Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
November 1, 2011

In attendance: Doug Briney, Frank Bushakra, Jeff Dense, David Drexler, Darren Dutto, Leandro Espinosa, Mary Fields, Heidi Harris, Rebecca Hartman, Mike Heather, Colleen Johnson, John Knudson-Martin, Charles Lyons, Elwyn Martin, Donna Rainboth, Chris Heidbrink

Guests: Allen Evans, Carolyn Bloyt, Sally Mielke, Ruthi Davenport, Nancy Knowles

Meeting came to order at 3:02 p.m.

Approval of minutes from October 4, 2011: Colleen Johnson clarified that faculty other than her had also received the email on faculty release time. John Knudson-Martin moved, Charles Lyons seconded. Meeting minutes were approved.

The Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee (EPCC) provided a consent agenda, which included the following:

- Name change for the NAT minor
- The addition of NAT 110, 210, 310, and 410
- The Chemistry GEC Review – GLO Curriculum Map

With no objections, the consent agenda items are adopted.

**President’s/Provost’s Update:**
No President’s or Provost’s updates were provided.

**Child Care Task Force:**
Ruthi Davenport spoke about the child care task force update. She worked with Nancy Knowles and a large committee for the child care task force. The task force surveyed students, faculty, and staff at Grande Ronde Hospital, gathering data for the need for a child care center on campus. The PDF of their final report is in Senate Archives and will be available in the library, through WRRC and ASEOU. Ruthi indicated that the task force felt that EOU needs this on our profile as an institution. Members of the committee visited U of O and looked at facilities had guests on campus and looked at many scenarios. The task force recommendations are that the best model to meet EOU’s childcare needs and those of the hospital (50 children a day) would be to build on the Head Start property by Candy Cane Park that EOU already owns. The best model is to engage in community partnerships, provide infant care, and provide professional development operations in conjunction with Head Start. The facility might also be used by the Early Childhood Education program, which is currently an online concentration but could possibly move to on-campus provided this could be used as a resource. The final report includes description of scenario and budget.

Ruthi Davenport commended Kari Day and Steve Clements, who, along with their students, were vital in putting together document. Sixty-three to seventy percent of students surveyed were in favor of a modest student fee to help pay for child care. Students using the facility
would pay a reduced rate. Grant funding would be secured for the initial building. The task force study showed the need for childcare as method of retention. The committee requested that an Implementation Task force be recommended to President Davies to complete the work this task force began. The data, including appendices that were not included in faculty senate document, are available at the library.

Questions were raised about the possibility of overlap with services provided in the community. However, the task force found that not enough care was provided in the community. Infant care does not happen at any center, and it would at this center. A question was raised about why EOU would partner with Grande Ronde Hospital, and Ruthi Davenport indicated that the connection with the hospital was because of the nature of the small, rural site. The hospital has looked into daycare and doesn't have one, which makes us have a common purpose and allows for collaboration. Potential grant funders for capital expense include those grant agencies that serve rural areas and are interested in initial building costs. EOU and the hospital both said for this to occur it can not cost money from either the hospital or EOU. The groundwork is laid with the needs assessment and discussions with hospital. Another year to put a plan together would give it some traction with the hospital. Ruthi Davenport will continue to communicate with President Davies in order to continue to keep the issue on the table. Colleen Johnson brought up issues with having increased student fees at the state level. The task force did not consider what the process would be to charge new student fees. The university has an agreement with residence life as a separate entity with which the university partners (need to find term), and the center would work in a similar fashion. Nancy Knowles agreed to continue as part of a new task force should one be appointed.

The issues of a faculty senate resolution was raised encouraging President Davies to appoint a child care task force to continue this work through the 2011-2012 year (last line of the current task force document). ASEOU has been a part of the conversation all the way through, and it and University Council will perhaps draft their own resolutions. President Dense will draft a resolution and circulate before the next Faculty Senate meeting. It will be on the next meeting agenda.

**Faculty Senate President's Update:**

President Dense provided a report on weekly meetings with Dean's Council and the Provost and once a month with Provost Council and Shared Governance Committee, which consists of President Davies, Provost Adkison, University Council Chair Anna Maria Dill and ASEOU President Chris Heidbrink. The Provosts’ Council consists of Provost Adkison, Dean Witte, Dean Mielke, University Council President Anna Maria Dill, Library Director Karen Clay and Research Analyst Fárooq Sultan. The theme Provost Adkison is focusing on is the Sustainability Plan, following through on what the plan says and contingency planning in light of possible 3-7% cut for rest of the year. Discipline Action Plans are tied to the Sustainability Plan and need to be completed in a timely manner.

The update on Senate Bill 242 is that the big changes were in regards to risk management. Tuition setting is moving to the campus level. Planning and governance will be through a K-20 board, which has yet to be implemented. More of the day-to-day operational will also move to campus. Faculty needs to look at big budget in regards to faculty lines. A continuing issue is U of O keeps trying to break from system. President Dense read a communiqué
from Nathan Tublitz at University of Oregon that stated the proposal was losing traction without Governor Kitzhaber’s intervention.

President Dense also sits on the Dean’s Council, which consists of Provost Adkison, the Deans Mielke and Witte, and himself. The Dean’s Council discussed the administrative structure task force. A report from the task force chaired by Doug Kaigler should be on table at Nov. 29th Faculty Senate meeting. EPCC should forward only consent agenda items for that meeting so discussion can focus on the Administrative Structure Task Force recommendation. The purpose of the administrative structure report is to provide pros and cons of a one-dean vs. a two-dean model. The Provost is intent on seeking input of Faculty Senate. The report will also be circulated to the entire faculty for comment.

President Dense sees the EPCC consent agenda as a step forward to clearing time for faculty senate to discuss important items, including two issues related to shared governance. What is the role of administrative faculty in faculty senate? What role should the University Council representative from Faculty Senate play on University Council? Also, the Faculty/Staff handbook needs to align with the AAP Contract and College Bylaws.

Angie Scott talked about 1039 calculations which could be disadvantage or advantage on pay scale. Given the number of retiring faculty in the near future, faculty engaged in 1039 activities should consult Payroll to determine financial implications.

Also discussed at Dean’s Council were the speech, biology and math departments participating in the Eastern Promise Summit November 4. EOU faculty are also looking to more advanced placement, credit by proficiency, and dual enrollment to get more students prepared for college. The overload/inload policy was discussed, which is guided by accreditation more than anything. It was concluded that Deans have final say on course load assignment.

President Davies has charged each one of the shared governance entities with a review of committee structure size/composition and reporting and communication among groups. There is a commitment on the part of the administration to come up with administrative support for shared governance. Legwork consuming us might be mitigated with support from an administrative assistant. The individual shared governance bodies are to report back to President Davies with a review of the shared governance report by April 1.

President Dense appointed an ad hoc committee of Elwyn Martin, Heidi Harris, and John Knudson-Martin to report back to Faculty Senate by April 1 regarding student evaluation issues. At that point, the issue will be on the agenda for input.

President Dense is committed to representing best interests of faculty. In this area, he will continue to discuss exclusion from Presidents’ Cabinet, which is clearly stipulated in the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Currently, the Presidents’ Cabinet consists of the President Davies, the Vice Presidents and the Director of Athletics. President Davies has demonstrated a willingness to reconsider this decision.

Colleen Johnson requested a written as well as verbal report regarding those items from the meetings. President Dense indicated that he is willing to consider and post the notes from
various meetings prior to Faculty Senate meetings and then provide the written report with highlights at the meeting.

Faculty Personnel Committee: Allen Evans came forward to discuss the draft of the emeritus policy.

Emeritus Policy Discussion:
Allen Evans indicated that he appreciated the thoughtful comments of the FPC members. An emeritus policy had been found. The policy was adopted by the old assembly but did not make it into formal print in the handbook. The original policy forms the backbone for the current policy. What the original policy lacked was implementation. The FPC established criteria that are basically the same as the original policy and recommended a process for awarding emeritus status that did not seem to be addressed in any form. President Dense read a note from Past President Deanna Timmerman that indicated that the emeritus policy was in the handbook, but after new negotiating with union, the emeritus status was not in contract, so the handbook language was removed.

One question that arose in drafting the emeritus policy was whether emeritus status should be self-selected, a nomination by peers, or both. In addition, the question of what documentation should submitted by a faculty member in the awarding of emeritus status.

The current draft was designed to be similar to the original policy and straightforward. Leandro Espinosa indicated hesitancy about item #2 on the plan. Emeritus was not connected in the document to tenure. Colleen Johnson questioned whether attaching it to tenure would attach it to a current process in place without establishing additional procedures. The caveat of the necessity of tenure would address issue #3 in the draft plan. Earlier FPC discussions included tenure, making emeritus status for those with tenure automatic with at the point of retirement. However, this posed problems for those faculty who were awarded tenure at the point of hire. An alternate suggestion was that the qualifications include tenure and 15 years service to EOU. Frank Bushakra asked about the word "usual" in the old policy. In the past, the "usual" exemption has been used to bring in administrative faculty or other members. Should language be included that was broad and based on a candidate's significant contribution to the university? Donna Rainboth asked about those individuals who may have been here 18 years and are not tenured, would they be allowed to receive emeritus status? Darren Dutto said language seems to need to address the issue of those without tenure but with substantial service.

Chris Heidbrink requested clarity on item #5 regarding whether or not FPC would be reviewing individual recommendations. Dr. Evans indicated that FPC would be reviewing more at the level of institutional oversight as opposed to the "heavy lifting" of the CPC, which would better know a candidate's credentials. The levels of review were raised, and Dr. Evans indicated that it parallels the current processes in place. The transition from #5 to #6 was questioned. Does the Senate also make a recommendation? In the previous policy, the recommendations needed to be approved by the committee. We could acknowledge service in minutes of meeting, so we could not have it for discussion or review, just for acknowledgment and information. The question would be one of visibility. The Faculty Senate should perhaps see who has gone through the process, but not necessarily in order to vote. The question was raised regarding whether or not administrative faculty could have
emeritus status. There are some instances of administrative faculty here having emeritus status. The draft plan was tabled until it could be revised based on the comments of the Faculty Senate. Chris Heidbrink moved, Colleen Johnson seconded. Item was tabled with one abstention from Leandro Espinosa.

EPCC:
Sally Mielke said that there would be no report from EPCC. President Dense asked Sally Mielke to speak in regards to the consent agenda. She indicated that EPCC has been in favor of clarification of action versus consent agenda items. Dr. Dense visited the EPCC meeting when the handbook was clarified. Consent and action items were discussed. The handbook is now posted on the EPCC site after coming to an agreement about those items. The question of how policy decisions will be forwarded (re consent versus action agenda) will be clarified by EPCC in the near future. The handbook is on pg. 6 to clarify the events which should go on the consent agenda. President Dense commended EPCC for being clear on these standards.

Academic Standards Committee:
Chip Ettinger was not present to report.

University Council:
Elwyn Martin reported that the first half of meeting was President Davies’ address, which was similar to the one he presented at Faculty Senate. One policy issue that was raised was the animal control policy, a proposed ban on pets in campus buildings unless they serve a disability need. The University Council has gone to President Davies with concerns about enforcement of the policy. Those issues were not resolved, and the policy was sent back to the safety committee to be revised and sent through the process again. Dr. Martin was not sure when the revisions would come forward again. The remainder of the meeting was discussions of why shared governance should be evaluated. The general message was that University Council feels that in the past communication between bodies was not as effective as it could be and the hopes were that it would improve. The University Council will meet the 2nd Tuesday of each month.

Public comment period:

Colleen Johnson raised the issue of release time in regards to the agenda. President Dense said that the survey regarding release time had not yet been completed, and if the report is complete, it will be on the agenda at the next available meeting, although we don’t want it to distract from Task Force discussion.

Colleen Johnson also discussed the role of the Executive Committee. President Dense said that his leadership model is inclusive in developing an agenda. The only deviation from Roberts Rules of Order that came out of consultation with the Executive Committee was that the meeting might be hijacked by discussion of items pulled from the action agenda. It was decided that the agenda for meetings would be posted a week in advance, and that all Senators would have an opportunity to pull items from the consent agenda for discussion by the Friday before the senate meeting. Colleen Johnson indicated that the bylaws say that the Executive Committee should act on behalf of Faculty Senate during specific times but that the Executive Committee has no formal or informal role. President Dense indicated that if
Colleen Johnson were to read further down the bylaws, the individual duties of the officers include that the Faculty Senate President can assign other duties to the Executive Committee members. President Dense stated an evaluation of role of Executive Committee should be part of the larger review of shared governance that has been requested by President Davies. He also noted that a review of other OUS Senate Bylaws indicated that the consultation of Executive Committee in formulating the agenda for senate meetings was common throughout the system.

Chris Heidbrink raised the issue of ASEOU addressing concealed weapons policy. The ASEOU believe that the law will impact faculty. Questions about the concealed weapons policy should be directed to Chris or to Devon Baremore. Concealed weapons are not banned on campus. Oregon appeals court ruled that the legislature can not make that ruling. The ban was removed. So right now, students can carry concealed weapons on campus. Oregon Student Association is not taking a stance on the removal of the ban as of yet but is pursing allowing campuses to determine their policy on campus.

Rebecca Hartman questioned as to the status of the meeting minutes from the May 2011 Faculty Senate meetings, which are still not on the Faculty Senate website. President Dense has inquired of last year’s secretary to try to provide those minutes, particularly because of the numerous EPCC items that were discussed during those meetings. The diversity strategic plan and the background checks policy were also raised, and if they were not resolved, we need to take up and resolve that issue. Dense said that the background check issue will be brought up again after the November 29th Faculty Senate meeting dealing with the Administrative Task Force recommendations. We have the ability to influence the background check policy. Dense will check on the diversity policy at this point.

Carolyn commented that we will need to address the background check issue quickly because EOU has already had a position hired with a required criminal background check.

Rebecca Hartman announced that Ars Poetica would be at 7:30 in Huber.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 p.m.