

Faculty Senate
June 5, 2012

In attendance: Doug Briney, Frank Bushakra, David Drexler, Darren Dutto, Heidi Harris, Rebecca Hartman, Mike Heather, Chris Heidbrink, Colleen Johnson, John Knudson-Martin, Charles Lyons, Elwyn Martin, Susan Murrell, Mike Pierce, Barb Schultz, Deanna Timmermann.

Guests: Sally Mielke, Dan Mielke, Bob Davies

Meeting was called to order at 3:03.

Meeting minutes were not linked to the agenda. Meeting minutes will be approved at the first senate meeting of the 2012-2013 year. Secretary Harris was commended for her work with the meeting minutes and the website.

President's Update:

Bob Davies joined to give some updates. He commended Jeff Dense for his leadership this year. One of the key elements that is important for the EOU administration is to have a strong sense of shared governance and to have a transparent process. One of the benefits was the Shared Governance Coordinating Committee, which began under Deanna Timmermann's presidency. Over the past three years, that committee was more formalized, meets on a monthly basis, and is more engaged and engaging. That is part of the evolution of shared governance. We have also reconstituted the President's Cabinet, meeting on a bi-weekly basis to ensure communication and dialogue on issues facing the institution. The continued evolutions involve the Provost and the leadership team, and that foundation continues to grow. Next year, the town hall meetings once a quarter will be revisited. The university might have experienced "town hall fatigue" given the information shared in the last few last year. But having updates for the university community on a regular basis is important. As President Davies looks at our future in terms of budget and enrollment, he sees the numbers as not being bad news. It is about communication opportunities between and among constituencies. Another key element is providing support staff for the bodies of shared governance and to have a systemic way to ensure that minutes and policies are posted on websites and shared with the university community. The importance is in getting information out and enhancing dialogue. He is looking forward to furthering the commitment and communication and the relationship between administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Macro-level: the discussions of governance at the state-level will continue. One element was locked with the appointment of Rudy Crew as the CEO. President Davies was impressed with his presence. He has led 2 of the 4 largest school districts in the country and was brought in as a change agent to establish a clear agenda. As the overseer of pre-K-Ph.D., he is here to establish models, systems

and procedures and then move on. His focus, as it relates to us, is teacher preparation. How do we teach teachers to teach? He is committed to coming to Eastern early Fall 2012. He is interested in the sites and centers throughout the state, clearly, a change in the government.

OEIB and the HECC and the state funding teams, the campus compacts, are all still in flux. They are supposed to be finalized by the end of October or early November. We are also seeing regular politics with the governor and legislature, and the institutional boards at PSU and OU. We have debated what boards would do, but not the who, when, where, and why. President Davies is on record that the institutions should not be the ones to decide; it should be the legislature and the larger citizenry. Having said that, for EOU, an institution-specific board is not in our best interest. The role of governing boards involves giving citizens of OR a voice at the table in regards to "ownership." Any change should have an impact, and he doesn't see how the board will help meet enrollment, graduation or 40/40/20 goals.

At the last state board meeting, there were two interesting discussions: governance and tuition. One of the things particularly interesting was that the thought that the state board would not vote in support of the tuition packages. The lightning rod was SOU's proposal in which they are increasing tuition by 9.9% and decreasing student fee part, so the total increase is 4.2%. Lots of discussion ensued around that proposal. Out of the 7 proposals, only one was supported by students: ours. All others were not supported by students. That was duly noted multiple times. Over the next 3-4 years, we will be proposing tuition increases of 2-4%. Another part of that discussion was the role of tuition and state funding, which we will be watching closely.

The discussion of governance involved the president of IFS, and her report was pretty depressing. She was describing the attitude of shared governance and that attitude of conflict between faculty and staff, particularly at the larger metropolitan universities. The examples and symbolism that were being portrayed were not positive. Coming back to EOU and seeing how we work together and tackle problems together was heartening. We won't agree on every single policy, but we disagree in ways that are respectful and cherishes shared governance and individuality. The ultimate goal is how we can better serve our students and increase our mission. We do disagreement in a way that is transparent, open, and inclusive, which was refreshing in that we have good things going for us and that the relationship that we have garnered over the 3 years he has been here has paid great dividends.

He concluded with a heartfelt thank you for allowing the Provost and President to have an environment where we can openly discuss ideas, change ideas based on input, feedback, and guidance. And he thanked faculty for the ability to push the envelope on the President's side as well.

And he is a proud father...Katie has won several awards at the Eastern Oregon Livestock show.

Provost's Update:

Provost Adkison focused on the college task force structure. We all saw the results of the deliberations.

It is clear from discussions at the college levels and the feedback that was funneled through Frank, John, Karyn and other colleagues that what we need in the C of Ed through the TSPC certification is delineated roles, responsibilities and authority so that we can clearly move through certification. One of the big pieces of certification is that we are the guinea pig for the new approach to standards. They are adopting NCATE-like standards and expectations, which are robust. They require full-time, ongoing staff and administrative support. A lot of smaller colleges of education have moved away from it over time. TSPC has decided to move the whole state certification in an NCATE-like direction. This is tied with discussions with the OEIB, the governor's executive branch body, and with the HECC, which is the legislative branch body. Rudy Crew, the new CEO, is focused on K-12 quality and teacher preparation. He is probably going to have a lot of very specific expectations for TSPC. TSPC is going to gain an evolving understanding of expectations through us over the next year. We are well positioned for that. The College of Education doesn't need to have to work through TSPC at the same time that they are evolving a different administrative structure than they have now. What Dean Mielke will be doing in conjunction with the Provost over the summer is to delineate roles and responsibilities. College of Business is going to get an associate dean, and that A.D. is going to function very much like what Doug Briney described in the college task force documents.

College of Arts and Sciences had a highly successful dean search. Dean Gammon will be starting July 25, and will be in town and on the ground a few weeks before that. We need to have a place for him to start next year with the CAS faculty. What he wants to talk about now is mostly focused on CAS and what we are going to roll out over the course of this week, not just in terms of administrative structures but also advising structures that is connected with everything the task force considered and the way that the college functions.

What will go out later today to all faculty is a draft of where we start next year. What we are putting in place really is a starting point for phase 2 or 3 next year so that we understand, the college faculty with the relevant dean/deans, how it is going to work, who is going to make it work at the various levels, and how those people are selected or elected as the case may be. What we will see from the Provost today or tonight will be a starting point, a draft for discussion that we need to have in place over the next two or three weeks so that we can start having things in place next fall. Associate Deans and Division Chairs will be interim next year. The college faculty and deans will be deciding over the course of next year how those positions will be shaped going forward and how they will

be filled. We have to start somewhere, and work has to get done next year. We can't just suspend things next year while we get things figured out.

The COB needs to work out a college professional advisor, much like Heather Stanhope, Kim Mueller, Joella Devillier, and Sam in other divisions. That will need to be in place, and we will need to talk about how to approach that. Other than the Associate Dean in Business, there aren't many structural changes. For Ed, once we are through the TSPC certification, we have to understand the college of education faculty and who to move everything forward. That conversation will be picked up with the Task Force discussions.

What we will have as a starting point for CAS is a full-time dean doing what deans do. We will have a full-time associate dean that will take care of scheduling, faculty evaluations of fixed-term and roll-up of online adjuncts. The associate dean will handle post-tenure review, college-level program assessment, student complaints, and college council and curriculum management at the college level. We have gotten away from having College Council as described in the by-laws, and we are moving back toward that.

Colleen Johnson asked about the interim one-year appointment. Provost Adkison said that we would have an ongoing 1.0 FTE appointment. Whatever Steve Gammon and the CAS faculty decide will determine the search. Johnson asked how that associate dean would be decided upon. Adkison said that he has a number of possibilities for each position, but those that would be good ideas might not be interested in the position. He would be surprised if we have an external search but that would be up to the CAS college. Johnson clarified the point about the College Council. Leandro Espinosa asked about how the associate dean would be involved with assessment.

Under this structure, we are keeping three divisions. Most programs have three divisions. Some people want departments, others want discipline reps with no divisions. What he suggests starting with are keeping our programs distinct, but creating three departments in each division, so that we go from having 16 discipline reps who are doing different things with no load credit or some load credit to having department chairs, nine of them, that will replace 16 discipline reps. Department chairs will do program scheduling (existing two-year schedules on a rolling basis). Department Chairs will be bargained and will be of the faculty and not just from the faculty. They DCs will do program scheduling and roll that to the Associate Dean, and they will have authority for program assessment for the programs in their department. They will coordinate the online adjunct faculty evaluations. They will engage program curricular processes at the program level. And the DCs will constitute the college council as the discipline reps did. They will receive for their duties a course release per term plus a stipend. It is a .33 FTE release, basically.

John Knudson-Martin asked about the online evaluations. Is that a conflict of the union restriction about who can do personnel evaluations? Adkison said no, because the online adjuncts are not part of the bargaining unit, and the program faculty are currently doing those evaluations.

The Department Chairs will be the point of contact for college professional advisors, who will be the focal point rather than the intake advisor. Johnson asked how these people will get chosen. Adkison said that we might leave the current Division Chairs in place and then leave it up to the college faculty and the dean to figure out. The department chairs are still going to be faculty, so the process we have in place needs to be solidified.

Charles Lyons asked about filling the .33 lines. Adkison said he didn't have an answer for that, and if we move in this direction for next year, that is the central question that we need to answer next year. He doesn't know if it will work, and it won't save the money that we thought it might going into the Task Force deliberations. What we are after are the most effective structures in the colleges.

Timmermann asked how the departments would be created. Adkison said he is tempted to throw something on the table and run. This is the draft starting point for the conversation. Here is a starting point, and he is open to further iterations and discussions and deeply cares about the structures and departments, he is only putting this forward as a draft.

A & L: Department of Art and Media Arts and Communications, Dept. of Music and Theatre, and Dept of English and Writing

SMT: Chem, Bio/Chem, and Biology, including Physics minor; Math, CS, MM; Psych and administrative coordination of the geology minor. Geology could also go with the first group.

There is one large department in every division and two smaller ones, but he has no particular desire for symmetry as a driving criteria.

DSSML: One of the driving needs of the college task force is how to integrate programming at a distance within the life of the academic colleges. One way to do that might have been to have an associate or assistant dean of distance education, which really would have been recreating a mini-college-based version of DDE. It occurred to him over the course of the spring in conversations with faculty in BUS and CAS, was not to worry so much about distance programming but to look at the pieces are current focal points of distance, such as Liberal Studies. Historically, it was owned and operated by DDE, which hasn't owned and operated for 6 years and still isn't connected to an academic college. The central focus of Liberal Studies is DSSML programs, so it becomes a department of DSSML, perhaps clustered with Modern Languages and Global Culture.

We might have ANT/SOC and History clustered as a department, along with REL studies and Native American studies minors; PPE and PA as a department.

Arts and Letters and SMT seem straight forward, he played with at least two other sets/clusters in dismal.

Timmermann said that she liked that Liberal Studies having an academic home. Adkison said that he didn't anticipate that being an issue. Johnson said that Liberal Studies has no faculty, so what does it mean to put it into DSSML. There is a lot of work with no one there to help with it. Adkison said that it suggests in his mind that the department chair for that area would be a little different than the other entities. The Liberal Studies staff director goes with the program. Liberal Studies over time has been our distance degree, period. The structure, either the pre-approved or the dual minors, is interesting if it is consistently and rigorously applied. But it doesn't need to be the default choice for our online students but an option for a small sub-set of students. What we need to move to in robust structures are what ANT/SOC has done or what HST and PSY are doing. The pattern over time has been that students switch from majors to Liberal Studies, but his intent in putting Liberal Studies as a department is to make it easier for majors to switch to majors at a distance. The logical place now is in DSSML because that is where the center of gravity is for CAS majors in Liberal Studies. There will need to be a concrete connection through the deans because BUS/ADMIN has a significant presence with the dual minors. Adkison said that it might not work, it might be a good idea, but not practical.

Mike Heather asked if there will be discipline reps. Adkison said no. Faculty members in a given program will know who to go to for what kind of problem or need to be addressed, and that should be clear. Responsibility and authority will be attached to the roles that each of these will play. Barb Schultz asked with the move of Liberal Studies if advising would be moved for those majors. Adkison said that yes, the on-campus college advising would be affected. We don't have a year to affect some of these changes, and advising needs to figure out how this will occur. Sam has agreed to work this summer to help with the transition to figure out how they will be handed off. The bulk of our Liberal Studies students are off campus. We will still have campus in-take and undecided advising in Inlow. They will feed on-campus advisors. The regional advisors will play the in-take role, but their off-campus advising role will need to feed into advising. We have examples of how that can work, but Sam, Joella, and Kimberly cannot handle all of the college professional advising for all those students.

Rebecca Hartman asked that, if the department chairs are doing program scheduling, what autonomy will programs have? Adkison said that that person will coordinate schedules and move paperwork up to the Deans office. The programs will still set the schedules. But the programs won't be doing the paperwork. Hartman asked if there was any concern about the amount of change, considering the Dean and Associate Dean, which would make it difficult

for Steve Gammon to come in. Adkison said that if that seems too difficult, then we have Discipline Reps with bounded roles for the next year. Steve Gammon will weigh in on this just as Dean Mielke has on the Business and Education pieces. Late next week, he would like to have a meeting with each of the three college faculty to have some of these discussions and to see what kinds of feedback he gets and to talk about that before people are off-campus this summer. Too much change, even if any one piece is fairly straightforward, is sometimes self-defeating. Steve Gammon's chief concern will be how he can best be successful. Harris indicated that having an old system for one year, then having a new system the next year, might be just as confusing as making all the changes at once. Adkison said that Gammon would need to weigh in on that. Sometimes we move faster in the end by moving slower at first.

Susan Murrell asked about in terms of financial and clerical combining, such as with Media Arts and Fine arts with equipment and student fees. We would have to put together all of the administrative duties, and those duties might not decline because someone from the departments will still need to get everything together to hand it off. Adkison said that the fees stay attached to programs, and we can't mix those because of administrative structures. But we are going to see these issues arise not so much with scheduling because that is according to course rotations and plans. Department chairs won't necessarily do it, but they can coordinate it. A person will need to be a department level version of the Provost or Dean. That person is not going to be able to do the work that the program faculty are doing for the program. The intent is to consolidate divisional checkpoints or locus of responsibilities so that people know where to go to get certain kinds of things done. Ultimately, who is accountable for making sure that assessment portfolios are done in a rotation and on time? From the dean's perspective, they can go to the department chair, not 2/3/5 program faculty. Each department will act differently. But the departments are like-enough so that they can be handled together. The classified staff will not change much. We are staffed as thinly as we can be and still get things done. They talked about not replacing Vickie Lee and going to a single college business center, but that doesn't seem to be working going forward, so we will be replacing Vickie Lee. Probably going to shift the titles to college operations managers because they do more than assist the deans; they run the business operations part of it.

Part of the department chairs piece is that if we bring some structure to those roles, and there is actually release time, it can help build leadership pools in all three colleges we can draw on over time. We have been fortunate in that regard over time because of the quality of people on the ground. We need to build on that consciously, too.

Nothing has changed with the achievement compacts. The board's academic strategies committee is going to approve the draft targets. Our draft targets are interesting because of FERPA...if you have numbers of students in certain categories below an absolute number, minority students for example, who qualify

for aid at a certain level, then the number has to be blacked out when those go forward publicly. Because our numbers of students in the targets we have, what the board is going to see and approve, degree completions or retention targets, for example, will literally be a black box. If we put a number down, those students can in theory be identified. We have targets, but the board will never see the numbers. The board will never see those numbers. We can talk about them on campus, and OUS institutional research can see them, but not even the Chancellor's office will see anything but the black box.

Still no clarity on the quality/educational quality piece. He thought it would have dropped off by this time but it hasn't.

The only other interesting set of developments has been capital projects related to state bonding. In 2000, the state created \$330M of bonds, and paid them off last spring. Bonding capacity moving forward that they will parcel out for the next biennium starting in February is \$240M. All 7 OUS plus OHSU have cued up. The top 9 will probably get funded. Our top proposal is well within the cut off. It started as the Live/Learn center, and based on feedback we got, we are now calling it the Eastern Learning Commons, including the Media Arts Communication HUB idea rolled out to encompass all the disciplines. It will use technology to bridge distance, the physical building that will bridge on-campus students with off-campus students. It was originally tied to a residential piece, but the state is not going to fund residential halls. There will be enough residence hall rooms in the Eastern Learning Commons to simplify the bonding issue and to replace Hunt Hall. His guess is that within the next two years, Hunt Hall will go away, and we will be breaking ground on the Eastern Learning Commons. We will need to flesh out the concept between now and next February. There is a high likelihood that we will get bonding for that project. We don't really need more on-campus instructional capacity, what we need is capacity to handle those students of ours who are off campus. Expect to be involved in those discussions next fall as they develop.

We are moving forward with discussions with OSU agriculture program, which has been a collaborative program we have hosted. He is not sure why or how, but there is traction for the idea of that being a true joint degree, that we don't just host on campus but that we will own, it will be transcribed as a joint EOU/OUS degree. OSU found out that they had been transcripting EOU minors, which is a huge problem. It is important that those majors have a minor option, and those will only come through us because they won't go through Corvallis. The only way to transcribe those minors is for it to be a true joint degree. There is a new dean who is a distinguished research faculty member, very different from the old dean, which will make our discussions with that program easier to have over time.

University Council Rep:

Elwyn Martin is going to give a list of membership changes: Rory Becker, Colleen Cascio, Steve Clements, and Scott Smith. UC voted on new officers, Sam Eggert is the new chair Steve Clements is the new vice-chair, no secretary was appointed. Some uncertainty as to whether Molly would continue that post.

Dense commended Elwyn for his diligent service at UC, and he has changed the culture in terms of respect.

President's Update:

First, Jeff Dense wanted to thank President Davies and Provost for their profound commitment to shared governance. Thanks to Kris Olson for keeping him in the right place. The executive committee for being a sounding board procedurally. Shout out to Nathan Tublitz for believing in him to do what he has done.

What have we accomplished this year? Some things got done and didn't get done. But some things have profoundly changed how we get things done. EPCC consent agenda is a movement away from micro managing. Dense asked for progress to be made in regards to things being in the pipeline early. He recommends further changes in the future. We accomplished discussions of standing committees, particularly the EPCC. Those who have looked at President Davies memorandum sees that he shares the sentiment that curriculum belongs to the faculty. Another thing that was brought forward was the ASC committee, of the 12 members, fewer than half are faculty. Consider changing faculty to the majority. One of the proposed constitutional amendments (thanks ad hoc committee) the Library Personnel committee will be in place to break LPC as our colleagues. Those who have served in the FPC know it is a profound learning experience and one of the best examples of shared governance. We have highlighted some policy needs. Our discussion of BUS/ECON shows that we don't have a procedure in place for contemplating such things. We need to formulate a policy about making decisions in absence of a policy. One of the best things to do is to look at policies from a comparative sense. We have utilized the executive committee approach, and even though it was resisted at first, bouncing ideas off the leadership team has been beneficial. One of the things we have come forward with is the shortcoming of the T & P handbook. There is a hole in the process and it is necessary to put the breaks on that in order to protect junior faculty, but that is a huge issue that needs to get taken care of regarding online faculty members. There is no mention of online teaching in terms of being criteria for tenure and promotion. That will be run through FPC and the colleges.

We tried to make the meetings more efficient. That has had mixed results. In terms of putting limits on speakers, we do so not to muffle everyone's voice, but to encourage everyone to participate in shared governance. He wanted to make sure that our quieter faculty have a say.

The IFS proposal still needs to be taken care of to make sure that smaller institutions have the same number of representatives. That will be discussed at the end of this week in Portland. All IFS schools should have a faculty senate member as a contingent to strengthen ties with faculty senates and give faculty a stronger voice at the state level.

There is a need for administrative assistance and office space. Hopefully we will have help and office space.

The faculty senate role has changed profoundly over the course of this year, and he thanks President Davies and Provost Adkison for understanding of faculty leadership in shared governance. One of the most positive things he has been able to do is to participate in dean's council to have an opportunity to figure out what the faculty stands for. The vision statement, and what the faculty stands for needs to be the driving force. Always remember to do what is best for our students.

EPCC Consent Agenda:

Moved to approve. Passed unanimously. Dense abstains.

EPCC Action Agenda:

BA Program change: Dan Mielke joined the table. Deanna Timmermann asked for specifics about how the hours changed to include 12 more credit hours. Mielke clarified the hour change and then addition of one elective.

Charles Lyons said that it would be a significant increased expense without specific data. Mielke deferred to Doug Briney. Briney indicated that part of the accreditation review involved a review of curriculum, and every program at the state level involves an operations management course, so that has been added into the core requirement. Looking at the number of electives courses meant that most programs include 6-7; BA is a minimum 3 and maximum 4, so that there needed to be an increase in order to get a concentration, with the exception of accounting. Students still have to have 180 credits; those will just need to be reconfigured. Lyons said that it is more than other programs on campus and asked if it was similar to other programs. Briney said no. Mielke said it depended on how we count accounting and statistics courses, which in some cases also meet General Ed requirements. Upper division courses here are 5 credit courses, which means there are more credit hours in the courses even though there are the same number of classes. Barb Shultz asked about contact hours. The common practice is that faculty do not meet all 5 hours. Mielke said that there are some courses that have online components that substitute for contact hours. Rebecca Hartman asked what other degrees include. Doug said between 94-97. Colleen Johnson asked if the difference between then proposed program

requirements and total credit hours were the required skill courses. Mielke said that the difference was the addition of credits in two courses, one additional core class, and the elective in the concentrations. Doug said that the program requires BA courses and the total include pre-requisites such as statistics.

All in favor. Opposed: Charles Lyons, Deanna Timmermann, Leandro Espinosa. Dense abstained.

AA Administrative Management Program Change:

Mielke added for the point of information that the changes for this and the certificate is the result of credit hour changes in BA 131.

All in favor: Dense abstains.

Certificate Office Management Program Change:

All in favor. Dense abstains.

ED/MS Program Change:

Darren Dutto asked if it was just the addition of two mentor courses at one credit. John clarified it was.

All in favor. Dense abstains.

REL 330:

Heidi Harris brought an issue with the process. The problem was clarifying if completed paperwork had or had not been submitted to Senate. Colleen Johnson said that Kayla Komito had not been contacted about the meeting prior to her course being discussed and that we should not discuss a course without the faculty member present. Moved to table. Dense abstains.

Proposed Faculty Senate Bylaw Amendment:

Colleen Johnson said that last time we talked about this, what was an issue is that we are going to add to the bylaws of Faculty Senate the service on a committee that is ad hoc, which is problematic. If we are going to have a committee, which is a good idea, that committee should be in the constitution. We might be putting the cart before the horse. Why wouldn't we put this committee into the constitution so that everyone has a stake in it. If Bob leaves, it can just go away. We need to put in the constitution if we expect people to serve on that committee. John Knudson-Martin indicated that there are three elements, and that Colleen is talking about the third, the Shared Governance issue. Charles Lyons said that he didn't understand the Faculty Senate being involved in Dean's

Council. It isn't the Dean's Council if the President of Senate attends. If creep happens, then it is an administrative council, not a Dean's Council. If this is codified, then it added to the Faculty Senate President duties, who has much to do. Dense said that how policy is created is through comparative analysis. The Faculty Senate President sits on what is the equivalent of the Dean's Committee at other institutions. What Steve has tried to do is to codify shared governance and administrative governance. UC council chairperson is not a part of that committee. It is important to have a faculty voice, not necessarily an administrative voice, when discussion of policy has taken place. There has never been a vote taken. It is more of a sounding board. But it is important if shared governance is going to grow, we need to look at sister institutions. At other institutions, the faculty senate serves in dean's council. If we are going to have a voice at the table, someone needs to be there. Perhaps the other body should also be jettisoned. Whether or not the faculty senate wants to parse out those elements is up for debate. Charles Lyons said that it should not be codified and that the release time should not be assigned to the Faculty Senate because that eliminates faculty from the classroom and limits who can serve in the position. Dense said that it is hard to teach and serve as Faculty Senate President. Why this needs to be done is that if Bob and Steve leave, then we might not have a say at the table. He appreciates Lyons student-centric view, but we need a seat at the table if we are to have a voice in policy deliberations.

Chris Heidbrink said that the language might be "may attend" so that the Faculty Senate President can choose to attend. In terms of SGCC, it was debated as to whether it should be added to the constitution, and the amendments in the constitution to increase the communication will affect the SGCC as a committee. The SGCC might not be important given the constitutional amendment changes.

Leandro Espinosa asked if we need to codify it now. Dense said that in terms of the constitution, we have to do that next year. John Knudson-Martin said that what we have on the table adds it to the bylaws. Johnson made a friendly amendment to eliminate the shared governance and keep the other two. The first two are committees that are in existence; the other is ad hoc. Dense accepts the friendly amendment. Charles Lyons asked about the attendance at 10 hours of meetings. Why isn't this list longer if the president is attending more committees? Dense said that those aren't formal meetings of groups. There are individual meetings in regards to the faculty leadership council of faculty senate presidents in the system. The shared governance conferences also play in. The other responsibilities, such as the Administrative Task Force, the Dean's Search, it isn't just the codified responsibilities but other committees. Steve feels the faculty senate needs to be involved in those decisions. Lyons said that he wanted justification for why we are listing any. What we have decided at this point is that we don't need to codify one. Dense said that the other meetings are more informal. The Shared Governance Coordinating Council is an informal meeting. But in Dean's Council, policies are discussed, and a faculty voice should be at the table. The President's Cabinet is one Dense feels strong about. The FS

President was excluded. The shadow cabinet included the HR Director and the Athletic Director. Faculty issues were discussed, but Faculty were not represented. The UC rep and other elements are also included in those meetings. There are votes, and the President has final say, but we have a voice at the table when policies of concern are discussed.

Rebecca Hartman said that she could see the merit in both positions, but she moved to table so that we could discuss with new members next year. Motion to table.

Nay: Dutto, Drexler, Harris. Motion passes.

Administrative Task Force Recommendation:

Colleen Johnson said that if there would be a meeting next week, he should do it ASAP so that people will get it on their schedule.

Elections:

Dense read the rules from the bylaws.

President: Charles nominates Deanna Timmermann. Vote is for Deanna Timmermann.

Vice-President: Doug Briney nominates John Knudson-Martin. Mike Pierce nominates Doug Briney. Doug declines. John wins with 17 votes.

Secretary: Colleen nominates Rebecca. Rebecca wins with 15 votes.

UC council rep: David Drexler, Frank Bushakra, Frank wins with 11.

IFS Rep: Fill seat of Ruthi Davenport. Nominate Jeff Dense. Jeff wins by 17 votes.

Good of the Order: Dense wanted to say that he appreciates everyone's collegiality. Robust discussion on the issues is important. Welcome to Susan and Barb as new members. Those members cycling off, Darren Dutto, who is going to EPCC. Dense is going to chair FPC and will be campus coordinator for American Democracy Project.

Meeting is adjourned at 5:16.