**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**January 27, 2014**

**SU 313 4:02 - 5:54 p.m.**

**Present:** Jackie Apodaca, Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Todd Carney, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Sherry Ettlich, Carol Ferguson, John King, Byron Marlowe, Richard May, Kasey Mohammad, Pete Nordquist, Garth Pittman, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Mary Russell-Miller, Kevin Sahr, Larry Shrewsbury, Craig Stillwell (for Elizabeth Whitman), Robin Strangfeld, Elizabeth Whitman, and.

**Absent:**, Steve Jessup, Jamie Vener, Erin Wilder.

**Visitors:** Jody Waters, Karen Stone, Sue Walsh, Dan DeNeui, Steve Thorpe, Jessica Piekielek, Mark Tveskov, Lee Ayers, William Hughes, Kristi Wright

**Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.

Nordquist motioned to approve the minutes for December 2, 2013 and a second was made by Sahr. The motion carried with all in favor, none opposed, and one abstention (Mohammad).

Then John Richards mentioned a correction that needed to be made on page 8. The text “…Richards said faculty senate oversight of the process would be greatly allayed if they were to see what the task force has been charged with …” should be replaced with “…Richards said faculty senate’s *concerns* over the process would be greatly allayed …”

With that update Purslow motioned to approve the minutes for December 2, 2013 and a second was made by Sahr. The motion carried with all in favor, none opposed, and one abstention (Mohammad).

**Announcements:**

Carter made an announcement for the Jackson County Fuel Committee’s program to help poor families in the valley subsidize their fuel consumption through the use of wood. They need volunteers who would like to get a great workout chopping wood. Last December they sent out 178 truckloads of firewood to needy families.

**Comments from President Cullinan:**

Cullinan was unhappy about the delay in sending out the provisional retrenchment plan, which she had planned to send out today. Interim Chancellor Rose said that they needed to review it and that we needed to expand the range beyond what had been agreed upon. So rather than the three to five million, she wanted it to be three to seven million, with another scenario. She also wanted an analysis of our WUE (Western Undergraduate Exchange) tuition rates, and why it makes financial sense for us to be serving California students. We had “best, medium, and worst” case scenarios, and now we will have a “very worst” case scenario. It’s upsetting, said Cullinan, that the provisional plan will go out and include a very unlikely scenario, which would require such drastic cuts that we would have to go back to a comprehensive campus planning process.

**Questions**

Ferguson asked if she had any sense of why that was requested. It concerned her that they have more information than we do. Cullinan said that they have less information.

Pittman asked how we should read this document when it comes out. Will these things take effect next Spring term or next Fall? Mary said almost everything starts next year.

Then Pittman asked when will we know which scenario will be our framework. Cullinan said that, built into the plan, are benchmark dates, such as the Fall enrollment, where we look at where we are, what our state allocation is, etc. Phe plan lays out at which points we pivot when we need to. Fall enrollment is a huge driver.

Nordquist asked what the process was for implementing one of those scenarios and if the first cut that was going to happen be based upon the Fall enrollment?

Klein said the first cuts could happen as early as this Spring term.

Cullinan added that what actually happens probably won’t be one of the scenarios. These are all projections and assumptions.

Marlowe: Recently our political representation here has asked, based upon some emails, to share with the faculty that within four years we are going to be going through a process in which you described: where’s your enrollment, how are you hitting your budgets, and after those four years, between ourselves and Eastern Oregon, and separating it from Western and OIT. It looks like legislation is going to make a decision on the affiliation model. And it sounds like that’s the plan that the Chancellor is working off of. I want to bring this up because I think it’s important for faculty to know that this is all tied in to enrollment, budgets, and the decisions that will be made will be based off of that, and is it really serving our students?

Cullinan said that it’s unfortunate that serving our students doesn’t appear to be on everybody’s mind in discussions about governance.

Ettlich wanted to verify the order in which things would be happening: the provisional plan will be coming out soon, then we will go through a comment period, and ultimately come up with a finalized plan. Will the final plan also have multiple scenarios to it? Cullinan said she thought that it would.

Ettlich: I’m assuming that whatever’s in that best scenario are the things that we will implement no matter what, so those are the things that we could actually see in the Spring. And as the enrollment numbers come in we may move to the next best scenario and implement more of those. And hopefully no more problems will befall us, but if they do then we move to the next scenario. Is that kind of the layout?

Cullinan thought that was a reasonable way to talk about it. And the other way that she wrote in the plan is that we need to aspire to the best. We want to see our enrollment be as good as it can be. That is the part of our plan that we have some control over. And regardless of what the media does, we need to be as positive and as excited with our students as possible. We’ve had some incredible Preview Days, and there are a lot of other things going on. We can help ourselves to get to that best-case scenario. “And that’s a really important message that I ask that you take back to your departments.”

Pittman wondered how long does retrenchment last?

Ettlich explained that retrenchment, as defined in the bargaining agreement, is a planning process. The planning process will end with a plan, and that ends the retrenchment process. Then we have a strategic plan, and strategic plans have lots of different durations.

Cullinan gave an update on governance. The four TRU presidents remain committed to this proposal that we put forward, which was to have each of the institutions have their own governing board, but have a president’s council that would be a collaborative effort. We’re calling it the Hybrid model, a TRU governance model. With this model, we would have 40 or more people around the state lobbying and representing the smaller institutions. But we would have a board for each of our institutions who know and support us. The presidents felt that was the best of both worlds.

**Comments from Provost Klein:**

Be mindful of the students who may look at the “very worst” case and think, “the sky is falling.” Let them know that the “very worst” case is about 1% likely to happen and 99% likely to not happen. We have to help them understand what these levers are and try to keep them from making decisions that are not in their best interest.

We have made an appointment for the Associate Vice President to Karen Stone. The Director searches are going forward. Sue and Karen met with the OC’s and the APA’s last week.

Questions?

Richards asked Klein a series of questions regarding how the process for hiring the Directors doesn’t seem to be following the same process for hiring Deans (this went on for about 6 minutes).

Klein said the process was a little odd considering it’s not written down specifically how you go about this kind of a search. And that’s where Richards disagreed because he thought it was pretty specifically written down. He understands that reorganization has taken place where we do not call Directors “Deans”, but the minutes in the meeting for November 18th, Klein committed to following the process in the by-laws for the appointment of Deans. And it seems to Richards that the process has only “sort-of” been followed.

Klein said what he meant to say at that time was “…the process of the certification of the candidate is being followed.” Because we were spending quite a bit of time explaining what was going on with the reorganization.

Richards said his basic concern is that the shared governance on campus and senate has been severely curtailed throughout this process, and that’s what he is worried about.

Klein said he was sorry that Richards felt that way.

Marlow: The School of Business has voiced a concern over how you will demonstrate how the academic reorganization will fiscally save money. And they were wondering if that is something you would be able to share with us when you come to each department meeting?

Klein said they are just projections at this point.

**ASSOU report:**

Kristi Write, the Communication Director for ASSOU, said they were going to have an all-campus student assembly tomorrow in the SU Arena, doors open at 5:30, pizza comes at 5:45, and the meeting starts at 6:00. Faculty are welcome, and they plan to talk a lot about the issues and try to get a lot of students involved. Next week we will be sending students up to Salem to be lobbying for the whole month for funding for our school. The students who are attending should be talking to their instructors ahead of time, and we hope the faculty will be lenient with attendance and allow assignments to be done online. February 18 will be a “day of action”, a big rally up in Salem, and they have been recruiting coalition partners to turn up at that event. The student government at OIT are going to help send people up there. They also launched a media campaign on Facebook. Look up the “Oregon Opportunity Movement” page and check it out and “Like it.”

**HECC Report:**

There will be a full report at the February 13th meeting on putting forward the perspective construct for what the budgets will look like under the HECC model. And they’ve started a draft of the questions that will go to the community colleges and the universities for input on the process.

Ayers is also on the Student Access Subcommittee and they looked at the $40 million a year that’s given to the Oregon Opportunity Grant. It’s only open for one month from January 1st to February 1st, and the window is just too narrow. Of the 156,000 that are eligible 33,000 Oregon students are funded. So they looked more at what Pell Grants are doing: $400 million goes out to about 124,000 Oregonian students, and we know about $80 million is left on the table – it’s just not connecting to the students. They are looking at ideas and ways to reaching into it: Let tax preparers (e.g. H&R Block) know the information that they can pass on (e.g. “Based upon your tax return you are eligible for this grant.”).

There was a big piece done on Grades 11 through 14 and the transition to what is expected of them when they enter the university. Incentives available are dual credits, advanced credit hours, and advanced placement tests. It’s estimated that 2.3 billion nationally need to take remedial courses.

IFS said they are totally committed to working with HECC.

Belcastro, who is on the Student Success & Retention Committee, asked Ayers if she would send information to their committee. Ayers said that she would.

Cullinan said she’s been hearing that there’s some push to have the Oregon Opportunities Grant to be primarily for Community College students as opposed to University students. And she’s hoping that’s not the truth. Ayers said she’s heard nothing of that in the HECC meetings.

Ettlich mentioned that the Math Assessment for Juniors Intending on College (MAJIC program) was dealing with getting a drop in the developmental math rate. It might be something adaptable to other subject areas. It was primarily coming out of OSU, and Ettlich said she could give Ayers the skeleton structure of it.

**IFS Update:**

Waters explained that the big issue for them would be sorting out the governance issues. They have been asked to gather suggestions from their colleagues for short-term and long-term priorities for IFS. One of its primary priorities over the past couple years is determining if it needs to continue to exist in the form that it is. One of the positives out of the current challenges is the viability and need for a body like IFS.

In regards to textbooks Sherry asked if she had information on the 5-year adoption process and Library book access that the math department does to try and keep textbooks affordable. Waters did not have that, so they both agreed to get together for that.

**Information Items:**

Discussion and approval from faculty senate on Promotion & Tenure for: Communication, Physics, Environmental Studies, Psychology, and SSPC.

Questions?

Sherry wanted to make sure that these departments that are “double-downing” are aware that they are “double downing.” The way that P&T is set up is that you must make progress across your columns as you go up. But several of the departments have “double-downed” on that because not only have they required that you make progress across the columns, but they have also made the columns more difficult to progress across – so it sort-of “doubles” the process. The process was that in more areas you will become more expert, but by also increasing what is required in each of those areas has accelerated it. And she just wanted to make sure that the departments that made those choices made those choices with their eyes wide open.

Waters asked Sherry for an example, which was:

To become a Full Professor, if you are not Exceptional in any area you must be Preferred in every area. Whereas to be an Associate you could still have an area that is only Acceptable. That’s what is meant when we say “you have to move up in the columns.” But several departments have two sets of requirements, one for going up for Associate and one going up for Full Professor. So it has made that increase more notable. And as long as you’re doing that with perfect foresight, it’s fine.

For those who have already applied for promotion, they are not required to use these new guideline. They have the choice to use them or the guidelines that were in place when they applied for promotion.

Ettlich moved that we wave the two-week rule to approve the P&T materials today so that they are in place. But there was no second.

**Action Items:**

Carter clarified that new courses require senate approval, and amended courses do not require it.

David Oline gave a summary of the new courses and programs.

Rich May inquired on what the difference was between the new proposed course ED 340 “Child and Adolescent Development” and the current psychology course with the same title (PSY 460/560). Steve Thorpe said it was part of the Elementary Education program and it’s slightly different in that it’s directed towards teacher licensing. Belcastro said she would bring that back to her department for discussion.

Ettlich motioned to approve the items, and a second was made by Richards.

Belcastro asked if we should set aside from the motion ED 340 so her department could discuss it, and perhaps cross-list it.

So with that amendment, Ettlich made an amended motion to approve the items, and a second was made by Cleland-Sipfle.

The motioned passed with all in favor with no objections and no abstentions.

**Discussion Items:**

There was discussion on whether or not faculty senate should have a letter in support of TRU Shared Governance model.

Richards motioned to endorse the letter made by Mark, Dan, and Warren with the following changes: change the date to January 27; change the opening line to “As the faculty senate of Southern Oregon University, the only body authorized to represent the faculty as a whole.” A second was made by Carney.

This was followed by a lengthy discussion and Richards handed out a letter that he had written. Editing changes to this letter was discussed.

An amended motion was made by Ettlich to replace the original letter with the current letter made by Richards with the editing changes, and a second was made by Carney.

Those in favor: May, Nordquist, Sahr, Ettlich, Russell-Miller, Cleland-Sipfle, Richards, Stillwell (sub for Whitman), Carney

Those opposed: Purslow

Those abstained: Ferguson, Brown

The motioned carried.

A number of “fine-tuned” editing changes were discussed and made to the letter.

Then Ferguson motioned to accept the edited letter as our faculty senate letter. A second was made by Carney.

The motion passed with all in favor except for Sahr opposed and no abstentions.

Purslow motioned to go into closed session with a second by Richards.

It passed with all in favor, no objections and no abstentions.

Adjourned 5:54 p.m.