**Faculty Senate Meeting 5/8/12**

**I. Roll Call: Present**

Bob Hautala, Tracy Smiles, Maria Dantas-Whitney, Erin Passehl, Keven Malkewitz, Dana Ulveland, Tad Shannon, Kristin Latham, David Doellinger, Kathy Farrell, Claire Ferraris, Cheryl Beaver, Michael Phillips, Mark Van Steeter, Michael Freeman, Keller Coker, Katherine Schmidt, Tom Rand, Cat McGrew, Terry Gingerich, Amanda Smith

**II. Correction to Minutes**

No corrections to minutes.

**Action:** Minutes approved.

**III. President’s Reports**

**Gavin Keulks, Faculty Senate –**

Previously discussed, at request of Dean Scheck, whether Senate was to discuss a possible four-day finals week, as well as the issue of professors not holding class at their scheduled final time. No senate interest in forming an exploratory committee. The Provost also emailed President Keulks the text from the Faculty Handbook governing the need to use final exam time for instructional purposes if not giving a final. That text simply directed readers to the Contract Bargaining Agreement, so this item is not senate business.

Seeking volunteers for senate executive committee. Committee will need to be formed at next meeting through elections.

Keulks and Provost Neely sent out a co-authored email to faculty, asking for ideas concerning the requirement of an academic minor, the size and structure of the LACC, whether majors and minors need to be capped, etc. Next year, ARC and SPOC will continue working on these issues in preparation for the state audit (through Secretary of State’s office). Provost will be meeting with the ARC at their May meeting.

The Nominating Committee has been formed and will be voted on today. Katherine Schmidt is committee chair. Tracy Smiles, Mark Van Steeter, and Amanda Smith make up the rest of the committee. They are looking for nominations for President, Vice President, Secretary and two at-large members. The at-large members do have to be current Senators.

**Action:** Motion made to approve Nominating Committee. Motion seconded and approved by unanimous consent.

Question raised about the official nominating process.

Answer: There is no official nominating procedure in the bylaws. Nominations are usually made by email.

Question raised about the work load and duties of executive committee members.

Answer: President, Vice President and Secretary’s duties are outlined in the bylaws. There is nothing specifically outlined in the bylaws for at-large members. It is not a huge time commitment. Executive committee has met an hour to 90 minutes per week every two-weeks. Current members have enjoyed being on the committee.

**Mark Weiss, Western Oregon University –**

Currently university priority is the construction of a new College of Education building. This is an 18 million dollar project funded by bonds. The old building space would be used for temporary space when renovating, as well as many other things.

The funding for the next biennium looks also less daunting than we had previously thought. The numbers are equivalent to this biennium’s funding plus 2.5%. We had previously expected a decrease in funding so this allows us to downsize some of the goals from the SPOC task-force committee. These goals are listed on the SPOC website. Progress has been made for generating ideas to fill the gap created by decreased funding.

Question raised about how this affects our Window of Opportunity discussions and ongoing budget pressures.

Answer: Pressure has slightly subsided. Was seeking $4.5 million in cost reductions; now closer to $3.2-3.3 million.

Question raised what actual biennium plus 2.5% amounts to.

Answer: Roughly 27 million dollars plus 2.5%. We were previously planning for about 25 million dollars, so the 27 million plus the percentage is good.

**Marshall Guthrie, Staff Senate –**

WOU is hiring a new director for Service Learning and Career Development. If you have time to attend upcoming presentations please do and give feedback.

**Jonathan Farmer, ASWOU –**

Not present.

**Kent Neely, Provosts’ Council –**

The important thing to share regarding the Oregon University System Achievement Compacts and board is that OEID is asking all public education organizations to put together achievement compacts to illustrate their priorities as well as the diversification of campuses around the state. We have gathered data and now populated the achievement compacts with numbers. These numbers are what OEID would like to see. They would like to see larger numbers of minority groups, bachelor’s degrees obtained and PELL grants or students that qualify for PELL grants. These students may also be minority groups and there will most likely be some crossover. 2010-11 and 2011-12 have already gone through or are in the pipeline. We are looking to see what happens at the end of this year and what the target is for next year. There is an increase in numbers but not a significant one. Target is also an increase in the number of rural students and number of advanced degrees (masters). You will also note that there are two categories regarding employer and alumni satisfaction, as well as a category regarding connections. There is an emphasis on high school and community college students. The number of high school students taking dual enrollment, AP or IB credits has declined. However, the number of bachelors degrees awarded to students who have transferred from a community college has increased slightly. Trends occurring are indicators that students are from lower economic and minority groups and may not have the opportunities for these advanced credits. What we have seen in state funds from 09-10 is that there has been a dramatic shift in three years that will become even more dramatic in five. The question that no one seems to be able to answer is that with this large decline in funding there is still a high standard for expectations of productivity. How is this going to work?

Question raised regarding rewards or punishments for meeting (or not) these targets.

Answer: Most likely are but we do now know them at this time.

Question raised regarding the unemployed vs. employed category.

Answer: This was OEID’s input. We are looking at many different indicators. We have not used the percentage of students employed before. We don’t believe the employer satisfaction is limited to Oregon but the unemployed in Oregon category obviously is.

**IV. Old Business**

**Shift to 4 credit courses, Art department –**

Proposing to convert all courses from 3 to 4 credits. They made sure to keep the entire major at 82 credits. Any courses that were eliminated had their content redistributed into other courses. This will ease up scheduling grid for students and professors and help with transfer articulations. All other Universities in Oregon have already made this credit shift, including Chemeketa and Linn-Benton.

Question raised regarding whether how credit increase will affect student-contact hours.

Answer: Currently there are six contact hours for three credits. Other universities were contacted and the trend seemed to be that they were meeting for the same amount of time we were with three credits for courses with four credits. We believe we are moving to the standard of what everyone else is doing.

Question raised regarding the prerequisite affecting education majors which would increase their major by one credit.

Answer: A clear decision has not been reached yet. They are looking for a good solution and are open to discussion. Because education majors need the nine credits in arts required by the LACC, they could still take a four-credit course in art and fill the last five credits with other courses. It is not required that a student take three three credit courses. There is also an A100 course that is two credits and open topic that could work for some students. However, they feel they should get together to discuss the exact problem, especially with AR 433. Please get in touch with department. This is not being implemented until winter term so there is still time. It is not their intention to balloon anyone’s major.

**Action:** Motion made to approve. Motion seconded and approved.

**V. New Business**

**Changes to Governance Charter and Faculty Senate Bylaws, Faculty Executive Committee -**

First, a word on process. Revisions and updates have not been made for at least five years. After the executive committee had completed their work, they circulated the proposed changes to the past five senate presidents for vetting. All presidents were generally in approval.

An email was then sent to all faculty soliciting feedback. Regarding the Charter revisions, Cheryl Smith had some great insight on some duplicate language that was removed. Other changes made to the Charter included language surrounding evaluation of faculty. The Senate does not evaluate faculty so this was struck. The desired presence of persons presenting proposals at both the initial meeting and the second meeting was clarified. Someone does need to be present to answer questions and there was a problem with this earlier this year. The major change revolved around the removal of the Committee on Committees as a standing committee. It has been extremely difficult to find anyone to serve on this committee and its structure was unusual (five essentially at-large members). A recommended timeline for ongoing review and revision of the Charter was included that states a review should be conducted every five years.

There were no major changes made to the bylaws. The biggest issues surrounded officer elections. Elections were moved from the last meeting of May to earlier in April. This places elections before registration, which is key to preserving presidential time and course reassignments. The other large change was the shift from a one to a two-year term for the Senate President. The learning curve is over by the second year. There is also an escape clause listed in the bylaws that states that if a vacancy arises, elections should be held according to process. The Order of Business for Senate was also streamlined. The President’s Reports were changed to include the Provost, while speaking positions for Staff Senate and ASWOU have been removed. They are always welcome to come speak; they would just have to notify Senate ahead of time. Committee and Dean’s reports were rolled into the Informational Presentations section. Membership of X-Com was also clarified. Will be first item of old business on May 22nd.

Comment: Shifting the term to two years could limit the pool of individuals who would want to serve as President. This could make Senate more stagnant and administrative.

Answer: These revisions are for Senate to vote on. At the next meeting you will have the ability to amend, if necessary. The rationale for the change was to achieve consistency. The president is asked to participate in a number of activities that are more effective within a two- year period. To preserve and ideally improve the quality of senate culture, two years could be beneficial.

Question raised regarding that if one would serve two years as president, would they have to also serve two years on X-Com as past president? Does this essentially become a four-year commitment?

Answer: No. An existing clause states that if the current past president is not available to serve, any past president can serve on the executive committee.

Comment: As a person who served a two-year term as a Department chair, it was a wonderful experience. He got a great sense of how the university worked and felt a large sense of involvement. This second year could be a good thing. However, the second year could also be intimidating and limit the amount of faculty who want to get involved. The faculty may feel they need a change.

Question raised wanting to know the overall feeling of the Senators.

Answer: The two year term is not essentially the problem. It is felt that the two-year term could be a stable model. It could allow for the president to serve at their full capacity and be more efficient. It is the potential for a three-year term makes some senators slightly uncomfortable. One option might be to have a vote of confidence at the end of the first year. This would allow for someone to be voted out, if needed, or to stay if they were doing an effective job. Capping the position at two years is another idea. A reelection at the end of the first year could be a more positive suggestion. Before a Nominating Committee is formed, the president could be approached and asked if they were interested in running for a second term. If they were not, a Nominating Committee would then be formed.

Comment: Amendments can be made at the next Senate meeting. The amendments would be voted on first, then the entire package. Voting does not have to be unanimous.

**VI. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report**

None.

**VII. Committee Review**

None.

**VIII. Informational Presentations**

None.

**IX. Meeting Adjourned**