**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**February 10, 2014**

**SU 313 4:02 - 4:56 p.m.**

**Present:** Amy Belcastro, Deborah Brown, Todd Carney, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Curtis Feist, 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, Robin Strangfeld, Jamie Vener.

**Absent:** Jackie Apodaca, Steve Jessup, Elizabeth Whitman, Erin Wilder.

**Visitors:** Mary Cullinan, James Klein, Teresa Ristow, Lee Ayers,

Sue Walsh, Margaret Wright, Anita Caster, Dennis Slattery, Sherry Ettlich, Jody Waters, Craig Morris, Kay Sagmiller, Ezra Severin, Vincent Smith, Mark Tveskov, Karen Stone, John Taylor, Max Goldman.

**Agenda**

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

**Announcements:**

Curtis Feist is now replacing Sherry Ettlich on Faculty Senate.

Sherry Ettlich has been “the master” of Constitutional Committee for several years. Also Pete Nordquist and Richard May are on it, and we need a third person to replace Sherry. Carol Ferguson volunteered.

Carter wanted to let everyone know about the “Lock-In” that the Criminology Department does every year, and if we have any students interested Carter has applications for them. And this year they will have the Bomb Robot and the Canine Patrol!

There are 3 more public forums being put on for the provisional retrenchment plan.

The faculty shouldn’t be painting negativity or venting frustrations in the classrooms. The students do not deserve the brunt of our frustrations.

Purslow motioned to approve the January 13th minutes, a second was made by Belcastro. It passed with all in favor, no objections, and one abstention by Feist.

**Comments from President Cullinan:**

Salem was closed last week due to weather issues, so we have no news from Salem. We will be having three more open sessions, and she has asked David Carter to work with her office and Klein’s office on putting together some “just faculty” meetings. We will be meeting with students this week and set-up some “all students” meetings – we need to have as many points of communication as we can. We got a number of questions from today’s open forum that we can respond to. I strongly encourage faculty to go to the State of the University website and read the material on it. It was pretty clear with some of today’s questions there were people who had not read the provisional retrenchment plan. We will continue to update the website with answers to questions.

Cullinan wants to stress that this is the *provisional* plan, and she believes that may be the most confusing part of this whole process. People are thinking that it’s final, but it’s not. In 2006-2007 when we did this before there were significant changes to the provisional plan. This is a process, a time to see what other options are out there.

Programs that are listed in the retrenchment plan need to have responses, and Klein and Walsh are working on a template that these programs can use to respond.

We’re trying to do this in a way that impacts students as little as possible.

One question that has come up a lot is why aren’t the other parts of the university being impacted? Retrenchment is specifically for the academic process. There have been huge impacts throughout the university, and there will continue to be reductions. Mary will be putting together a summary so that we can see all that has happened.

We’re not going to get bailed out by the Oregon University System, or by the State Board of Higher Education. We’re on our own and we need to work together. Be positive with students; this process should mostly be invisible to the students. There’s no doubt that this is a very difficult time on campus; people are stressed, but we really need to be communicating honestly and not relying on rumors. Come to the meetings so that you’re informed.

If a major goes away that does *not* mean all of the classes in that area will go away. There’s a lot of confusion on things like that.

For the programs that need to respond to the retrenchment plan, Carter asked to clarify on which scenario they need to do that on. Cullinan said they need to respond on every scenario.

**Comments from Provost Klein:**

We’ve had four successful searches for Directors that have now been confirmed by their Divisions:

Sherry Ettlich is the Director for STEM,

David Humphrey for the Center for the Arts,

Scott Rex for Language and Culture,

Lee Ayers for Undergraduate Studies.

Two other search committees are on-going, and there’s only one search committee that hasn’t finished their work.

The Classified Staff will be able to see the position descriptions tomorrow (Feb 11) so they can decide which positions they would like to apply for. So that by the end of next week (24th at the latest) all classified staff will know if they are staying in an academic area, or going to the Business Center, or if their position is being laid off.

An Innovation & Leadership proposal has been approved by the Provost Council and goes to the Board for approval next month, early March.

Questions?

In regards to the Directors, Richards asked if by “confirmed by their Divisions”, if that meant by a vote of all faculty in that Division. Klein said “Yes.”

Sahr said he heard a rumor that there could be a Service Center placed where our Main Computer Lab is, and he asked if that was true. Klein said it’s one of several sites being considered. Craig Morris said there have been five or six sites around campus that have been identified, and the Computer Lab is one of them. We have an architect that we hired that’s going around and analyzing spaces. The decision will need to be made relatively soon since the Service Center needs to be placed by July 1st. Sahr expressed concern that they are considering the effect this will have on students when they make their decision.

**ASSOU report:**

Max Goldman:

Tommy, the student body president, and a few other members, have been in Salem all last week, and have been making great headway. Their message has somewhat shifted from what we had originally had (Emergency funding for the institution for the amount of $5 million). Now, as the dialogs have progressed, the message is now more about governance, and supporting a house bill that would allow students to get a student-voting seat on the governance board, as well as supporting the TRU hybrid model of shared governance.

The ASSOU senate will be voting on passing a resolution tomorrow night, in support of the TRU hybrid model.

On February 18th, we will be shipping a bus of students up to the capital to have a day of action on the steps to talk about the systemic issues of higher education and the things we are lobbying on behalf of. We would encourage you all to provide to these students attending the day of action some leniency on attendance and assignments.

The student government has been getting a lot of questions on how students feel about retrenchment, but we haven’t done a survey, so we are not in a position to represent the entire student body.

**UPB Report:**

Jody Waters:

We met on Friday and took a look at the provisional plan, discussed it, and generated a list of questions that has been forwarded to President Cullinan. Waters handed out copies to the faculty senate.

**IFS Report:**

Jody Waters:

On the previous Friday Jody Waters and Charles Lane were in Eugene for the IFS meeting. Here were the main two pieces covered:

There seems to be some indication that there’s a possibility of receiving emergency funding on the basis of the 2% pullback. Whether or not that’s available, we don’t know.

Concerns on the effects that retrenchment would have on changing the nature of the institutions, specifically affected by changes in the system, ongoing reduction in state funding, and to make sure that we value and honor what happens at the technical and regional institutions.

They will be bringing changes to the bylaws to faculty senate, asking us to ratify them to endorse the work that they’ve done and will do for all of the institutions. This will probably happen at the next faculty senate meeting.

From the telephone conversation with Denbrow:

The struggling situation here at SOU is not an individual problem at this school, but rather an indication of the system. Eastern has made a declaration of program reduction, and PSU is having very similar struggles.

He also felt that it was important for the faculty to be speaking as one voice as much as possible.

There will be a significant impact on the affordable care act in terms of part-time instructors. He hoped that the part-time instructors would be allowed to piece together their employment hours from more than one institution.

Nordquist asked about the sentence in the IFS Statement letter regarding “SOU’s steadfast attempts to serve underserved populations, such as first generation students.” He wondered if this characterized IFS’s take on our primary mission. Waters said “No. Our most important piece to speak about is 40-40-20.”

**Action Items:**

We have five Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Environmental Studies, SSPC, Physics, Psychology, and Communication department.

Questions?

Ferguson asked for clarification on teaching effectiveness when it says “The Instructors teaching effectiveness well into the Outstanding Category.”

Carter explained that’s the current language that’s in the bylaws, and it’s certainly something we can address in the Constitution Committee, to quantify those.

Ettlich mentioned that originally there were numbers, but they were removed. “Well into” was approximately 70%, the “Near or at” was approximately 50%. She added “More power to you if you put them back.”

Sahr said for Physics and the Environmental Studies it says candidates for professor need at least 7 academic years of full time, and he believes we changed that to 6.

Carter entertained a motion for these with those changes. The motion was made by Sahr with a second from Cleland-Sipfle. It passed with all in favor, no objections, and 3 abstentions: Ferguson, Richards, and Feist.

**Discussion Items:**

The advising task force, which was initiated by the President and Provost, came up with the idea that the undergraduate advising committee might be better served under the UPB, under the direct purview of the AVP for Enrollment and Retention (Lisa Garcia-Hanson). If we choose to do this it would require an amendment to the bylaws.

Belcastro felt it would be helpful to have Lisa come and talk with us about her thoughts.

It was decided to table this topic until after Lisa comes and talks with us.

Carter asked that we mull over and think about a live-video feed recording of our faculty senate meetings. As soon as the session is over the minutes would be uploaded and available. Belcastro has heard from a number of faculty that would like to know more about what’s going on, and they would like to have access to these video recordings.

Discussion on Retrenchment:

Ferguson: I wanted to bring up another discussion item, and I want to preface it with 3 points:

(1) Faculty have expressed concern over our university leadership.

(2) Section 6 of the bylaws of the constitution of the SOU faculty does not specify a specific procedure for individual faculty members, those would be members by article 2 of the faculty constitution, register their support for the removal of academic administrators, and

(3) the sensitive nature of expressing support for the removal of academic administrators in a way that personally identifies individual faculty members is somewhat intimidating to most individuals.

With that in mind I would like to move that the faculty senate authorize the faculty senate elections committee to administer a vote to the members of the faculty, so those are the people described in article 2 of the faculty constitution, and that this vote should be confidential, and allow faculty members to register their confidence, or lack of confidence, in the leadership. And by leadership I mean President Mary Cullinan, Provost Jim Klein, and Vice President Craig Morris.

This motion was given a second by Nordquist.

Discussion?

Richards: This seems like valuable information for everybody to have, to get a feel for the pulse of the campus.

Feist: How is the vote used?

Carter: My understanding is that for a vote of confidence to occur it has to go up to the individuals identified as faculty. At that point it is a vote of confidence for the leadership for the university. It requires 2/3 of the votes (for either a “vote of confidence” or a “vote of no confidence”).

We are voting to authorize the faculty senate elections committee to administer a vote.

Cleland-Sipfle: What percentage of the faculty will need to participate in this?

Carter: That is a good question; we probably need to clarify that.

Ferguson: I don’t think it’s specified what percentage of the faculty need to participate.

All were in favor, no objections, with only one abstention: Cleland-Sipfle.

Adjourned 4:56 p.m.