**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**April 21, 2014**

**SU 313 4:04 - 5:55 p.m.**

**Present:** Jackie Apodaca, Deborah Brown, Dave Carter, Kate Cleland-Sipfle, Curtis Feist, Carol Ferguson, Gregg Gassman (for Amy Belcastro), Dennis Jablonski (for John King), Byron Marlowe, Richard May, Pete Nordquist, Garth Pittman, Vicki Purslow, John Richards, Mary Russell-Miller, Kevin Sahr, Larry Shrewsbury, Robin Strangfeld, Jamie Vener, Elizabeth Whitman, and Erin Wilder.

**Absent:** John King (Sab.), Amy Belcastro (Sab.), Todd Carney, Steve Jessup, and Kasey Mohammad.

**Visitors:** Mary Cullinan, Sue Walsh, Donna Lane, Sherry Ettlich, Dan Deneui, David Oline, Eric Baird, Sylvia Kelley.

**Agenda**

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

Gassman motioned to approve the faculty senate minutes for 2/24/2014 and 3/10/2014, and a second was made by Vener.

Nordquist pointed out an error in the minutes for 2/24, page 7. The words in brackets were missing:

Ayers:  I ***[do not]*** view it as a new Gen Ed, I view it as a deliberate distinctive Gen Ed. …

With this editing change the motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions (May and Jablonski).

**Announcements:**

We need some people to be on the Committee on Committees to replace the members whose terms are ending this year. Talk to Robin Strangfeld to volunteer for this.

**ASSOU report:**

* They are working on a referendum for the Rec Center, putting a measure on the student elections ballot.
* They have been in talks with the administration and students on how best to use the $500,000 that they received from the state. They wish to invest it in retaining students.
* Student Senate is restructuring itself, going from 18 senators down to 16.

**HECC Report**

* Ayers had handouts that were passed out to the senators. One was the letter that was sent out to the presidents of the three large universities to get ready for their budget planning. This will help us to understand what HECC will be looking at this go around for budgets.
* The other was a summary of the strategic plan for the HECC. The number one shift that’s being focused on is “Student Success.”
* On June 11, when HECC will be here, Ayers will be doing with IFS the report on textbook affordability and policy recommendations for the state on textbook affordability. These meetings are open to the public and we can sign up for a testimony.

**Foundation Report:**

Sylvia Kelly talked about who the Foundation is, the Development Office, what they do, and have been doing.

* Their meetings are public meetings.
* The Foundation and the Development Office is sort of a hybrid operation.
* The Foundation Board is a community board and it has about 35 – 40 members from the community.
* The Foundation has one mission: to fundraise for initiatives brought forward by the president and the university.
* A couple years ago they changed their focus from the construction of new buildings to the impact that they can have on students.
* Their campaign for student scholarships is in four areas: Honors College, SOU Scholarship (need based), PEAK Program (jobs on campus), and Scholarships that are restricted by the donor (this is where most of their funds are right now).
* Since the market changed in 2008 they don’t have as much unrestricted funds now.
* Their focus on Planned Giving has been going on for the last couple years (people putting SOU in their wills).
* They could do a better marketing job of what they are doing, but so many of their donors do not want their names out there.

 Eric Baird went over the basics of the numbers.

* All of their financial information is on their website (<http://www.soufoundation.org>)
* They have $28 million in assets: $2 million is non-earning (land, music collection), $21.5 million in an endowment fund (market value), $3 million temporarily restricted for scholarships/program-support, $700,000 is unrestricted, $1-$1.1 million in planned gifts.
* The Foundation took out a loan to fund the Medford HEC of $1.6 million and that’s down to $385,000 that they are still paying off. These payments are coming from the unrestricted funds.
* To date this year they have sent out $940,000 in scholarships.
* It costs them about $1 million a year to run their operations.
* They sold the Mary Phipps Center last year and the proceeds were used to pay down the loan for the Medford HEC building.
* Let them know what other information you would like from them.

**Information Item:**

Peter Nordquist handed out a copy of the amendment to the Bylaws for Senior Instructor 2. The words in bold italics are words that are being added. It’s pretty much an administrative change.

This will be sent out to the entire faculty [It was sent out April 23, 2014].

**Comments from President Cullinan:**

* Our recruiting folks are doing a tremendous job of recruiting new students. It looks like we will once again be graduating one of the largest classes in our history, maybe 1200 students. It’s good that they are graduating, but it also means we need to replace those students who will be leaving. Recruiting new students is huge, but retention is even huger. We all need to take responsibility in helping our students to stay enrolled and on track. We brought in 647 new freshmen last Fall, and typically we would lose 33% of those students. Financially that’s about $2 million if you include the cost of recruiting those students. But it’s also a loss for them and their families. Students may think they are just “stopping out” for a term, but for many of them they just never come back. So our message is that staying enrolled is the way to go, and “stopping out” can have terrible consequences.
* If we had a retention rate like Western’s, which is about 75%, we would have a whole different financial picture.
* Cullinan is working with UPB to have a “listening and conversation event” on May 16th, and probably 2:30 – 5:00 pm. In part, it’s to talk about the issues on campus, but also to help us to think about what we need to do to get our governing board ready.
* Sahr asked if the metrics being collected from the Divisions would be used to determine if the conditions have been met for our governing board. Cullinan said the conditions for the governing board would most likely be much more general than that, but the conditions haven’t been worked out yet. Walsh also clarified that the metrics being collected are specific to the retrenchment plan. But Ettlich did remind us that failing to meet the retrenchment goals would have a negative impact for retaining our governing board.
* Cullinan thinks that we will be given a window of time, say 5 years. And if we’re not financially viable by then the governor may decide we can’t continue to have our own governing board.
* Richards said the budget should align to the mission, and currently there’s a push to rewrite the mission statement. Who rewrites the mission statement? Cullinan said the State Board of Higher Education went over a lot of different things that the conditions could be. One of them had to do with Eastern and Southern may want to review their mission. And there were others who felt that shouldn’t be a condition, it should just be financial viability. Cullinan thinks we can work on reviewing our mission in 2015, working with the governing board, and we can be talking about it the rest of this year. But Cullinan is much more interested in, and concerned about, our financials. Thinking about our mission is useful, but it’s not a pressing concern.
* Carter asked for an update on the matrix for selecting the board members. Cullinan said it’s pretty broad at this point: we absolutely need a couple people with strong financial skills; some who are very knowledgeable about community college and K12 partnerships; industry leaders who will help us think about our graduates and where they might go in terms of their careers.

**House Discussion:**

Richards said a lot has changed since a few months ago and moved to rescind the motion of 2/24/2014 to delay the discussion of House courses until after the approval of the House Program Proposal, including a budget, on the grounds that the House Program Proposal is no longer relevant. The House courses now fit into the University Studies program, and since the Houses are no longer a new program, a program proposal isn’t necessary. A second was made by Marlowe.

A friendly amendment was made to the motion so that it now says:

We would like to rescind the motion of 2/24/2014 to delay the discussion of House courses until after the approval of the House Program Proposal, including a budget, and declare that the House courses are part of the University Studies program. A second was made by Marlowe.

Feist asked if these House courses get approved, would faculty senate finally be done with Houses. The final answer to that was “Yes.”

Jablonski asked about the difference in the cost of the House courses. Carter explained that is the responsibility of the Division Director. House courses are not a different program, and we’re not approving a different curriculum – all we’re doing is approving courses that have already been approved by both the Curriculum Committee and University Studies. So cost is a mute point for faculty senate.

Ferguson wanted to clarify that these House courses are “shells” (no names are associated with those courses). Ayers said that they are shells, or templates, that people fill out, and then it’s reviewed in its totality. It goes through the subcommittees, which consist of curricular people, University Studies people, and Assessment people. They will ensure that the outcomes are being met.

Richards pointed out that faculty senate doesn’t do approval of individual syllabi.

The motion passed with 9 in favor, none opposed, and 9 abstentions (Wilder, Strangfeld, Sahr, Gassman, Apodaca, Purslow, Whitman, Brown, Jablonski).

Purslow felt there’s no need to create a new prefix for the Houses, and that we should eliminate the House prefix. She thinks it could undermine our University Studies in the long run.

Ayers explained that when we look at a House course we are looking at the integration piece for the total experience – they are put together in a very distinctive way. With the House prefix we know exactly what we’re looking at.

Vener wanted us to consider the student’s viewpoint: if a student wanted to be in a House, they would be proud to be in there and they would want some sort of evidence that they were, such as a House prefix.

Sahr wondered if we would be getting less funding on the courses because of the prefix that’s used. Sherry explained that it’s the cip-code that makes the difference, not the course prefix. And using a new House prefix, which has no established protocol to it, would give you more flexibility in tagging it to an appropriate cip-code.

Marlow said the Houses seem to be a solution to help with retention. Ayers said that is what they are hoping, and that’s the way it’s been designed.

Richards moved to approve the hard numbered House courses that have been given to us by the Curriculum Committee. A second was given by Brown.

Sahr asked if instructor permission was no longer required if a student wanted to take a House course, if there are slots available. Ayers said that’s correct because they wanted to make this a flexible model within University Studies.

Ferguson was concerned how would we be able to evaluate if House courses are helping with retention if students can come into and leave Houses. Ayers said part of it will be from term to term, and we don’t consider it a loss if the student left the House but stayed at SOU. Maybe they decide they’ve had enough of House for their second year, but decide to jump back in for their third year. We don’t consider this to be an either/or.

Purslow asked if it was still true that student’s AP credits could not be applied to those going into a House. Ayers said that’s not true. Purslow said that as we move forward with this it would be much better if the Provost wouldn’t sign documents like the Golden sheet, and distribute a document campus-wide saying you can’t use AP credits, because it’s created so much more angst over this program than there ever needed to be.

Ayers said one of the big things that happened for us is that we heard the faculty loud and clear and we made changes. So she hopes we see that this alignment really reflects the voice of the faculty, and not so much what it was going to look like originally.

Sahr said the curriculum approved by the Curriculum Committee has prerequisites, and we would need to add to the motion that we approve these courses without prerequisites. Ayers said she would say ‘or instructor approval.’ Sahr felt that was different than saying I can register for the course without anyone’s approval. Brown explained that the 100 level, at some level, has to be completed (either USEM, transfer credit, or the House Seminar 100 level). Ayers added that if you fail House 101, you couldn’t go into House 202. Sahr still felt we couldn’t approve it as it’s written.

Ayers said we can make the suggestion that the prerequisite piece be removed, and that would be a condition upon your approval.

Richards said Ettlich has a very straightforward fix, and asked her to share it with us.

Ettlich: Just have the prerequisite say House 103, USEM 103, or instructor approval. So it lists all of the available options.

Carter restated the updated motion:

Richards moved to approve the hard numbered House courses that have been given to us by the Curriculum Committee, with the condition that the prerequisites be changed so they list all of the available options (e.g. HSE 103, USEM 103, or instructor approval).

The motion passed with 9 in favor, 2 opposed (Ferguson and Purslow) and 5 abstentions (Strangfeld, Wilder, Nordquist, Apodaca, Jablonski).

Carter: Are there any questions on the material that David Oline presented in our last meeting for the Course/Catalog changes? [There weren’t any]

Ferguson made a motion to approve them, with a second by Sahr.

The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and one abstention (Feist).

Purslow made a motion to video record our Faculty Senate meetings beginning May 5, 2014. A second was made by Richards.

Larry Shrewsbury and Mary Russell-Miller will each bring a camcorder. The movies will be on the Faculty Senate website along with “brief, condensed, bulleted” minutes. We will continue to approve the minutes.

The motion passed will all in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

Adjourned 5:55 p.m.