

EOU FACULTY SENATE
2-20-18
INLOW 201

Senators:

Daysi Bedolla
Cori Brewster
Shaun Cain
~~*Joe Corsini*~~
Ryan Dearinger
Dwight Denman
Teresa Farrell
Theresa Gillis
Bill Grigsby
~~*Nicole Howard*~~
Nancy Knowles
John Knutson-Martin
Scott McConnell
Lee Ann McNerney
Michael O'Connor
Brian Sather
Michael Sell
Emily Sharratt
Amy Yielding

Guests: Sarah Witte, Lacy Carpillo, Nate Loew, Colleen Dunne Cascio, David Vande Pol, Peter Giesinger, Chris Burford, Luke Aldrich, Allen Evans, Sally Mielke, Doug Briney, Jeff Dense, Colleen Dunne-Cascio, Angie Evans, Chris McLaughlin,

NK	Call to order	Meeting called to order 3:17 PM	
	Agenda Review		
	Approval of minutes	Moved to next March meeting	
NK		Goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify sections of the draft constitution we could identify today, parts we could pull out, talk about and potentially vote separately? - One issue is FS apportionment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UC ran paper ballot on three different 	

		<p>apportionments for their makeup</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do we want to think about our own apportionment? - Based on # faculty, # tenured faculty, SCH, etc.? - Take action on apportionment at next meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JKM - I'd like to talk about rationale for choosing one of the numbers of colleges over the other. - CB - Are track changes on new draft showing what UC did differently? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NK - I had documents come in later than the agenda. - UC changes - UC apportionment and constitution of student affairs committee. - TF - COE and COB are used interchangeably, but they are in fact separate colleges. - NK - on some committees, COB and COE are represented equally, and other times COBE is represented by one person (either/or). 	
JD	CRC overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NK - CRC's stance is that they are done. Now FS works with what they've given us. <p>JD - I've undertaken all tasks with vigor based on what's best for EOU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I commend members of CRC: Jeff Carman, MJ HEather, Deanna, Daisy, and Doug Briney. ● JD - These are recommendations and recommendations one. FS and UC may make revisions, as it is their responsibility. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We conferred with each shared governance committee w/ regard to comm composition. The ability to hold regular meetings wasn't available bc we could only meet when CRC received feedback from committees. ● We need to get this done. In order to have a smooth transition and elections held in spring. CRC's view is all positions will be elected, starting from scratch. So there are process issues to consider moving forward. ● NK - can you speak to COB and COE standing committee apportionment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JD - Doug Briney received feedback from COBE and we were deferential to colleagues and their suggestions and desires. ● AY - Tracked changes document has tracked changes after changes were already made. Are these changes that UC made because it's different from the original constitution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JD - old changes were taken care of in 2015 (OUS references, institutional boards, etc.). Missing changes made related to student affairs 	

		<p>that don't appear in new document with tracked changes; student affairs changes too recent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● JD - Re: changes in preamble: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussing different interpretations of the charge of the committee. Language in original charge addresses housekeeping/amendments "in particular," and changes guided by documents at other institutions. Tried to clean up language related to BOT (which aren't mentioned in any OUS school constitutions). Illusion of redefining the power of the president or the deans, which isn't true. Housekeeping language is the same as before, only bulleted. 	
NK		<p>NK - further discussion about makeup of standing committees re: COB and COE?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TF - I just wanted clarification. ● NK - trying to protect COE and COB from assumed workload with fewer total faculty. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TF - I don't know how the rest of the faculty are understanding that or if they're aware of the proposed changes. ○ NK - when we come to vote in March, we can pull that out as an item and make an amendment if we want to. <p>NK - Constitutional changes being made by the library</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TG - changes the library is proposing doesn't involve increased representation or anything like that. ● TG - The constitution refers to librarians, which won't work for us any more, as the makeup of the library has changed; we have a person who is an admin professional who supervises other people, and she'd be represented by administrative professionals. ● TG - Replace "Librarian" with "Library faculty." ● TG - Other changes are makeup of Library Personnel committee and CPC, as we may not have enough tenured faculty librarians to do the work laid out in constitution. We've proposed a change in language to "one tenured librarian," and another person on the committee from another college, for example. ● TG - Also we don't have enough people to participate on the grievance committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AY - Is there an issue with tenure because you see tenured faculty as retiring soon? And there might be a gap? ○ TG - Yes, it's both. We're looking forward to retirements and we have classified staff who are not library faculty, and we may get more in the future. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SW - Point of clarification: Not all library staff are library faculty. Does the constitution not pertain to other employees of the library? ○ TG - Not when it comes to these standing committees. ○ SW - So just that section of the constitution? ○ TG - The language has an impact on us. For instance someone from the library staff who is an administrative professional wouldn't be eligible for serving on University Council. ○ SW - Just in those sections of the document pertaining to tenure and promotion ○ TG - ...and committee membership. ○ SW - Does the constitution not apply to all members of the library staff? ○ TG - Librarian applies to a lot of people but it wouldn't be entirely accurate in many places in this document. ○ CB - Grievance committee makeup is a good example of this: 2 admin professionals and 1 librarian, so there could be 2 library employees on the committee ○ SC - I went through the document and in every single instance it should be "Library faculty." ● SW - General remark: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I'm wondering if duties and responsibilities for personnel committees aren't better located in Processes and Procedure handbook? Why are we repeating info held elsewhere in another document? Language in handbook designates handoff from deans to committee, but language in constitution has it reversed. ○ CB - There is a hierarchy of documents. These are standing committees of university and they should all be there. Handbook language should reflect what's in the constitution, but it shouldn't be removed from the constitution. ● SW - In 5C the phrase "ineligible to serve on either college or library personnel committee if you're being considered for promotion" what's been added is "...and sabbatical." One doesn't necessarily know whether one is planning a sabbatical or whether one will get one. In those situations, can't member recuse themselves? Why this addition? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JD - I think we had a different understanding of the process re: CPC. Our understanding was CPC makes decisions about sabbaticals. There's nothing in policy that says you should recuse yourself or when you must, that's just a decision individuals make. You could be on CPC and 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ submit a sabbatical proposal and review ○ SW - Why not include summer stipend proposals? ○ JD - We did not think about that. ○ AY - CPC doesn't review summer stipend proposals. ○ SW - is that true? ○ Loew - I think the language is you get a separate committee to review stipend proposals. ○ Angie - Language might be in CBA? ● NK - It's sounding to me like decision process/recommendation process is moved outside CPC. In any situation where a decision being made is being made about you, you shouldn't be on the committee or you should recuse yourself. Are sabbaticals such that someone would choose to not be on a personnel committee because they're applying for sabbatical. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JKM - If someone were on a committee and their sabbatical application came up, they could recuse themselves from that decision, but they wouldn't to anticipate that and not be on the committee. ○ NK - Does there need to be language about recusal? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AY - I think the more appropriate language would be to include a line about recusal. ■ NK - I can draft a line for each reference about recusal. ○ NK - Operating under constitution language, the CPC recommendation was interfered with by the dean en route to FPC. Puts the dean in the position of contradicting the CPC or making them rewrite recommendations. Handbook language has prevented that. Should the language live in the constitution, making it harder to change? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CB- It should live in the constitution. ■ SW - is there a more general way to define it in the constitution: "It will follow the orders outlined in the P&P handbook," so there's no mistake about where you go for the specific protocol? ■ NK - If language in handbook now is important to integrity of the process, it belongs in constitution. Problems have arisen when things worked the opposite way. Const shouldn't point to handbook, it should be there. ● CB - Apportionment of U Grievance committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussed whether director of student affairs serves as an ex officio member of the committee? Would clarify that Colleen doesn't have a vote because of the role they play in the issues. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NK - Can the Grievance committee send language to that effect? ● NK - FS Apportionment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Straw poll resulted in vote favoring 4-4-3-3 ○ Reminder: when talking about apportionment, think philosophically about what do we want apportionment based on. Concern might be increased burden on COBE, w/ fewer tenure track positions. ○ JD - We did a data inquiry from college operations to determine TT faculty. Utilized those numbers to perform these calculations. ○ JKM - If you count fixed-term faculty... What sort of rationale do we want to use for apportionment? My opinion is that it's not adversarial, it's just a governing decision. ○ SW - One doesn't change the constitution very often. What underlies the changes? Equality? TT lines? # Faculty? SCH? If we choose the number now, it forecloses the possibility of getting smaller or getting bigger? Do we annually evaluate apportionment, or look at the principle for choosing apportionment? ○ JD - In looking at other governing bodies across the state, the issue you've raised as been addressed. OSU conducts reapportionment every 5 years. One senator for every 7 faculty. Reapportionment is written into their bylaws. ○ CB - It's important FS is big enough for people to be able to fill positions on ad hoc committees. Proposed models don't mention representation from disciplines. Part of this is about a diverse set of interests, not just a number from a particular college. 	
BREAK	BREAK	BREAK	
		<p>NK - Should we talk further about philosophy or numbers? My preference is to get something done, and talk numbers first.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TF - I think it's important to have equal voice. ● CB - I don't know what that means. When people identify their voice with their college, I don't know what that means. I don't see us as having one faction, especially in our college. ● TF - You're representing your constituents, the faculty that come from your college. Whether I'm representing divisions or whatever, that's who I'm representing. There needs to be a fairness about it. ● CB - But that assumes a uniformity of interests across 	

		<p>colleges. What does equality of voice mean?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AY - I have joined the 4-4-3-3 vote. When Cori is discussing diversity, the opinions aren't the same, but neither are the needs. I think that the colleges with more disciplines within them deserve more representation. ● CB - With changes in college structure, PAH moved colleges, with STM having 3 plus PAH. Education has 4, business has 2, and A&S has 6 seats among 10 programs. In 4-4-3-3 model, AHHS loses two seats with most programs and most TT faculty. What would rationale be for reducing representation? ● SW - The philosophizing around this might ... I think it might be healthy to not think about who can win at the table but who needs to be represented so that all of the colleges and their representatives are working together. We can count on these voices and when we need to send voices back to programs, the body can always do that. Does everyone have their voice heard at the table? The numbers game makes me a little uneasy. Sets up a tensions that doesn't need to be there. ● CB - It's important that once senators are elected, they're not bound to vote... You vote in best interest of the university. ● NK - One thing we could have is an at-large or several at-large positions. I've been opposed to that because we're still working on how to get your constituents connected to this group. We could have 4-4-3-3 plus one or two at-large? ● CB - Talking about equity, is that fixed-term faculty and adjuncts have a harder time participating and being represented. There needs to be a commitment from EOU to get them involved. ● JKM - Are we thinking of hte FS as US senate, or as a representative body? That's what we have to decide. ● DB - I didn't realize the split of CAS created an uneven split. Conversation might be 5-4-3-3. ● SC - I want it to be 4-4-4-4. If someone doesn't hold their own, that's on them, not an issue of numbering. ● JKM - To Cori's point of enough to form ad hoc committees, I agree with what Sean said. We could go 5-5-5-5. ● BG - 4-4-3-3 with an at-large or adding a fixed-term. ● NK - votes on next meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Apportionment first ○ Complete document vote ○ Any other contentious parts ● CB - Vote at college level? Is this document as a whole going to pass? ● NK - UC has done online straw polls with their members. We could do an online straw poll and bring those results 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>to the meeting. That would give teaching faculty an opportunity to vote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● JKM - If it's our duty as senators to gauge our constituents, we can do that in 2 weeks. I don't think we have to have votes in between. I'm in favor of a run-off vote. ● Burford - Multiple votes or ranked votes. 5 things to choose from, everyone gets 3 votes, and you can't double up. ● SC - I feel strongly that Fixed-term faculty have a permanent seat, as opposed to apportionment. 	
C Burford	Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Surprised committee's (CRC) work product addressed things other than apportionment questions. Wondering if I missed out on something. Compared changes to 2015 and this year's. ● SCOPE document was brought forward to shared governance in both instances. Neither was voted on and neither was brought forth in more than one meeting. Concerned about process at the meeting, and contacted the committee chair. I was interested in attending meetings of CRC, as I attended prior meetings in 2015. It'd provide a way for president's office and cabinet to know what is going on. ● I was never invited to a meeting and didn't know this was going on. I attended FS and UC meetings where materials presented (i.e., apportionments). ● In terms of other amendments (Article I, back of document - ad hoc committees, history of things) were unknown to me. ● Important that president's office and cabinet were involved, and have opportunity to bring forward ideas. ● Request is that for this round of decision making: focus on apportionment issues, what everyone knew was the subject of the CRC's work. If we want to have a discussion about other articles of the constitution, let's set up meetings and delineate the process. ● I would ask that changes to Article I, the back of the document, etc., — that people weren't aware were within the scope of this conversation—be deferred to a later time. ● CB - I don't understand why general counsel should have access to something the rest of the U community doesn't have access to. These were on FS agendas, with opportunity for people to engage in discussions. ● NK - My interest today is whether FS wants to pull some of the language and vote on it separately. These recommendations come from the CRC and FS can wish to pull them and vote on them separately. Would you like to do that for Article I and Article X? Or are we ok with 	

		<p>the document as a whole going forward?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SW - Where is it all going after it leaves FS? ○ NK - Process is described in constitution. FS votes, then UC votes on same document (if US and FS vote on different documents, we need to have a discussion about that)... Have a public forum for input following approval votes of FS and UC and before vote of Uni community. ○ SW - Where does it go? ○ NK - Article IX introduces action item forwarded (READING) <i>“If approved, the proposed amendment must be distributed to the electorate of the University Council at least two weeks of a regular academic term prior to voting. The election, which shall be conducted electronically, must take place during a regular academic term and must be conducted over at least a three-day period.”</i> ○ Burford - I was just told that there would be adequate time to talk about this later. But FS will vote at the next meeting, then it goes to UC for a vote at the same time, then it goes to a (Uni community) vote. Doesn't sound like enough time to either propose additional amendments or discuss merits of the amendments that haven't been discussed at this meeting. ○ NK - It doesn't look like FS wants to amend those things. Where are the amendments coming from? ○ SW - Describing a solipsistic system. It doesn't go anywhere, it's its own circle. ○ AY - Anyone could be here right now at our meeting. Those are the opportunities, people can attend, and there are public comment periods. ○ CB - Amending the constitution can be proposed at any time. It requires 50% of FS, 50% of UC, and 50% of electorate. ○ Burford - The issue is that if you have an orderly, deliberative, public process where people can participate appropriately, you can bring forth a package of changes all at one time, rather than on an frequent basis as amendments tumble through. My question is why does FS think that amendments scattered across the constitution is adequate. ○ NK - FS has indicated they do not want to pull those issues out separately to discuss or vote on them. ○ Burford - What does that mean then? ○ NK - It means we won't be voting on those issues separately, unless they tell me they want to. We 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>will vote on those issues as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Burford - I think that's the problem. I think the merits of those [changes?] need to be discussed and addressed. ○ BS - We will have a discussion during the vote. ○ TG - Re: new library language will be included in the draft to be voted on? ○ NK - Yes. 	
	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● JKM - I'm fine with voting on changes all at once, and apportionment separately. 	
	Good of the order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Talk about OPM at next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CB - Ad-hoc committee has met once. Need to identify list of information we need access to and questions people have to submit to administration. In order for entire campus community to engage in Pearson discussion, there's a lot of information we need to have. ○ CB - Need feedback by this Friday <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ BS - Who's the audience for questions? ■ CB - At the very least, the provost and the president ■ DB - ASEOU is meeting with Pearson next Monday or Tuesday. ■ CB - I've heard from non-faculty people who felt unable to discuss it in their employment situation. I'd like to reach out to the entire University community. ● 	
		Meeting adjourned at 5:15PM	

Minutes prepared by Michael Sell, 2-20-18

Minutes finalized by Michael Sell, 2-27-18