

Faculty Senate Meeting
May 15, 2012

In attendance: Jeff Dense, Heidi Harris, Elwyn Martin, Charles Lyons, David Drexler, Colleen Johnson, Deanna Timmermann, Doug Briney, Frank Bushakra, Chris Heidbrink, Darren Dutto, Mary Pierce, Michael Pierce, Donna Rainboth, Leandro Espinosa, John Knudson-Martin

Guests: Sally Mielke

order 3:04

Approval of Minutes May 1. all

President's Update:

Secretary Harris has been diligently at work helping to create the Faculty Senate Website, which should be updated this week. She will train the new Secretary in how to update the site. In the next meeting, we will need to have Senate elections and also elect Honor's Committee and RAG Committee members. He has spoken with Honor's Chair Committee Cori Brewster, who said that all the people on the committee would be rotating off, but some would be willing to continue to participate. The FS is responsible for nominations of teaching faculty representatives. He will contact Dean Witte to conduct elections for CAS at Thursday's meeting and will do the same with Dean Mielke. The RAG Committee has a variety of members from the faculty, and a number is rotating off RAG, and Faculty Senate are responsible for electing members for those committees.

Chris Heidbrink asked if a student was on that committee, and Dense clarified that it would need to be an honor student.

Deanna Timmerman indicated that both RAG and the Honor's Committee should be staggered. Dense and Dutto said they couldn't find that information on the staggering, and Timmermann said that she would try to locate the document.

Dense met last Thursday with Heidbrink, Anna Maria, Prov, Pres, and Chancellor about shared governance. He commended Bob and Steve with their commitment to shared governance. He was interested in the proposal that a Faculty Senate member be the representative to IFS to create stronger links to the Faculty Senates.

Dense will invite new Faculty Senate Representatives to the next meeting for elections. The language from the constitution is problematic regarding elections in the last few weeks of the term.

UC Report: Pass

Consent Agenda: Pull REL 330

Move to approve. In favor. all dense abstains.

EPCC Action Agenda:

JRN/WR Prefix change--Dense asked if the prefix change should be on the action agenda. Sally said perhaps not.

MAC program concentration change in course requirements--Clarification that all is a prefix change. Timmermann asked questions about whether or not those courses would still include an additional hour of load credit. Harris indicated that she did not believe that it did. Dense indicated that the load credit is outside the duties and responsibilities. Moved to approve. All approved. Hartman, Johnson, and Dense abstained.

Provost Update:

Adkison is meeting with the CAS dean search committee tomorrow. They expect to have an offer out either tomorrow afternoon or Thursday. All three finalists had a positive experience. The feedback from the search consultant indicated that all three loved their experiences on campus. He is confident that we will have a successful search. Several have submitted feedback through several venues. If anyone hasn't done that, please do. The feedback has been very useful. The successful candidate should start July 1. If the candidate can start earlier, that would be ideal. The candidates have indicated their interest and excitement in the search process.

The chancellor and three board members visited campus last week. We are getting a lot of positive attention from the Chancellor and the State Board of Higher Ed. WE have found out that our "policy option packages" --the two that we submitted this year ...the Eastern Promise and the Veterans Retention are ranked 3&4 behind the system ones. We are the only ones who have initiatives at that level. We also submitted our capital proposals (\$62 M). The state paid off all the bonds they issued in 2000, I think that they have a \$3B bonding capacity as of next year. OUS looks set to get 300 M of that. Our #1 capital proposal, which received feedback for the proposal. Living Learning Center, which would be the old Hunt Hall. They walked through Hunt Hall, which was effective. It looks like, barring global issues, we are well positioned for that capital project. This has been conceptualized as part of the campus master plan. He feels that the campus master plans are a pretty good fit for who and what we are here.

There is still no CEO of the OEIB. There is a lack of consensus for who they will hire. Nothing has changed since the last meeting in respect to the compact.

Meeting with the College Task Force tomorrow night. There should be some draft Admin. Task Force available at the beginning of next week. He hasn't received as much feedback as expected, which means that the Task Force has covered all the basis. Frank Bushakra asked what will come next. The drafts for Ed are just a shell, but the management plans are tied into rules and regulations. Adkison said that for the college of education, the deans and Provost will

come and meet to indicate what they think is the path forward. It is not just the administrative structures but also the business practices, and in Ed, accreditation and certification.

Spring Fling is next week. You will have an opportunity to fling pies at the President and the Provost, which would be money well spent supporting students. The pie-ing might be Saturday at noon.

He has been asked to co-chair the Provost's Council, which might be a good sign. He is also on the search committee for the Vice-Chancellor's search. Sona Andrews is going to become the Provost at Portland State, which is good for us. The Chancellor, despite some concern about his position post U of O President issue, was given a two-year contract extension, which says a lot about the governor's confidence and in the Board of Higher Education.

The Three business community members, three K-12 members, one CC faculty member (who is also a legislator), and no higher ed members. No one is sure what the funding teams mean or how they are going to work. As we get information about that over the summer and fall, that will be forward out to the campus. He encourages that as we get questions from others, please ask. If we hear things, then that gives us a chance to go check things out and become more aware.

Dense asked about the current status of the institutional governing boards. Adkison said that was Senate Bill 4061. The legislative committee tasked with that received feedback about why those two institutions needed boards. Pointed questions were asked, including a question about their data. Two of the legislators involved were open in saying that the legislature need more than the word of the Presidents. Bob and Ed Ray are being called to testify in front of the committee related to institutional boards. It seems as if it is not so clear cut that schools will have institutional boards. As the picture emerges, if we get institutional boards, they might report to a state board. It is also clear that Phil Knight created a backlash by upsetting people. The stronger the system is, the less need we have for an institutional board. If the system is weak, we might be forced down that road, too, for no other reason than legislative influence.

Student Symposium is coming up.

Military Call Up Policy:

Dense said that the policy originated in the student affairs committee, who recommended that it be shared as an informational item at Faculty Senate. However, the Provost felt it needed to go to Academic Standards. The policy before us was passed by Academic Standards. If we approve, it goes to the President's Cabinet for discussion and to the President for a signature.

Motion to approve. Timmermann opposed the policy. Dense, Charles, Elwyn, Johnson, and Harris abstained.

DFL Policy:

Dense indicated that they had done a system-wide analysis. Several proposals had been floated, one of which was if you have 35 credits of transfer you had the DFL waived. At this point, the institution is going to maintain status quo until more research is done and more accurate numbers are collected. U of O doesn't let people in who are DFL as a means of filtering their pile of applications. The issues raised by ASEOU in relation to FL at the same time as they are taking CORE and WR courses was heard by ASC, and they will table the motion and take it up next year.

Proposed Faculty Senate By-laws Amendment:

The Provost has agreed that the FS President should be part of the Dean's Council in keeping with other state higher ed institutions. No votes take place; the meetings are more about discussion. However, it is an opportunity to present the faculty, in particular the senate, point of view on issues of concern. We often get visitors with regard to specific policies. It is a meeting that fosters communication. The other aspect of the proposal deals with the Shared Governance Coordinating Board. UC Chair Dill indicated that we should codify that body. At President's Cabinet, he didn't want his hands tied, but Dense ensured that the meeting is for fostering communication and the President is free to have others at the table for those meetings. It is good to have all the parts of shared government in the room and is reflective of the commitment of the Pres and Prov to shared governance.

Move to approve.

Johnson had a question about how the faculty senate needs to get it two weeks in advance. It would be a week from Friday before we could vote electronically.

The vote could be moved to the next meeting.

Doug Briney asked if the Shared Governance Coordinating Council should be in the Constitution. Dense said the President didn't see this as a part of Shared Governance, it is more a meeting to facilitate communication. Colleen Johnson clarified that the membership would be the Faculty Senate President, the University Council President, and the ASEOU President. Dense confirmed this and indicated that the other shared governance groups would be moving this through their by-laws as well.

Dense indicated that the new incoming President should be prepared for many meetings of Dean's Council, Provost's Council, and other meetings and commitments. Colleen Johnson asked whether others could share the burden. Dense said that in some places the Vice President takes some of the meetings, but the meetings of these groups probably need to include the President.

Charles Lyons clarified that the vote would happen at Faculty Senate, which Dense affirmed.

EOU Constitutional Amendment:

Charles indicated that there should be two amendments. The changes to the Budget and Planning Committee should be on the agenda for a vote today. Dense indicated that the documentation has not been forwarded to him. Charles indicated that they hoped to have only one election for Constitutional Amendments. Regarding the Faculty Senate Rep for UC, the ad hoc committee indicated that the members saw an inequality in terms of having several members from senate, more than from the rest of the constituency. Chris Heidbrink clarified that the membership is 3 across the board for all UC constituency. The non-voting members have sometimes used their voice at the table. Leandro indicated that having a healthy policy will perhaps keep from personality conflicts happening. Johnson indicated that she agreed that electing someone that is supposed to sit in the corner and not say anything is offensive. If people can't handle dissension, then why are they on committees?

Leandro asked for clarification of the position, whether it is to observe or to vote. What might not have been clear was what exactly the function of the body was to serve. Johnson said that the same logic would say that the Provost's designee could not speak on EPCC. Charles clarified that the original language was for "observation and reporting" was indicating that they should not speak. Dense said that if the language of the amendment was offensive, then the Senate should vote no on the amendment. Dense said that he would encourage passing the original, but first we have to deal with the amended version. Heidbrink asked to consider parallel wording. How much should a classified staff member have input. Hartman said that it is a good idea for someone from UC to sit on Senate as a non-voting member. It might have happened when we constituted Senate. But it seems arrogant that a colleague would come to a meeting and then not participate.

Doug Briney said that the issue might be clarified if we elected one of the three members from Senate who also sat on UC. Lyons said that would be a different change, other than what the ad hoc member specified. Timmermann indicated that it is the chair who recognizes a person for speaking, so putting whether or not that person could speak in language seemed to take away the role of the chair.

Heidbrink said that as a person who is voting on several bodies, he sometimes has to think about whether he is a UC rep or a Faculty Senate rep when it comes to voting. Dense said that this is an issue that needs to be dealt with in shared governance. Dense said that having people on multiple committees limits the votes from faculty members and might affect personnel matters.

Johnson asked for clarification. The ad hoc committee changed adding the one non-voting member. Lyons clarified that the UC was wanting to strike the statement that the member from FS attends UC. Instead the faculty senate would also have a non-voting UC rep sitting on faculty senate. Then UC added language to clarify and to define the scope of the vote of the reporting member. Pierce had a question and a comment. The ad hoc or committee from faculty senate, are you in concurrence that you support the amendment on the table. Lyons said that

they supported the original wording. The amended version is more controversial. Pierce asked if the sub-committee had met to look at the language before us. Lyons clarified that they hadn't. Pierce said he didn't take offense with the "observe and report" language because the purpose was clear, to ensure communication. The verbiage is less as censorship. Sees that as an indication that it is taking more of what is going on in UC as a faculty senate representative and bringing that back to faculty senate rather than being a spokesperson for faculty senate on University Council. The role of that person is not to be the voice of the Faculty Senate. We have other existing mechanisms for communication. Sees this as a way of capturing what is going on and bringing it back to Senate. He would support this, and as a faculty member on UC and Senate, he doesn't see a problem with how this would work.

Rebecca Hartman asked Elwyn Martin what he thought of this as someone who sits on UC and reports back. Martin said the core of the issue is that two individuals have sat on the UC and monopolizing time. If you have someone who insists on speaking, and you are an effective chair, you stop it. Some people on UC want to make sure that they don't want to end up in that position again. The new language of observe and report doesn't make them a rep from FS. What is important is how UC perceives the position. Whether or not we agree, it might be a good move to make things more equitable. The key is to foster communication between the bodies. People who sit on UC do not appreciate how this position is constructed. When a person is there, they are seen as a Faculty Senate Representative. Elwyn said he felt that a position that goes to both meetings, votes on neither, and serves as reporting, and rotates between Senate and UC rep makes sense. Hartman said that makes sense to give something to a constituency that feels slighted. But what that would suggest as colleagues is that we would be making a constitutional change based not on practice that would best serve everyone, but that we would be agreeing to pass policy that is a response to an ineffective procedure. It seems that we would then be making a policy change that is trying to deal with a personality issue. Martin responded that she is probably right, but he finds it interesting that because of personality issues between two people. Martin indicated it could have been more effectively dealt with at this time. We do have the option to say no, and that if there is a person who is problematic, bring it back to Senate and the President will deal with it. Dense made a point of clarification that there is language in the UC Council Rep serving on Senate that was never implemented.

John Knudson-Martin said that this issue is not going to come up again, at least in part because of awareness. I agree with the Senate that a stronger chair could have dealt with the issue of someone being recognized or talking too much. At this point, we should take some step to say that we want a good relationship and move forward. This might not be a problem again. If the equitable language in the Constitution is parallel, the problem is fixed. What we don't want to do is take a stand and create animosity. We want to take a stance that we are supportive of shared governance and move on.

Doug Briney said that we as faculty members hold a dignified position and that it is more difficult to say "no" to them. The feeling is that they are inferior. If this is what it takes to make peace.

Heidbrink asked whether the addition of "to observe and report" clarifies the purpose, but does it say that the person cannot speak. It would still be the chair's prerogative to recognize the person because they are sitting at the table. Leandro Espinosa said that the intent was not to craft language based on personalities. The UC sees us as powerful because we are powerful, we tend to guide conversations, and some on the UC are not used to that, and it is seen as imposing our views. They feel that we are inhibiting and imposing. Frank Bushakra agreed that it is ineffective to pass a policy to deal with a communication issue. We need to make sure that we are good communicators. If you have a forceful personality, you should understand that the role is to be a good committee member. Leandro said that they posed a question that if a person from Faculty Senate was a problem, we could change it. Dense indicated that when the ad hoc committee was asked to take on this task, and he would support their decision. As the shared governance review moves forward, there will be bad feelings. Donna indicated that for fairness, we should have a UC member representative to Senate. She agrees that the three voting members should be voting and the observer should be just to observe. Johnson indicates that she agrees for the symmetrical people on each body, but she does object to the qualifier. She is happy to support the middle ground, but it is not a good idea to qualify what people can do with their committee. If we do this, then we need to come back and change the language about the University Council.

John Knudson-Martin moved to accept the amended language. Motion to vote on the amended amended language (to observe and report).

Rebecca Hartman said that these are the kinds of discussions she likes because she thinks about changing her mind. She wants to go with what the ad hoc committee says and not accept the language. But she sees that it is still condescending if we say that we will give this to them because they can't handle the rules.

Pierce had a clarifying question. The document for the motion was to approve the document that was posted with the agenda. Dense clarified that this was the amended version from UC, not the version created but the shared government ad hoc committee. It is the one posted with the agenda.

John Knudson-Martin said that we need to dispose of this amendment, whether yes or no. It reflects on the issue of institutional power, and that people with institutional power often don't notice that there is institutional power involved. We have service requirements to be here, but classified staff have to ask permission to participate in shared governance. Frank Bushakra said that the amendment indicates that there is a differential. He sees language issues with the idea of "members who observe."

Lyons said that he went into the meeting in the first place to attend to the proposal to remove the FS member on UC. Lyons said that he has hope because the nature of sharing is in the language.

All in favor: Opposed Fields, Johnson, Timmermann, Bushakra.

Dense and Harris abstain. Motion carried.

Budget and Planning Constitutional Amendment:

The amendment was to make the VP for Finance and Administration an ex officio non-voting member and to remove the language for the person who no longer exists.

Moved to approve. Seconded.

Darren Dutto said that the ad hoc committee discussed it in a more global sense, but for this issue, it needs to go through quickly for the procedures on their committee. Lyons clarified that the person in the position now is already operating as if it had passed. John Knudson-Martin called questions.

Motion carried. Dense abstained.

Dense commended Senators Lyons, Espinosa, and Dutto for their work on the ad hoc committee.

Public Comment: none

Good of the Order: none

Meeting adjourned at 4:34.