

**University Council Minutes  
Eastern Oregon University  
June 2, 2008 ~ 3:00 p.m. ~ Inlow 201**

**AGENDA**

- Chair's comments on recent change in items up for a Constitutional vote.
- Nominating and voting for University Council officers for 2008-09.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members in Attendance:** Thatcher Carter, Steve Clements, Joe Corsini, Anna Maria Dill, Marilyn Levine, Dan Mielke, Nick Romriell, Steve Tanner (Faculty Senate Rep)

**Members Absent:** Doctor Ayeliya, Katy Barnett, Jana Parmele, Kathryn Shorts, Kim Sorensen,

**Others in Attendance:** Dea Hoffman, Registrar

**Meeting Notes, Decisions, Issues**

**Steve Clements (SC)**, UC Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:07p.m. with comments on the Eastalk exchange regarding the recommended constitutional changes for EPCC.

**Discussion:**

**SC** - Communication has been a big issue and a challenge. I recommend that, at least one time per term, we conduct joint meetings among chairs of University Council committees, Council chair and President of Senate.

**Steve Tanner (ST)** - A big part of the confusion could have been eliminated had there been a joint session of the UC and FS. The next time there is an issue as important as changing the constitution we should hold a joint session of both the UC and FS. Rather than writing this recommendation into the by-laws of the Constitutions, I believe occasional joint meetings can evolve as a tradition between the governing bodies.

**Marilyn Levine (ML)** - The shared governance structure functioned quite well in its first year and that the EPCC recommendation was not a "constitutional fiasco" but rather a problem of timing. The University Counsel did not go against the will of the Faculty Senate. The University Council had agreed with the Faculty Senate and afterwards the Senate rescinded their vote.

**SC** - Shared Governance worked in this case. People did make their voices heard.

**ST** - In retrospect, something like an open campus forum on the constitutional changes before the final discussion in the two governing bodies would have been a good way to get the word out about the issues that needed addressing.

**Anna Maria Dill (AMD)** - In the early stages of developing the current model of shared governance, we had talked about the necessity of occasionally calling together an Assembly of sorts, so information like this could be easily shared.

**Dan Mielke (DM)** - In going from the old Assembly model to a representative model, it is imperative that the representatives share information with their constituencies. Had we done that earlier, rather than near the end of the decision process, we may have gotten more input. I have tried to emphasize the need for representatives of the Faculty Senate and the University

Council to keep their constituencies informed and up to date on what is being discussed or taking place in the Senate and in this body.

**SC** - Dissemination was made more difficult when we went from an Assembly that routinely 60 or so people attended to these smaller governing bodies.

**AMD** - Dissemination is different, not more difficult with Shared Governance. Individuals who would normally not have spoken in Assembly have had more opportunity to have their voices heard in this shared governance format, especially administrative faculty.

**ST** - I think Dan Milelke's point is well taken. When representatives take information to their constituencies that is potentially contentious, then, that would be a logical time to hold a special Assembly where various ideas and points of view can be aired.

**SC** - It takes some history of the organization to recognize what items or issues may light fires. I am often surprised by what individuals respond or do not respond to.

**Nick Romriell (NR)** - It is true that some of the committees, like the Athletic Committee gave quarterly reports to UC, but a better way to keep account of committee activities may be a request for a brief annual report. What is the committee's mission? What were the goals for the year? Were those goals realized? How can the UC help? -- that kind of thing. It might help communication and accountability.

**ML** - I like Nick's ideas and suggest limiting the report to about 5 questions.

**DM** - At one time, Assembly committees did a complete a report but not as constructive or formative as the one Nick is suggesting.

**SC** - This summer would be a good time to formulate the types of information and feedback we would like to receive from committees and run the information by the chairs to find out what they think.

**DM** - We could have the committee chairs attend the UC in the fall and get them oriented and they could attend once again in the spring and give a brief report rather than wait until the end of the year for a report.

In drawing up a visual of the original model for Shared Governance, the committees were placed in the center, the spine, so to speak, because it is at the committee level where much of the work is done. That diagram may have implied, unintentionally, that the work of the UC and FS was not as important.

We are still trying to work this new form of governance out, and I think if we were to draw that diagram today, the FS and UC would be more of the focus in the middle, with the committees, being important, but not necessarily the centerpiece. I think if anything, we have evolved into that structure.

**Joe Corsini (JC)** - Does the UC approve minutes from the various committees?

**DM** - We do not approve minutes, but we should review them. One of the ways we were going to do that is to have the committee minutes posted on the Shared Governance website for us or anyone else to review. And then if there were any questions, we could call the committee chair in for clarification. That's one of our communication issues right now. We don't know what anyone has done anywhere, really. The only committee that has been out there in the forefront is the EPCC.

**JC** - Is the Faculty Senate reviewing minutes of the committees of which it oversees? I ask, because, that's what the FS did at another institution where I taught. It was mostly routine unless there was a problem or action taken that required our attention. In those cases we called the committee chair in for discussion.

**DM** - Your point is well taken because campus-wide we are not getting enough information about what the committees do and the campus needs better access to that information. I think our original suggestion at the beginning of this school year--putting all those committees' minutes on a website whether it's the University Council or Faculty Senate website, is a good one because at least then there is a place where things can be noted. And whether or not we go to the format of formal approval, at least we go to the format of regular review.

**NR** - If we go successfully into this format, this would be more effective than the old Assembly model. We did hear regularly from the EPCC and sometimes other committees, but for the most part, the Assembly did not really have any idea about what most committees decided upon on a regular basis. Overall, this structure would be more effective than anything we have ever seen.

**SC** - It would and it would play to the idea that the committees are integral to the structure of shared governance and it behooves them to keep track of what they are doing and then inform the UC so that we can disseminate that information.

**ML** - So do we need a new by-law about review and acceptance of minutes?

**SC** - This is something that we might address first thing in the fall --to modify the bylaws to address this issue of communication between the committees and the UC and the issue that Steve Tanner mentioned earlier about establishing a procedure for calling Assembly-type meetings or open forums when necessary. I want something formalized.

**AMD** - I think you simply modify Section 2, Item e. of the Constitution. Although it does not explicitly state anything about committee minutes, the following item formalizes that a line of communication does exist between the UC and the committees that report to this body. It seems logical that the committees' recommendations are readily available from the minutes.

**Section 2, item "e" reads:**

*Committees: The University Council shall accept, consider and act upon recommendations from the following standing committees of the University: The Student Life (formerly the Student Affairs) Committee, the Budget and Planning Committee, the Finance Committee, the Athletic Committee, and the Diversity Committee.*

**SC** - I think the committees are not fully aware of the changes called for by the new Constitution for Shared Governance and still operating under the old Assembly structure. This is a whole new thing for the committees to participate. Maybe there is a way to help the committees understand that this is an opportunity to come out of isolation and shuffle that power upwards.

**JC** - That's right. This a way for the larger community to review what goes on in committees at multiple levels.

**ML** - We need to all talk to our constituents. I will talk to the Deans' Council.

**AMD** - Do you want to make a motion that at the beginning of the year, at the second mtg. of the UC, we have a meeting with all the chairs of the various committees and discuss the expectations about the minutes and interpretation of Section 2, item e?

**Liz Burton (LB)** - Are you ready to call for a second or can we open this to discussion?

**SC** - We are open for discussion, Liz.

**LB** - I think that it is critical that we, the University Council members, have a meeting before we invite the chairs so that we are all in agreement on the details and clear about we are asking of the committees.

Everyone agrees and the Chair reframes the **motion**.

**ACTION** - It was moved and seconded that The University Council invite its committee chairs to the second meeting of the Council for academic year 2008-09 for the purpose of clarifying interpretation of Section 2, item e of the Constitution and discussing methods for improving communication between committees and University for disseminating that information among members of the University at large.

### **New Business**

#### ***Nominating and voting for University Council officers for 2008-09.***

**ACTION:** Steve Clements volunteers to serve as Chair for another year. Anna Maria Dill agrees to serve as Recorder for another year. Kim Sorensen will be asked to serve as Vice Chair for another year.

### **Other Business**

#### ***Voting on Changes to the Constitution-***

Voting on the following three items will take place on WEBSTER beginning June 11 and ending at 5:00 p.m. on June 13, 2008. Classified employees may vote by paper ballot in the Human Resources office.

1. Article V, Section 6, Para a: proposal to remove "...including a representative from Division of Distance Education and a representative from student affairs..." with reference to admin faculty numbers. Proposal to add the language, "at least one from Student Life and/or Enrollment Services..." as a descriptor for the admin faculty.

2. Article V, Section 7, Para a: proposal to remove "...the Division of Distance Education..." and add the language, "...Student Life and/or Enrollment Services..." as a descriptor for the admin faculty numbers. Additionally, proposal to remove "the Dean of Student Life" as a voting ex-officio member and to add "In addition, the Dean of Students shall serve ex officio without vote."

3. Article V, Section 9, Para a: proposal to remove "...the Division of Distance Education..." and replace with "...Enrollment Services..."

#### ***Web casting -***

Steve Clements will contact Paul Rowan to find out where we are in the process of having web casting capability in Inlow 201. In the meantime, Steve will look into the possibility of purchasing a more reliable tape recorder for recording the University Council proceedings.

### **For the Good of the Order**

Marilyn Levine recognizes Steve Clements for his excellent leadership during the first year of the University Council.

**Meeting Adjourned at 4:00 p.m.**