**Faculty Senate Meeting 5/22/12**

**I. Roll Call: Present**

Bob Hautala, Tracy Smiles, Maria Dantas-Whitney, Erin Passehl, Keven Malkewitz, Dana Ulveland, Tad Shannon, David Foster, David Doellinger, Kathy Farrell, Claire Ferraris, Cheryl Beaver, Michael Phillips, Mark Van Steeter, Michael Freeman, Keller Coker, Katherine Schmidt, Cornelia Paraskevas, Cat McGrew, Terry Gingerich, Edwin Cancel, Amanda Smith, Mickey Pardew, Breeann Flesch, Rahim Kazerouni, Tom Rand

**II. Correction to Minutes**

No corrections to minutes.

**Action:** Minutes approved.

**III. President’s Reports**

**Gavin Keulks, Faculty Senate –**

ARC was asked to take a look at the no double-dipping policy. The ARC recommended leaving the policy as is. Was some discussion regarding whether 3-4 credits could be allowed between majors and minors.

Update from the International Service Committee: voted not to support the Semester at Sea program. Executive Committee tasked Gavin with coordinating an advisory meeting consisting of the current chair of the committee, the past chair of the committee, the study abroad director and David McDonald. The meeting will be held during finals week. Gavin will coordinate and listen but will not participate.

Wants to thank the Nominating Committee for all of their work. There are names in every officer position for today’s senate election. Good job.

**Mark Weiss, Western Oregon University –**

Spoke to the Committee on Governance for Higher Education at the legislature in Salem. The issue surrounded dealing with Portland Sate and the University of Oregon’s plans to create separate governing boards. WOU does not support a separate governing board. If all universities were separate, those who had money and power would be able to lobby Salem more effectively than the smaller universities. It was felt that WOU would loose out and instead does much better under a unified system. Many costs currently covered wouldn’t be covered if WOU was a separate legal entity. Governor Kitzhaber expressed strong support for the separate governance boards. Eastern University was in favor of unified boards. It is unsure where this is going to go.

Question raised concerning if the two universities are advocating for the dissolution of the current board all together, meaning that everyone would have their own or if they are just advocating for separation from the existing one.

Answer: These want full and complete independence and separation from the current board.

Question raised if effects have been looked at nationwide when the separation has occurred.

Answer: Rationale from UO said that the separation would increase philanthropy from donors by having donors on their governing board. Experts and consultants from around the country made presentations to the state Board of Education stating that there was no evidence supporting that separate boards results in more money from donors. In some cases it even showed the opposite. States such as North Carolina showed no clear-cut evidence one way or the other.

Question regarding if this is the same issue that has been discussed for years.

Answer: About four years ago there was a paper written about breaking away from the system. This was the earliest mention they are aware of. What is happening now is a continuation. Nothing structurally has changed besides the fact that all of the seven universities are no longer state agencies. PSU wants to be able to do what community colleges are able to and collect taxes in the Portland area. That most likely will not happen.

Question raised if there is a timeline surrounding any of this.

Answer: The committee is split at this time. It is thought that OUS will deal out some independence but most likely will not go the full way.

**Marshall Guthrie, Staff Senate –**

Not present.

**Jonathan Farmer, ASWOU –**

Not present.

**Kent Neely, Provosts’ Council –**

Not present.

**IV. Old Business**

**Changes to Governance Charter –**

There were few places where the charter was in conflict with faculty evaluation. The major changes included the following: Article 2 section 4 was removed. Language was added stating that someone must be present at both Senate meetings where their proposal is being presented, discussed and voted on. Committee on Committees was made into an “as needed” committee and a clause was added stating that the Charter must be reviewed every five years.

**Action:** Motion made to accept the changes made to the Charter. Motion seconded and approved by unanimous consent.

**Changes to Faculty Senate By-laws –**

There were three major changes to the Senate Bylaws. The first was the tightening up of the Senate agenda. The second was the reclassification of the Committee on Committees from a standing committee to an “as needed” committee. The last change was a shift in the Senate President’s term from one year to two years. There were a lot of mixed feelings in the room and a lot of feedback was heard. There is always the option to amend the proposed bylaws.

Discussion –

Pros:

A two-year term facilitates a more effective way to take releases from departments.

It would ease the learning curve and allow for a more streamlined Senate.

Because the possibility of a three-year term has been backed away from, the only real difference is the wording between the current bylaws and the proposed.

Planning ahead is easier when you are looking at a two-year term.

A second term would be more effective.

Amendment language can be added stating that a two-year term is possible but not an obligation.

A longer term would give a person a chance to grow with their position.

A one-year term results in too much change and a lack of continuity.

Cons :

Smaller departments may struggle with one person being unavailable for two years. It would be impossible to schedule classes or to find someone to fill courses. This may not be entirely true because it is possible to find professors to fill in for those who go on sabbatical.

A two-year term does favor larger departments.

When asked around many people expressed they would not be willing to serve a two-year term.

It is a concern if anything is limiting participation, as we want to encourage as much as possible.

If one is elected for a one-year term, there is always the possibility to serve two years so this seems unnecessary.

If the elected president was not effective or a good leader, the Senate would be stuck with them for a full two years.

A one-year term is encouraging. If someone succeeded their first year, they could return and serve a second.

Comment: It is hoped that a department would not hold back someone who really wanted to

serve as president because they would be “overworked.” We are all overworked. Everyone

should be doing what they can to cover departments so those that aspire to be president can be.

We should be coming from the mindset of how to make the Senate as powerful as it can be.

Past president Keller Coker does not have strong feelings either way. He previously only served

one term because of sabbatical and if elected again, will only be serving one term as he is

heading out on sabbatical again. This does not seem like a large change.

Past president Katherine Schmidt feels that the two-year term is a good change. One year

allows for very little time to make change. If someone is willing to serve the two years Senate

could become very dynamic. People still turn down the position now as a one-term position.

**Action:** Motion made to amend bylaws proposal to revert to old language (one-year term, with one-year re-election opportunity, two-year maximum presidency) regarding senate president. Motion seconded and approved.

Question raised concerning where Committee on Committee’s responsibilities were shifted.

Answer: Some duties were shifted to the past Senate president, some were shifted to the Executive Committee. In order to ensure committees are appropriately populated language needs to be added.

**Action:** Motion made to amend language of bylaws to include “coordinate with division chairs to ensure committee appointments” to senate past president’s responsibilities.

**Action:** Motion made to approve bylaws as amended above. Motion seconded and approved.

**V. New Business**

None.

**VI. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report**

None.

**VII. Committee Review**

None.

**VIII. Informational Presentations**

**University Diversity Committee –**

A diversity action plan is now at the vetting stage. Please provide feedback. Intention is to finalize plan but it is a working document.

Committee was asked to provide a set of goals, actions and objectives to achieve a diversity plan for the campus community. They want to gather data on how we are doing and to further advocate for actions that need to happen. When they looked at diversity action plans on other campuses one of the striking themes they discovered was the need for support from everyone. President Weiss has put a link on his website to the diversity statement. It is a personal statement that is not just focused on staff or students but on the entire culture of campus. There is never going to be a time when diversity plan is done and finished. It is a growing, working, organic document. Desired outcomes are that we will implement and institutionalize the diversity plan. Hope to increase diversity and social justice around campus. Envision that this will involve everyone, whether around retention or curriculum, we all must be engaged. Believe there may be things identified that may require funding. This will be the job of the committee to allocate funds, etc. with appropriate administration.

Goal 1: Create a climate and culture of leadership, inclusivity, excellence and preparedness for our changing world by providing direction and training for the campus community founded upon and supporting the evolution of WOU’s diversity statement.

Objectives may require funding. Believe there should be focus on this topic in all faculty, new faculty, diversity and social justice training and orientations.

How to measure how we are achieving our goal? First is to have a plan, vet it and enact it.

Gives us opportunity to collect data or analyze existing data about the climate here on campus. There have been very interesting studies already completed on campus.

Goal 2: Focus on student population.

Objectives surround not only recruitment but also support. Have called out first generation and low socio-economic status as markers. Those who are PELL grant eligible are a key indicator. Want to elevate many services. Looking at state trends and ensure that we are keeping up on this. Will be monitoring retention and graduation rates. Will be keeping inventory of new initiatives.

Goal 3: Welcoming campus community

Objectives of whether or not we are able to use resources to recruit. Are we advertising in the right places? What are the best ways to get your add out? Will work with WOU affirmative action officer.

Goal 4: Develop and strengthen university’s relationship with diverse communities.

Will look at ways to recognize and advocate for support that may be needed. Tracking partnerships. Hope that they will be using baseline information this next year. A large part is to continually review and revise plan.

Comment: Thank committee for all their hard work and representative nature for incorporating this into a document. They really are doing a great job.

**Joint Committee on Faculty Evaluation –**

Many people believe we have something written and running right now. However, it is not the best system. UCS is hoping to do the final programming this summer. The earliest you will see the new bells and whistles will be this fall. Still struggling to work out the chain of commands day to day. No one knows who is in charge of the simple things. Response rate did slide backwards in winter term. Have been running by about 30%. How do we use and accumulate and report data? Course by course data is not working because there is not a lot of response. Instructor can pick five classes out of the year and use them to sum up how they are doing. Have student researching ideas. Came up with zinger: “Ignorance isn’t bliss” and “We love learning too,” accompanied by a picture of the staff sitting in ITC, appearing to be students, to encourage students to vote. Working on developing this idea. If it works could develop this as something for divisions. Need volunteers!

**Meeting Extension –**

A vote of the Senate must be taken in order for the meeting to extend past 5 p.m.

**Action:**  Motion made to extend meeting. Motion seconded and approved by unanimous consent.

**Elections –**

Officers for 2012-13 academic year will be:

* Keller Coker, President (Creative Arts)
* Steve Wojcikiewicz, Vice President (Teacher Education)
* Kristin Latham, Secretary (Natural Science & Math)
* Bob Hautala, At-large Member (Health & Physical Education)
* Keven Malkewitz, At-large Member (Business/Economics)
* Gavin Keulks, Past President (Humanities)

**IX. Meeting Adjourned**