been sort of autonomously out there and it’s not tied to any of our governance bodies. And so we’ve been talking about elevating it to a level that has governance scrutiny.

Carter: It looks like that has already been ratified by UPB, and so for us it is simply updating the Bylaws language to incorporate that committee to be under UPB.

Klein: I think UPB is also looking at all of the charges of the committees and they want to update a lot of stuff.

Ettlich: Would it be possible for them to bring to Senate an update package, sort of like the Curriculum Committee does, that we could review and then incorporate into the Bylaws?

Klein: Sure. They’re still working on the other things.

Ettlich: Is it okay with them to wait and send it as a package?

Klein: I think so.

**Discussion on Academic Reorganization:**Sue Walsh handed out a copy of the duties and responsibilities for the Associate Vice President (AVP).

Klein: Let’s give you an update on the sort of courting, suitors, and the love affairs that’s been going on for the last few weeks. We’ve had a number of presentations of the possible divisions, and we’re going to try and finalize those tomorrow in the Chairs meeting. This AVP job description is about the fourth or fifth iteration. The Chairs gave great feedback and we tried to incorporate that in here. One of the things is they felt that the director should report directly to the Provost, for things like evaluations, fund raising and grants. But work with this AVP on all the things you see here in this document (Scheduling and curriculum development, personnel, and budget and resources).
The plan is to get this position posted this week, next week at the latest, and have that hire announced before the directors are hired. So the AVP can work with the hiring of the directors. This will just be an internal search.

Ferguson pointed out that in a previous senate meeting when Klein was asked about the possibility of an external search, he said “Sure”, and she wondered why an external search isn’t being done. Klein responded it was a matter of timing.

Purslow: Could you define “faculty FTE assignments”? Because as I read that, I interpret it to mean that this AVP is going to tell Mary Russell-Miller that she’s one-third USEM this year and two-thirds psychology. Is that what that means?

Klein: That’s exactly what it means.

Purslow: Okay. My second concern is that the administrators that we most wish would go away, don’t go away. For that reason I share Carol’s concern. We have a tendency not to ask anyone to step aside. Would you consider hiring somebody in the interim, for say a year and a half, and then do an external search, with the understanding that this person could reapply. This way we will meet your timeline and also address the concern that we get the best qualified person for the position.

Klein: I will take that under advisement and consult with those same groups again.

Carter: Would it be possible for whenever the Chairs and you finish updating those that we could get a copy of those?

Sue Walsh said she would do her very best to get those to us as soon as she can. She doesn’t see a discussion happening until December 2nd.

Ferguson: Is there going to be a salary posted on here?

Klein: It about $100,00 - $105,000.

Belcastro wanted to hear more about changing the word “Chairs” with “Coordinators”, what implications it might have in terms of Bylaws, and how it looks to operational-like stuff.

Klein: If you take what Chairs are currently doing, about half of it stays and half of it goes. So they won’t be doing budget, they will be doing personnel issues, more of the scheduling and evaluation of faculty. A Chair used to have all of those duties, so we thought we would call it something different to distinguish it from that.

Belcastro: What implications will that have in terms of the process of who’s a Chair, how they’re selected, and the formula for FTE, does it shift all of the Bylaws and such?

Klein: The compensation for Chairs is in the CVA, not the Bylaws. We do a final replace in the Bylaws and take up Chairs and put something else in there that more adequately describes what these new duties are. But the things that don’t change is that there is still a collegial process for picking that individual. And the process we use for picking Directors will be like the one we use for Deans.

Ettlich: For the Bylaws piece in this discussion, what I’m thinking is that Section 3, which is about primary academic units, will not focus now on schools and colleges, but will focus on Divisions and Centers. Their leadership will be Directors. If we do much of what Jim is saying there’s not a huge amount of change that has to go there, besides changing names of things, and perhaps making some minor tweaks in the job description duties. In the same way I’m sort of seeing Section 4, which is currently Chairs, Departments, and Programs being Program Chairs, Departments, and Programs. There is some shift in the duties of a Chair because we have blown up the Chair’s job quite a bit over the last 15 years. And we’re going to shrink that down. But if we leave some of the same pieces in there, that will make the Bylaws changes much less extreme, and still have the procedures and processes that are there.

Purslow: Sherry, can you tell us what will happen for our colleagues who go up for promotion and tenure in January? Because I feel like by then the rules have changed greatly, and I’m concerned about how we take care of them.

Ettlich: As far as I understand, none of these changes are going into Bylaws until March. The faculty are going to still go through the same department personnel committee, Chair review, and the Dean review, just like we would have if we had not made this change.

Nordquist: Will there be an individual search committee for each Director, chosen at least in part from people in the Center they will be directing?

Klein: There is a division of thought on that. Should we have a search committee that has representation from all of the areas, or should we have a separate little search committee for each one of these?

Pittman: Do you have anything to say in regards to which way you’re leaning, or what are some of the good arguments for either one of those options?

Klein: If we were to have 50 to 60 people apply for these positions I could see where we could need individual committees, but I don’t know if there’s that many people that will be interested or qualified to do this work.

Nordquist: The advantage of individual search committees is that it gives some representation from the Center which is not only important, but an act of good faith.

Ettlich: It’s not following the Bylaws Section 3, procedure for Deans, if we don’t do search committees from within the divisions.

Belcastro wondered if there could be a general job description for a Director and then each Center would “personalize” the additional requirements and duties needed for that Center.

Klein: I think we will have about 60% that’s the same for all Directors, and about 40% that’s specific for that Center.

Ferguson asked about getting a firmed-up timeline, and Klein said we’ll try to get something out after Wednesday’s meeting.

**Houses Discussion:**

Questions were being collected to give to Karen Stone …

Ettlich: When will we actually get a program proposal?

Whitman asked Carter who was on the curriculum task force, and Carter listed them.

Ferguson: I believe we discussed having a representative?

Carter: Yes, Alma Rosa. And I could also talk to Vincent Smith if that would be beneficial to come and talk about what they are currently doing with the Houses.

Ferguson: Yes, because I purposely wanted to have faculty that are involved with the current two Houses and are teaching in them.

Belcastro (paraphrased): I would like to have the information to share with the students and parents at Raider Reg that will make the advising process clearer, particularly with the Houses. Right now I don’t feel I have much more to say to them other than “It’s going to be great!”

Cleland-Sipfle: Could you address the issue on how to keep the Houses populated over the 4 years?

Carter: Are you talking about through just general attrition?

Cleland-Sipfle: Yes

Carter: I do know that one of the things that are being discussed is the Transfer House for individuals who are coming in, as far as transfer students, being able to get into the House experience. Maybe this is something they could also talk about.

Purlsow: I would like to see a line-by-line budget, including the faculty lines, and how much FTE is allocated for a four-credit House class, are we using 4 ELUs or 5 ELUs or how that’s being loaded with faculty. I’d like to see an S-and-S budget, essentially the same budget work all departments have to complete in the February budgeting season. Because it looks to me like there are some marketing lemmings and things. There’s a great presence that the Houses had at Preview. I thought they had an exceptional presence. I want to get back to Preview in a second.

I’d like to see what the maximum enrollment was this Fall in the Houses, what the attrition rate is, so far to date. And I’d like to see that compared to the USEM enrollments and the USEM attrition rates to date. And then what happens to a student when they want out? If the number of credits are not going to be the same as Gen Ed, then how on earth do we help them, or is it a one-way ticket? I’m guessing it probably isn’t, I’m just curious. And that does lead me to a concern about Preview Day. If we don’t have curriculum approved for a House, or any entity, is it ethical to market four houses that are not approved curriculum? Otherwise, I’d like to implement a Psychology of Music degree, and start advertising it at Preview. Because I wonder if it’s ethical for us to do that? I would like Karen to share her perspective on that. Because if we advertise that we have that House, and then senate says no, we’re not going to approve the curriculum, then are we misrepresenting what we offer here at this university?

I feel we’re expediting approval for House curriculum when we are not allowing that same opportunity for all departments. And frankly, I think that if we are going to expedite for one area on campus, then we do it for all, or we don’t do it for one. I realize this is a special project, it was also started as a pilot, and I’m not for or against it, because I don’t know enough about it. But I am concerned that we are giving one area treatment that we are not affording to others, even for basic things, like closing down a major. We would love to have something out of the catalog this coming Fall, and we’re not permitted to do that, but a House can get up and running and ready to go by Fall. But I think it speaks to an issue of fairness, equity, and what’s right.

Nordquist: I would like to echo Vicki’s concern about the way that the Houses are approved. I had assumed that the House goes through the curriculum committee …

Walsh: It will. Proposals are being developed. Slowly, certainly, maybe in comparison to other curriculum that are being proposed, but the process will be the same.

Carter: Through University Studies and through Curriculum Committee.

Nordquist: For the Houses that are being piloted this year, when would their curriculum come from Curriculum Committee to Senate?

Walsh: I can’t answer that; I don’t know where they’re in-process. They’re developing the whole program, the way that the Senate requested that it move forward as a package.

Norquist: So probably this Spring?

Walsh: I don’t know. Because of the two-week rule and other things that postpone things from moving forward quickly.

May: Are the students who are choosing to not continue in their current House being surveyed?

Brown: I’m teaching in a House right now (Social Justice House) and we are losing a few students. We are surveying students who are exiting and I’m trying to incorporate them into University Seminar classes. But in the Green House there are openings, and they’ve been recruiting new students into the second term. The Social Justice House has decided not to do that. We’re down to 45 instead of 50.

Ferguson: I’m in the Social Justice House for faculty, and we were looking at the second year, and I can tell you, it is not a normal process. To even figure out what we’re doing. There’s discussion about should that second year be equivalent to explorations across a wide range for humanities and science. Especially in a House where most of the emphasis is from individuals that are not science majors.

Walsh: I just said “normal process” for the committees.

Ferguson: Right. The process is very complicated. We’re trying to get people involved, and we don’t know what we’re getting them involved with. We don’t know what those courses should really look like. We thought about the fact that currently in the Social Justice House there are no science majors that have chosen to be in that House. So if their General Ed is limited to the Social Justice House they will not get Explorations or Integrations intentionally in any Sciences. That is problematic for some of the core faculty who are teaching in there. When faculty ask me “What am I getting into?” I say “I’m not sure.”

So it’s actually very complicated. What makes me personally nervous is I might teach in that Social Justice House with a science based course, and we’re putting it forward, as Vicki said, it sort of is false advertising because we have students who are currently in there and we can’t tell them what they’re expecting to take next year because it’s not written down anywhere. It was all dicey at Preview, I felt. I did the “Well, this is what we think it will look like, and this is the component we know …” I don’t know, it makes me uncomfortable, but I’m willing to kind of try it.

Walsh: Thank you for that. I wanted to note that the group of people who went up to Portland, the AACU workshop for about 4 days over the summer and worked with an expert on the LEAP outcomes and some of the other AACU work that some of you have been working on for years and know about. The whole point was to propose the Houses as this group’s focus, and with the expertise in the room, try to work through what second, third, and fourth year should look like. It’s a little like making sausage, I agree Carol, I think it’s a really great point, and I didn’t mean that it was just like curriculum development in every other department. But the processes for scrutiny and approval will be the same.

Whitman: With the Houses we’re essentially running two Gen Ed curriculums simultaneously, and with two different credit loads. Normally, with the old advising sheets, those are generally signed off by advisors first, maybe University Seminar advisors, and then majors advisors. But what I’ve seen from the advising sheets from the students that are in the Houses, basically they are being signed off by Jim. So I’m just wondering how that’s going to work out?

Purslow: I just want to emphasize that while the steps that the Houses are going through are the same, the time line is not. And what I find really troubling is that putting four Houses on the block for this upcoming Fall is actually against our own policy and Bylaws; it’s got to be against something, otherwise we wouldn’t have a time line. And we wouldn’t say that all new curriculum has to be submitted. It would seem to me that the House curriculum for these four new Houses has to be submitted between now and the end of this school year for implementation in Fall 2015, like any other program on campus. So that’s where that special treatment issue that I really don’t want to get lost. We’ve got to deal with that as a PR problem for the Houses.

Belcastro: Last spring the senate tried to be very supportive of the process, and appreciated the big idea behind it. And that’s why we were willing to approve the first year courses only, with the clear understanding that the program itself would be approved before it continues. I think that would be helpful as a guide for people working on the Houses to have.

Richards: How much of this curriculum are we going to run simultaneously, and for how long? And for which students? Because Houses have the advantage that they are targeted to a very specific group of students. But just because the faculty are enthusiastic about half a dozen causes doesn’t mean that covers the student body. So are we going to continue with the USEM type curriculum, where is the rest going to come from to run the two simultaneously? How are students going to transfer House credit into their majors? Those questions haven’t been answered, and yet we’re putting a lot of resources into developing Houses. I don’t think the issues brought up by my colleagues should be brushed off as trivial or grandstanding.

Wilder: Is there a model that the new Houses are following from the first year Houses?

Deb Brown said there is a meeting on Wednesday where people from each House are getting together with Mary to talk about it. Mary Cullinan said a couple people were coming to the change leadership team to given an update. Erin Wilder emphasized that there needs to be some kind of model to ensure quality.

Nordquist: So “it” has to be against something, “it” being the process that curriculum is approved by. “It” is against the catalog.

The Houses are not in the catalog, and the catalog is our contract with the students. And we get things into the catalog through this process of going through the Curriculum Committee. So, with “it” being the process that the Houses are being approved by is against the notion that it’s in the catalog. In fact, they’re not in the catalog, and in my opinion, are not a part of our contract with the students.

Purslow: We need a legal opinion on that. Could there be any circumstance that somebody could sue the university over this House? With the Houses being absent from the catalog?

Ferguson: I’m not a lawyer or anything, but at this point, no, because they were only advertised as the “first year.” And as “first year” it very much met all of the goals and proficiencies of University Seminar. But that’s a good point for subsequent years.

Ettlich: I don’t think it would be any more problematic than the fact that departments that pilot courses prior to putting them into the catalog. If we’re promising students a four-year program, that becomes different. And so the question would be, have we promised students in writing that are enrolled in these Houses a four-year program that doesn’t exist. Because there have been problems with that in other institutions.

Brown: We’ve just been sitting down with our Social Justice students and advising them one-on-one. The Lime Sheet is what everyone is so familiar with. Well, the House students are using a Goldenrod sheet that is a much more pared-down version that does line-up the four years in very broad terms. But then there’s a paragraph that says, “If you complete this four-year program you have satisfied the General Education requirements at SOU.” And it is signed by Jim for each student. So we have in writing, promised at least this cohort of 100 students this year, that program for four years. I’m finding it’s hard to advise them beyond the first year.

This was followed with a discussion that Senate had only approved a first year, and they wondered where the four-year policy came from.

Brown: I’ve been getting it from Julie Smith in advising. When each student is advised they are given the Goldenrod Sheet at Raider Reg, so the advisor who saw the student signed it (just like with the Lime Sheet), and there’s a place for USEM or House Seminar, and then the Provost at the bottom. They were given it at Raider Reg, and if they have lost it, Julie Smith has a scanned copy for each student. Most students have lost it.

Klein: Before I signed that I checked with your Senate Chair to see if it was okay, for this one cohort.

Carter: Yes, and on that particular sheet of paper was the understanding that the three House classes HSEM 101, 102, 103, those that were approved by Senate, with the understanding that the rest of the material would be coming through this academic year for review.

Sherry Ettlich asked if it said “approval pending”, but was told it does not say that.

Ettlich rephrasing Belcastro’s question:

How are the specific courses being reviewed to make sure that they’re meeting the House 101, 102, and 103, which were approved by faculty senate? Because we approved a general description that should work for any House. In USEM there’s a wonderfully huge process to approve those course proposals. We could just be asking what is the process that’s in place that’s now approving the specifics for these Houses.

Carter: So I will take these questions and with Larry getting these all typed-up and send them out. I ask that you return them quickly so that I can get them to Karen because it’s going to take her awhile to go through these with a timely response of two weeks, for us to be able to talk about these.

Richards: I hope I misunderstood what I just heard, but I hope that the Provost and Senate Chair not get in the habit of approving curriculum matters without discussion with the senate.

Carter: No. Over the summertime I met with Jim and we went over the first couple of courses, as far as what the Houses were going to look like for the students for the Fall House students coming in. It was my understanding that it was based off of the three courses that were approved with the understanding that the rest of the curriculum would be coming forward, like we discussed, at a May or June session of senate.

Richards: So the document that you signed Jim, was that a document causing one-year or four-years?

Klein: I guess four years.

Richards: But that was not approved by the senate. So you were approving curriculum without approval from the senate, and I think that’s over-stepping your authority. I’m sorry, but that’s what it sounds like.

Ettlich: It’s hard to change things in hindsight. It would have been much safer to have some place in fine print at the bottom saying “approval pending.” Because in some ways if a student has litigious parents, we could be trapped into exactly that four-year that was predicted, even though we may move to some version of it that’s better by the time we get it finally approved. So I don’t want to be too nasty. In the future, I would encourage that there be a little fine print, even though I hate being a lawyer. Sometimes it helps.

Russell-Miller: What does that do to our process now, at this point, in terms of looking at approving?

Carter: Nothing. I believe that our particular purview, as far as reviewing the curriculum, having these materials brought forward to the Houses, and the Houses responding to these particular questions. And going through the normal mode of curriculum committee and University Studies and then coming to us – none of that would change.

Ettlich: The issue, Mary, would be if we change it. That would create an issue for the current Houses, because they will need to get their students revised Goldenrod forms and deal with any concerns students or parents may have with the changes.

Purslow: Should we be proactive and have a letter go out to these students and say there is an error in the Goldenrod form? Otherwise, it really does force our hand into approving a four-year curriculum that we may or may not want to approve. That then impacts all the Houses that come on board. I think it would really help us if somebody didn’t come back and say “But you promised me this in my senior year.”

Ettlich: You’re putting a huge spotlight on something when we’re trying to deal with retention issues. And I don’t know how much we will change it. I don’t think we’ll throw the whole thing out, so the question is, if we’re going to change it, it’s then: “How those folks sell whatever changes were made?”

Belcastro: Something that may be helpful, we did ask for this in the Spring with Karen when she was here, is a timeline. A timeline that would work for senate, so that we have a full program presented. And enough time that the new Houses that will be up and running next Fall have the time to use that program for some consistency.

Carter: Well, I believe that creates a rather lengthy set of questions for Karen, so Larry and I will work on getting these out to you. Please respond as quickly as you can to them, and if there is something else that you think ought to be included, please let me know. I will then try to get these to Karen this week so that we can have some more informative and detailed discussion in two weeks on Monday.

Adjourned 5:42 PM.