**Faculty Senate Emergency Meeting Minutes**

**October 30, 2013**

**SU 313 4:35 - 6:18p.m.**

**Present:** Roni Adams, Jackie Apodaca, Amy Belcastro, Todd Carney, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Carol Ferguson, Richard May, Pete Nordquist, Garth Pittman, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Kevin Sahr, Larry Shrewsbury, Jamie Vener, Erin Wilder, and Elizabeth Whitman (as a substitute for Deborah Brown) and Marlene Alt (as a substitute for Robin Strangfeld).

**Absent:**, Deborah Brown, Megan Farnsworth, William Hughes, Steve Jessup, John King, Byron Marlowe, Kasey Mohammad, Mary Russell-Miller, Robin Strangfeld, Jody Waters.

**Visitors:** Susan Walsh, Lee Ayers, Kip Sigetich, Dennis Jablonski, Kristi Wright.

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

**Discussion:**

Carter: I polled everybody’s Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday teaching schedules and this meeting time gave us the maximum number of individuals who could attend this meeting. I apologize to those who were not able to make it because of other engagements. I scheduled this emergency meeting so that we could talk about the models and have an open discussion. I asked Associate Provost Susan Walsh to join us so that she could give us clarification on the new Compromise Model that was discussed yesterday. My hope for this particular emergency senate session is that we have an open discussion about the models and, most recently, this current model which I think is a compromise which addresses a lot of the issues, which I believe were at the heart of the anxiety over the other models. And to that effect, Carol, representing the STEM faculty, has done a survey of the STEM faculty.

Ferguson: STEM stands for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math. These are the departments: Biology; Chemistry, Physics, Materials and Engineering as a single department; Computer Science; Environmental Studies; and Math. Based on our two meetings we reached a consensus and put out a survey that closed today that had 5 questions. 30 out of the 42 faculty responded.

Ferguson then read off the results from the survey. We all received a copy of it by email 10/30/2013 after the survey closed.

Carter: One of the issues is that the President and the Provost have within their purview to do academic reorganization so long as they don’t violate the By-Laws, the Constitution, and/or the Collective Bargaining Agreement. So they can reshuffle us to some degree, and our decision point today is really based on this new model. I think this compromise model does quite a bit more in what we had in mind as far as abiding by those By-Laws, Constitution, and Collective Bargaining Agreement, with a little bit of tweaking. But as far as the Constitution and the By-Laws it fits within those parameters. So our need to be here today to discuss this is to decide if we in fact want to support a particular model. Because the decision is going to be made, whether or not it’s going to be made on November 1st or some few days after that, that’s not really the pressing issue. The pressing issue is if a decision is going to be made, is this something we want to discuss and support by putting out a letter of support by the Senate that this is in fact the skeleton, or the framework, or however you want to phrase it, of the future organizational structure that we will have. Another question that has been raised prior to this is “Do we even want to have a particular organizational restructuring?” I don’t think that particular question is within our purview, because it is within the ability of the administration to do that already. We can object to that, however, there’s really no point, because they have the ability to do that. So I think our most crucial decision point today is we can discuss all of the models, but I would say that we would want to focus on this particular model since it is the compromise, so it is the melding of some of the models that were presented. And it does allow for faculty governance and representation because it does keep chairs within the model. And so if that is something that we want to discuss and have questions about it then that’s why Associate Provost Walsh is here to clarify any questions that we might have.

Richards: I hope I’m suffering from my own ignorance, because this looks God-awful to me. So I hope there’s a lot in here that I don’t properly understand. One of the best things I saw in the models that had been proposed earlier was to have a Dean of curriculum and a Dean of personnel. That’s gone from this model and apparently those duties have devolved to the directors. Is that correct?

Walsh: Thanks for having me everyone. I appreciate the time. John, you’re right, there were two deans and the thought was we could save additional money and shift the responsibilities around a little bit and still cover the same issues and concerns that we were trying to originally deal with. So there’s an AVP for curricular management, that person will have control of the resources like release time, all of that stuff that would fall under the category of resources. That person would also oversee course enrollment management, and the kinds of things that the current Associate Dean currently does, so there’s a lot in that. What’s not there is you’ll see Promotion & Tenure, which goes down to the Chair level and then up to the Provost office. So that’s really the personnel issue, I think, is the one that is missing from all the other duties that you saw in the two-Dean model. There might be some other things, I don’t have those in front of me. I apologize for not making it to the meeting last week when Karen presented because I was out of town.

Richards: It says 12 graduate program coordinators, is that one for each graduate student or what?

Walsh: The graduate coordinator doesn’t change. What changes is that I’ll keep graduate studies, but I’ll have a limited staff to do the marketing and kinds of things that faculty said they wanted help with. So this came from the graduate council, graduate summit, some other feedback surveys.

Richards: The other thing that kind of bothers me about this is that we’ve been talking about flattening the hierarchy, putting fewer tiers in the hierarchy. It looks like we put in an extra tier.

The directors coming between the AVP and the Chairs?

Walsh: In the model that Karen and I did we had a director level, but you may recall we didn’t have Chairs. Faculty were loud and clear they didn’t care too much about the Director piece but they did care that there weren’t any Chairs. So we built that back in, putting another level at the bottom, putting back the Chairs.

Richards: What I see that as doing is putting a set of managers between the chair and the AVP or Provost level, and those managers are not elected by the faculty, but appointed by the administration, and have decision making authority over the chairs. So what you’ve come up with is a much weaker Chair with less release time for Chairs …

Walsh: And much less responsibility.

Richards … and superimposed over that a whole layer of directors who are going to come from God knows where, and they are full time, 10 months a year and half time 2 months in the summer, right?

Walsh: On the Chairs piece, for some time the Chairs have been increasingly frustrated with the number of duties they’ve been assigned to do. I know that when I was a Chair, versus now, it was a lot less than what Chairs are being asked to do now. So we’ve tried to take the burden off of the Chairs, move it up to another layer, keep the promotion and tenure issue with the Chairs. The idea was to back off some of those duties for the Chairs.

Carter: One other point, John, is that right now the intent for the Directors is that they will be appointed from within the faculty.

Richards: I have one last question: I was under the impression that we were coming up with a skeleton for reorganization and the various centers would be populated later, and yet this comes out with a populated list.

Walsh: It was a toss-up: either put nothing in there or put something in there for a starter for a conversation. It was a 50-50 shot, and the people who wanted something in there won. But I can tell you that the Chairs, as we speak, they’re talking about all of this. We’ve got a good month before we have to worry about who gets with whom.

Sahr: You’ve been saying the Chairs have responsibility for promotion but according to this document the directors have that responsibility, or are they just in the chain?

Walsh: They are in the chain.

Sahr: So they sort of replace the Dean level?

Walsh: Yes.

Sahr: How many chairs do we have now?

After a little discussion it’s believed we have 18 Chairs and 5 program coordinators.

Sahr: We’re going to be keeping 18 Chairs? We’re not going to reduce the number of chairs? Is that what I’m hearing?

Walsh: There’s a little bit of discussion going on right now, it could be 2 to 3 Chairs per Center, depending on a couple of things; SCH, FTE, and the needs of each Center. I can’t give you any more detail than that. But it’s conceivable that a Center might have two to three Chairs, or perhaps a Chair and two program coordinators. It’s not a one-size-fits-all model. The Chairs are talking about this very thing right now.

Sahr: I was just figuring that if you say there are 18 Chairs now, and we have 18 Chairs remaining, we don’t lose any Chairs.

Walsh: It’s not so much the number of Chairs, it’s the amount of release time.

Sahr: Oh, you’re talking about FTE’s. Okay.

So the 12.5 FTE here in this model is for all of the Chairs and all of the Program Coordinators.

Walsh: Yes. Typically Chairs would be released 1 course per term. Directors would teach one course per term, so we capture release through that as well.

Sahr: Do we know how much FTE we currently have for Chairs and Program Coordinators?

After a little discussion it’s believed it’s a little over 30, perhaps 33.

Walsh: This total savings is $1.2 million; it costs out a little better than the other 5 models.

Sahr: But are we still planning on having release for Program Coordinators?

Walsh: Yes.

Sahr: But it won’t be as much?

Walsh: It may not be any, it depends on the program. That’s all being discussed. But what we want to be sure to do is cover all of the work.

Nordquist: Is the AVP a new position?

Walsh: It’s a new position that would take the place of part of what Karen does, part of what the other two-dean job description included.

Nordquist: So it’s a new position that we will be hiring.

Walsh: These are internal searches.

Nordquist: There’s a reference to a Dean down here …

Walsh: That’s me Pete, so I’m already that.

Walsh handed out an Organizational Chart and an Academic and Student Affairs flow chart.

Walsh: You’ve got two charts and I’ve got a couple of caveats. You have a “really in the weeds” chart and then you have a chart that was created today.

So you have a red one that’s dated today, and then you got one that came out of the transitional team’s work when the integration of student and academic affairs happened. So if you don’t mind let’s first look at the “in the weeds” one. It’s got a ton of detail in it. This is what is currently academic student affairs, post integration. So if you look at my position, you’ll see what falls under my position currently Pete, that will just give you an idea, you’ll see that graduate studies is there, and that’s been the case since I took this job, so that doesn’t change.

Now on the far left side you’ll see the Dean line. So I’m going to draw your attention to this, this org chart here, and this will show you the chain. So if you look at the far left line here, it’s the Center 1, Center 2, Center 3, or A, B, C, or whatever they will be called, we just don’t know yet. That takes the place of the other left hand sideline. Does that make sense? So I just wanted to give you that caveat because this was done pre academic reorganization but post student and academic affairs integration.

So you can see what’s in my portfolio, you can see what’s in the position that we hope we are going to hire this week, the AVP for enrollment and retention.

Belcastro: In term of the Directors, are they going to be full time employees?

Walsh: Half time in July and August. It’s ten months full time and two months half time.

Belcastro: They will teach one course per year?

Walsh: Yes.

Belcastro: They will come from our faculty and be APPSOU members?

Walsh: They will come from our faculty but they will not be APPSOU members, the Chairs will. And the feeling was, and I think there’s general agreement after we talked this through, that the Directors might be a little more objective on some issues if they were not elected and represented by APPSOU. But you have that Chair level, which seemed to be important to faculty.

Belcastro: In a sense, we are eliminating Deans, and replacing those, in a sense, with Directors?

Walsh: Yeah, I think that’s a reasonable conclusion.

Belcastro: So they really are administrators. Could you explain the rationale on why they would teach one course? Because it’s a different skill set.

Walsh: Because the faculty asked that we include that. We heard that very loud and clear. I suppose you could say that if an administrator says that I just can’t teach a class this year, they should have the ability to do that.

Belcastro: They will be appointed by who?

Walsh: The Directors? The Directors would apply for the position, and there would be a selection committee, just like there would be for a search if we went external. So the difference is that we would do an internal search, and we do those, it’s not something new, we’ve got an infrastructure for that.

Carter: It’s labeled as a “Dean Process”, but it’s pretty much the same process.

Belcastro: And that’s what I was going to follow up with. Will it follow the same process, with or without faculty approval? With the Dean it goes through faculty approval as well.

Walsh: Don’t quote me here. This is a question that I haven’t fully discussed with Jim or others. But my sense is that we would want folks to give a presentation, talk about what they bring to the party, why they’re interested in the position, and the things that we would ask any other candidate.

Belcastro: One last question about the Director. Is there going to be a formula for what the salary would be for the Directors? Because there’s quite a variation between SCH’s as well as the FTE.

Walsh: I think the goal would be to achieve parity. To do our very-very best. You don’t want to disincentive people from applying because it’s a lot of work. The reality is that if you amortize a faculty’s salary, let’s just use that as one example, as one method of doing it. You’re going to have variation, because you’ve got some people who are interested are full, others who are associate, so we’re going to have to work through all of that. But the goal will be to achieve equity and parity. That’s really important, you want to make sure people are being compensated appropriately for the amount of work they’re doing and the number of people they’re supervising. That said, I will say that there’s kind of an underlying goal to try to keep the FTEs in the Centers reasonably similar, so we don’t have a whacky FTE in one Center and something significantly less in another.

Belcastro: What number? This was priced out to get that.

Walsh: I don’t know what Chris used. It was an average salary; I think we took a full and an associate just to cost it out. But you don’t know what you don’t know yet, because you don’t know who those people are going to be.

Belcastro: So it’s not a position that you would apply for and this is how much this position would make. It will be based on …

Walsh: I don’t know. I don’t think we’ve got that much into the details of that. But I will say it will be fair and I think parity is key.

Ferguson: When we did the Compromise Model was retention and recruitment issues factored into this model? Because that’s always been a concern of mine. What’s the point if we can’t reach recruitment and retention? None of the models seem to have addressed that. We keep moving units and people around and relabeling them to save money, which I understand.

Walsh: I don’t know if you’ve seen the description for the new AVP position. That person’s expertise is going to have to be that or they shouldn’t come here. Now that’s a general answer. More specifically I can give you some examples. We know we need to grow graduate programs, we know that is going to allow us to do other things if we grow our graduate programs. So the idea of putting some staff into my office would allow us to recruit and do marketing, and the kinds of things we currently are unable to do in some of the programs that are sort of existing out there in la-la-land. Trying to teach and do all those things as graduate coordinators, etc. So that’s an area of recruitment. So I can just say “Yes, it’s a big deal.” I listen to Jim saying “recruitment and retention” about a hundred times a day. So I can tell you it’s very much in all of these conversations and I really believe its …

Ferguson: Okay, I just don’t see it reflected in …

Walsh: Not just a purview of this AVP that is going to be hired, it’s everybody’s responsibility.

Ferguson: Sure, I get that. I just don’t really see that it’s addressed. I see it addressed with that one position. I don’t see it addressed with moving people around, but that’s okay.

Walsh: We’re doing some stuff with first and second year orientation. Matt and Dan are working on academic advising, that’s another piece of retention and recruitment.

Ferguson: My other question has to do with the undergraduate studies center, which I’m a little confused about, because it says Honors College Director already exists and reports to the Provost. Then Honors College is part of that Center and has a Director. So that might be an example of a Director and then also a Chair, but my concern is around the Houses.

Walsh: They’re in there, primarily because of House Seminar, not so much the other curricular pieces of it. It’s really the Gen Ed piece, which at some point is going to be subsumed …

Ferguson: That’s where I think we haven’t had that discussion campus wide. Now things are moving forward sort of in starts and fits, but there’s no testing period, and personally I’m not comfortable with having two Gen Ed tracks. And then all of a sudden everyone’s shifting to these House tracks with no discussion about curriculum and advantages for doing that for all students. I just want to see more data collected to see the success or not.

Walsh: For that particular Center, the whole point of that is to try and put undergraduate curriculum into a place where it can be managed more systematically.

Ferguson: I’m just a little concerned that’s all a done deal. Maybe it’s not a done deal, I’m just voicing my concern.

Walsh: I’m sorry if I made it sound like a done deal. I don’t know if it is, I haven’t been as hands-on with the Houses as much as Karen has. So those discussions are sometimes not …

Ferguson: Those discussions are hard right now. With all of this other stuff they got pushed off, but they were pretty darn hot topics last year. I’m just saying that concerns me when things take on their own life, and then they become accepted because, well, they’ve already been boxed in this unit. And so we talk about them as if everybody approved that. So I just want to have that out there.

Walsh: I would like to see it not happen overnight either.

Carter: The House Model as a curriculum still has to go through committee and then to senate. It’s still moving forward, it’s just that this took precedence.

Walsh: It was one of Jim’s nonnegotiables to have that in its own Center so that it would get the attention and not get diffused in some way. Having said that, I can tell you that Curriculum Committee are very aware that this stuff is coming to them very soon.

Lee Ayers updated us on the work that’s being done by the Curriculum Committee and that the House curriculum has not been forgotten about.

Ferguson is concerned about what the student’s perception is for what’s going on, and what should we be telling the students? When we roll out something we should be in agreement with a unified voice, and she doesn’t want to see a further decline in enrollment because we’ve scared the students off.

Walsh: We should be mindful of what we say to students, because some departments will be going away.

Purslow stated her appreciation for getting a Compromise Model. She felt it would be helpful to have a clear delineation on what is required to apply for a Director. She felt any associate professors would be at a disadvantage with promotion and tenure if they were not teaching. She asked if the Honors College will remain in the Center for Undergraduate Studies or is it possible it could shift to this other AVP?

Walsh: The Honors College is unique in that they have to raise funds, they have external stuff they have to do in the community. They really have to report directly to Jim.

Purslow: I feel the whole Student Affairs has buried your office.

Walsh: It has become more challenging, but in other ways I think the University has benefited from the integration of the two areas. There are things that are working much better and more collaboratively as a result of that integration.

Purlsow: Do you expect that the Provost has some sort of regular meetings with the Directors?

Walsh: I do. I don’t see that as being a problem at all. And if I have to force his door open with a crowbar I’ll do it for those Directors.

Nordquist asked if the salary for the Directors is the same for 8th year Associate, and this was followed with a similar response when Amy Belcastro tried to find out what the salary was: It hasn’t been determined yet, but it will have parity and provide incentive for people to step up and take on those duties.

Nordquist was wondering how we could expect to be saving money if we were replacing 5 people with 9 people in our restructuring.

It was explained the savings is in Deans and Chairs release, and that you can’t think of it as “number of people”, but as FTE and release savings.

Nordquist: Who will be on the hiring committee for the Directors?

Walsh: I don’t know, we haven’t got that far yet.

Ettlich: What we talked about at the Chairs meeting after you left was that the AVP search would be handled like a AVP search so it will have faculty, staff, and students on the search committee. It will probably be searched November/December. It will be an internal search. For the 7 Directors, the search committees will be formed by the 10th of December and applications will be due by January 15. The Directors are all internal searches. We have to figure out who the buckets are for the 7 groups, and then they’ll be handled like a Dean search for someone out of that group. We have directions in the Bylaws for that kind of search.

Belcastro: Will we be able to replace the person that’s selected to be a Director?

Ettlich: That is not in the budget.

Belcastro: So that’s the salary savings, is that we would lose a person in our teaching?

Walsh: Let me remind you that I stepped out of Communications to take this position. It’s a burden for some departments, but it’s not a “one-size-fits-all” where we yank someone away from you and say “You’re just going to have to suck it up.” Those conversations happen when people go on sabbatical. If we didn’t make it appealing we wouldn’t have anybody internally stepping up.

Belcastro: What if nobody steps up, do we then go external?

Walsh: I hope that we have enough talented and interested people in taking on these jobs. My sense is, from the people who have talked to me, there are people who are really interested in doing these jobs. But if there’s a vacuum, we’ll have to figure out something.

Ettlich: Yesterday it was mentioned that the person who headed a center wouldn’t necessarily be from one of the departments if we can’t find someone in one of those departments.

Walsh: Deans aren’t discipline specific and that’s why you still have the Chairs so you can have that connection.

Belcastro: So many of the responsibilities of the chair are going to this Director, and that’s why the alignment is so important.

Walsh: Point well taken, but we have to trust that our colleagues are good inter-disciplinarians, in ways that count.

Nordquist voiced concerns that the people most motivated to apply for the Director position for its bump in salary would be the least qualified. And those who have been around a long time aren’t going to have a lot of incentive.

Walsh respectfully disagreed. People who have talked to her about the Director position are people who have been chairs, most of them are full professors, some associates, and all tenured. The chairs model works really well for some departments and not so well for others, so there’s a downside to our current chairs model.

Nordquist: We’ll have the same number of chairs as we have now, but fewer people to draw from.

Ettlich: But the chairs job is much more manageable which makes it much more attractive. And we did talk about the Director position wouldn’t require someone to take a pay cut, that it would at least roll up their salary.

Nordquist: I’m very suspicious about us being able to save money in this model.

Walsh: We could argue about this all day. There are pros and cons for all these different models.

Carter: My understanding is that when this was presented Tuesday and then taken to Chris Stanek, he used the same parameters that he used to cost out all of the other models. So if there’s error in the estimation, it’s an error across all the estimations. Whatever error is involved, it’s going to be the same. This model saved $1.2 million.

Nordquist felt that the other models didn’t have the four levels that this one does, and he’s worried that hasn’t been tested for.

Ettlich: I really think it has. When we had school directors, we also had an associate provost who was responsible for curriculum. Now Sue’s duties are more complex with accreditation and student affairs. She can’t continue that. This is more like that model, splitting the dean work between the AVP and the Directors. The costing for the AVP is similar to dean level. The Director is the director level that we looked at in other models. Chairs drop to roughly a third release because of reduced duties. It’s not like there’s a whole new layer from what was in the other models.

Ferguson expressed concern on why someone would want to be an administrator. That it should be someone who’s elected to that position, not someone who’s striving to be an administrator. And there’s an assumption that there’s people willing to jump into these positions that are not well defined yet. And she’s nervous to hear that they’re already talking about the job descriptions because that assumes that we’re going with this model. And once people get into these positions, and they choose later to step out of that position, we have a problem. What do we do then? Do we go to an external search?

Walsh: There is a model of chairs being administrative positions all around this country. I understand it’s not our model, but there is a model …

Ferguson: Most of those models are from large research universities.

Walsh: So what do they do if somebody steps down?

Ferguson: I’ve seen some, where I worked. Chaos. They usually bring in administrative chairs from somewhere else and it doesn’t work very well sometimes.

Walsh: I see your point. What we were asked to do for the date that we were to have the skeleton done by was to show what the leadership would consist of, and what the organizational structure that would support the academic side of the House would look like. So you’re right, it might be more detail than some people would like to see. At the chairs meeting I think it was less detail than some people wanted to see. But that was the goal, to try to get enough to put forward to the chancellor so they can see that we have a plan.

Ferguson: I get that part. However when I hear that you’re writing descriptions of jobs that tells me that this model is the one that’s going forward. I thought we, and the body, were going to review this model plus other models to actually tweak them some more.

Carter: To respond to that, like I said at the very beginning, the administration has every right to change this reorganization. It’s not our call and the president has made that decision. Sometime next week likely, that’s when the decision is going to be made. My point, and what I addressed to the email today, was we can choose to discuss these models, and I think that’s what we’re doing here today. And decide to support a model so we can also help guide that model. Say that we support this model with these additional tweaks, etc. Or, we don’t do anything, or we don’t make any decision whatsoever, we let the administration make a decision, and then we discuss it again. But the point is we can either be out in front of this and try to guide this conversation, and say “Yes, this is a good starting point, and we like to see this, this, and this happen as well.”

Ferguson: It just that when I hear that job descriptions are being written, that kind of moves it in a different direction.

Walsh: Beyond this piece of paper there are no job descriptions that have been written. This is it.

Ettlich: Jim has real concerns about finding 12 people, spread across the faculty and turning over every three years, providing enough stability, at the management level . The administration really listened to our saying that Chairs was a deal breaker, and came back with a model with Chairs.

Sahr: I want to expand on something that Vicki raised. So the reporting structure is going to be from the faculty to the Chairs to the Directors and then through this Associate Vice President to the Provost.

Walsh: For specific things.

Sahr: Oh, for specific things. I guess that’s my concern. A curricular management person doesn’t have the breadth to manage all aspects of academia, scholarship, and all these other aspects. Are those aspects moving directly from Director to Provost then?

Walsh: I think Directors can handle quite a fair amount of the personnel issues and the other kinds of things that might involve a higher-up decision. But ultimately, the buck stops at the Provost’s office. If you were to disagree with your Director’s decision about a resource issue, it might go to that AVP. But if it’s something else, a personnel matter or some sort of grievance issue that you want to have an audience with the Provost about, you still have that audience.

Apodaca: I just want to make sure that I understand this correctly: If the Directors are coming from internal searches, if they come from faculty, the faculty line is not going to be replaced. Is that correct?

Walsh: Currently faculty have retreat rights. So if I have retreat rights, I negotiated that when I took this position, I could go back into Communications if I should decide that I’m not liking this anymore. And I have a line in Communications. Now it may be in teaching something different from what I was teaching three and a half years ago, because the department might have changed.

Jacki: So there would not be a replacement for that person selected as a Director?

Ettlich: As it’s budgeted, there is not a replacement.

Walsh: And that’s been the case for years now. The idea that you would replace X person with the exact same X person has been kind of a long-gone idea.

Ettlich: The Directors, as part of their incentive would be given retreat rights.

Amy: You mentioned at the beginning about the awareness to grow graduate programs.

Walsh: The need.

Amy: Could you speak a little bit about the reporting and communication relationship in graduate studies? Number one, we don’t have a Director of Graduate Studies so …

Walsh: So let me tell you currently how it works and then what we envision for someone …

Amy: Let me finish my part so that you can see the whole thing. Would then within the graduate programs are they going to be reporting directly to the Associate Vice President of curricular management?

Walsh: No. I’m looking at this chart here, it’s the second line from the left. Graduate Studies is right under there. So what that currently consists of, I pretty much look at policies and procedures and make sure people are doing the right thing by their grad assistants, and kinds of things that grad council oversees, which is approval of curricula. I don’t create curriculum; I don’t do any marketing or that sort of thing. In order to grow graduate programs, what we heard, is that people want something more centralized, they want resources available so that they don’t have to be out there beating the bushes. And they would like some consistency across programs with regard to release and other things. That said, this person, I, would also be growing programs that we currently don’t have in consultation with other departments. For example, could we do a summer low residency graduate program on campus in Ashland for the Arts? Would that bring people here? Could we get 30 people? I don’t know, these are just conversations that we have. Could we do a four year “three plus one”; could we tell the students that you’ll have a Master’s Degree after 4 years? Is that a possibility? I don’t know. So those are the kinds of conversations that are currently not being discussed. Those are the kinds of conversations I would be having with departments.

Carter: To get back to the original motion on the floor. The motion was to accept the spirit of this with the four levels, with duties and other caveats to be discussed either on Monday or a continuation thereof. And it was seconded. We’ve concluded the discussion?

Ferguson: I have one question. Are we as a senate planning on Monday to actually craft something more formal?

Carter: Depending on the vote, I will take that vote, and start to craft a letter, send it out to everybody, get some feedback, finalize that letter, and send it on Monday. And then we can pass that forward to the administration. I don’t think the administration is actually going to make their decision Friday, it will probably happen next week.

Carter: Any other discussion?

All those in favor? (Everyone except Nordquist, Richards, and Whitman)

All those apposed? Peter Nordquist

All those abstaining? John Richards, Elizabeth Whitman (substitute for Deborah Brown)

Carter: The motion carries.

Are there any other items of discussion about this particular component?

Belcastro: I think it might be helpful on Monday to go into executive session to drill out the nuts and bolts on this so we can really move forward a little quicker and have a report from the Chairs and what their discussions and such are.

Carter: Just to clarify, for the last two weeks I have been waxing and waiting on whether or not to send a piece of information out to everybody. Our ability to go into executive session is clearly laid out in the Oregon Revised Statute. I will now go ahead and send this out to you as soon as I get back to my office. But given what we were talking about today, it is not warranted for us to be able to go into executive session. One, we can’t make any decisions or any reports from an executive session. Two, none of the conditions that we were going to discuss actually met the conditions on how to get into executive session. Other than to establish council and discussion within session, like either regular, special, or emergency session, which has to be voted upon, or enacted upon, by the senators. So it’s not like I can just automatically call one unless there are basically two issues for us. One is to discuss the legality of our contract, and two is to discuss the legality of …

Belcastro: Well that’s what I was thinking, the legality of the contracts. Some of these shifts in roles and responsibilities directly affect our CBA.

Carter: Let me clarify, we are not concerned about the CBA. We are concerned about the bylaws and the constitution.

Belcastro: And doesn’t this affect the bylaws?

Ettlich: It’s the closest to the bylaws of anything that we have had.

Belcastro: It’s the closest, but it affects it.

Carter: The one piece that is affected is one particular article that relates directly back to the collective bargaining agreement that says “See Article 8 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement” as far as the duties and assignments of the chairs. Our major issue was: does the idea of Directors fit with our idea of what Deans are, and do our Chairs still fit within the roles and expectations of what Chairs are. Given this model, and it was the closest to the Bylaws and Constitution, as long as we accept that school is really a unit and our discussion of Directors is what we equate to a Dean, we can tweak those definitional statements within the Bylaws, but it’s not changing the spirit of the Bylaws, or the letter, if you will, of what the Bylaws are trying to stipulate between the difference between a primary unit and a secondary unit.

Ettlich: This isn’t abolishing one of those layers, which the other models did.

Ferguson: But what about the process in the Bylaws, Section 3, about selection procedures for Deans?

Ettlich: That’s what we’re going to use for the search.

Carter: There are two major types of search processes that we can do. The first one in there is that alternate one that’s also discussed in that section about if we believe this is not the appropriate one, we can, as a faculty body, provide rationale for why we think a different or alternate approach should go forward. But my understanding is that the Directors would be brought forward into directorship through that normal process of the Bylaws.

Ettlich: What was stated in Chairs is that we would use Bylaws Section 3.

Ferguson: I would still like to see it in writing somewhere. I’ll believe it when I see it.

Belcastro: One of the issues that we have here is that this is being presented to Chairs, so I’m getting this second hand. And I’m expected to make decisions on it. And I’ve been struggling with that from the beginning of this year to now. We should not be second hand, we should be first report.

Carter: I agree, and hence is why I brought the presentations to us last week. And the reality is we can either try and guide the ship and provide a supportive statement to them with some caveats, like I think we did, or we can just wait and let them make a decision. Because until they actually make a decision all we can really do is pontificate about what they’re going to decide.

The presentation that I got, beyond what you got, is I talked with Jim last night at 5:30 and again at 7:00 about this. That was the first time that I had seen this.

Ettlich: We discussed it for an hour and a half at the Chairs meeting. One of the comments was that maybe we should have had both groups together and have all 40 talking about it at once.

Carter: I do agree, Amy, that they dropped the ball on their approach to how they presented this. I think that this is a much more immediate and pressing issue than the external governance. But there really should have been three open forums on internal governance first, prior to the external governance. But we can smack their wrist for a bad approach.

So, just to follow up, I didn’t think it was a great idea for us to try and get into executive session today. One, because it didn’t really warrant what we were trying to accomplish today. And even if we could get into an executive session, you are all the individuals who create that motion, and second that motion in order for it to go into executive session. Unless there is one of those two clearly defined issues of the legality of a contract or the overview or review of an administrator. We’re not a power plant, electric company, or medical facility. So it’s more difficult for us to jump into an executive session.

Kevin Sahr had an issue to discuss, and rather than have an executive session on Monday, he offered to give the 30 second version now, rather than in an executive session.

The meeting ended at 6:18 p.m.