

# **PACIFIC UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

**for May 14, 2009**

**Prepared by Kevin Johnson, Chair Elect**

**Approved by the Senate, August 27, 2009**

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m. by the Senate Chair, Carole Timpone.

## **Roll call.**

Senators present: Gail Aamodt, David Boersema, Tal Sanders (substituting for Jim Flory), Sandra Pelham-Foster (substituting for Linda Hunt), Nancy Henderson (substituting for Lynda Irons), Kevin Johnson, Jennifer Jordan, Shereen Khoja, James Lane, Rick London, John Medeiros, Mike Millard, Provost John Miller, Martha Rampton, Victor Rodriguez, Lori Rynd, Jeff Seward, Carole Timpone, Rick Whiteley, Lorne Yudcovitch

Senators present via telephone: Mark Bailey, Mark Szymanski

Guests: John Hayes, Jay Thomas

Staff: Karla Staihar

## **Approval of the minutes.**

David Boersema moved to approve the minutes of the April 23, 2009 meeting of the Senate. James Lane seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

## **University Committee reports.**

No committee reports were received.

## **Discussion Item: Curriculum and Standards Committee.**

The committee has not met this year, but plans to meet on May 19<sup>th</sup>. The committee needs revision in order to be more responsive to potential curriculum issues related to new programs. The Provost is currently serving as chair. However, the Provost expressed the opinion that the committee should be chaired by a faculty member. One option would be to separate curriculum from standards and create two committees. The duties and membership of the committee need to be reviewed. When considering changes to the curriculum and standards committee the process by which new programs are approved, as currently specified in chapter 6 section 3, should be reviewed as well: The current process requires that the curriculum committee first review the curricular component of a new program and pass its recommendations on to the Faculty Senate where the academic component of the program is reviewed and approved. Concurrently, the University Council may review and approve the non-academic components of the proposal. The final approval occurs at the Faculty Senate. The Provost expressed concern that once a new program reaches the committee it may take three to six months for approval and implementation of marketing. The Provost expressed the opinion that the committee's role in shared governance needs to be revised to allow flexibility and efficiency in approving new programs. In shared governance, the Faculty Senate must provide leadership and rely on the committee to examine the details. It is important for committee members to be able to attend meetings and spend time getting work done. It is challenging with so few faculty at Pacific relative to the level of representation on the Senate, University Council and committees. Review of the committee will begin this summer and it will be an agenda item in August. The bylaws do not specify an option for creating a task force to work over the summer. An ad hoc committee can be appointed.

Carole Timpone, Kevin Johnson, and Gail Aamodt are willing to be part of a group to review the Curriculum and Standards Committee. Linda Hunt may be available.

**Update from Presidential Search Committee.**

The new president will be announced Tuesday, May 19<sup>th</sup>.

**Approval of new Standing Committee members and announcement of newly elected Senators.**

Rebecca Schulte has been nominated to replace Mark Szymanski on the Honors and Awards Committee. David Boersema moved and Gail Aamodt seconded to approve the nomination. The motion was unanimously approved.

Nancy Neudauer has been elected to finish the remaining year of Shereen Khoja's senate term.

**Action Item: Revised Chapter 4 from the UPC**

In April the Faculty Senate received the Chapter 4 revisions from the University Personnel Committee and asked the UPC to consider additional revisions. The UPC submitted a sample page showing how verb tense will be corrected throughout the document (see attachment #1). James Lane moved and David Boersema seconded to approve Chapter 4 as amended by the UPC. Kevin Johnson moved to amend the proposed Chapter 4 text by deleting from page 36 the conclusion to 4.6.3.b and replacing it with "In addition to having peers comment on faculty work, colleges shall list for their respective disciplines items that may provide evidence of peer recognition of quality scholarly or creative work." James Lane and David Boersema accepted the friendly amendment. The UPC submitted an alternative conclusion to 4.6.3.: "In addition to having external peers comment on faculty work, the following items, by their nature, provide some examples of appropriate peer recognition and can be used as evidence of quality scholarly and creative work. This is not an exhaustive list:" would be replaced by "In addition to having external peers comment on faculty work, the following items, depending on the appropriateness to the program, may be used as evidence of quality scholarly and creative work. Colleges may determine how much importance to attach to each of these items. This is not an exhaustive list:" Kevin Johnson withdrew his motion. The Senate voted on the motion on the table: to approve Chapter 4 with the tense changes and the UPC amended language to 4.6.3.b. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Approval of University Degree Candidates for May 2009**

A list of the degree candidates for May 2009 was emailed to the Faculty Senate. Historically and by tradition the University Faculty in the past approved degree candidates at their May meeting. The Faculty Senate took over that responsibility last year. David Boersema moved and Martha Rampton seconded to approve the list, provided degree candidates have met all requirements. The motion was unanimously approved. The Senate will consider if it is appropriate for this body to approve degree candidates in the future. Procedurally it is the registrar's office that officially determines the list of students who have met degree requirements. Additionally the University holds additional commencement ceremonies without requesting faculty vote to approve the candidates. It may be more appropriate for the colleges to approve degree candidates. The Senate could give the responsibility of approving degree candidates to the colleges or not approve candidates at all. The Senate asked the Provost to research what requirements exist for approving degree candidates; perhaps it may be found in the Charter. Language at commencement will need to be changed to reflect any changes in procedure. A senator expressed the opinion that while the approval of graduates may be only a formality, it remains a faculty prerogative and responsibility to determine which students complete the requirements for a degree. This will be an agenda item in August.

### **Discussion for Presentation to Board of Trustees on Football Proposal**

Carole Timpone sent the Senate a summary of the Faculty Senate discussion of the football proposal (see attachment #2). The summary was sent to President Creighton and shared with the Board of Trustees. In April she asked for input on which areas she should emphasize in her presentation to the Board. There was not a consensus on which of the points should be presented to Board. The Chair feels that for football to succeed at Pacific buy-in of the faculty is the most important issue. The points on the list represent opinions of individual senators not the consensus of the Senate. The one thing the Senate voted on was the motion requesting the football issue be submitted to the regular governance process during the 2009/2010 academic year. The motion could be the focus of the discussion with the Board. Some senators felt the points are still important because they show the issues of concern that the Senate wants more time to discuss. The Board may have questions about the shared governance system and the full faculty vote. Send additional thoughts and comments to the Chair.

### **Faculty Senate Year in Review--Chair**

The Chair thanked the senators and said she thinks this group has done a good job. She presented a list of the Senate's accomplishments for the year and her recommendations for the coming year (see attachment #3). The Senate has accomplished a lot, but there are areas that need to be looked at more closely. The Chair attended the May University Council meeting. The University Council received proposed language for the creation of a Student Senate. The proposal will come to the Senate in the fall. The Students may not understand the process of approval. The proposal is for an undergraduate senate, not one senate encompassing graduate and undergraduate students. One suggestion proposed at the University Council was to have the Executive groups from the undergraduate and graduate bodies as the Student Senate. The students will continue to look at the proposal over the summer and come back in the fall.

This year Faculty senators are receiving new senator packets. The Chair recommends that all senators receive a packet and a training session in August. One issue this year has been senators having to wait for college meetings to get input from their constituencies. She would like senators to find other ways to poll their constituencies. Regarding the By-laws, the Senate rules and procedures need to be separated out from the Senate By-laws. Robert's Rules allow for rules (procedures) to be suspended but not bylaws. The timeline for minutes needs to be changed. The bylaws require minutes to be out by the Tuesday following the Senate meeting which is not possible. A Thursday deadline is more reasonable and will have minutes available prior to the regularly scheduled meeting of the Provost, Faculty Senate Chair and Chair-elect, as well as the meeting of the College of Arts and Sciences. Improving communication between governance bodies is a priority. The website has been improved, but the University Council website needs to be added to facilitate UC minutes getting out in time for the Senate to review. Governance meetings are staggered to allow for moving information. The agenda for both groups should be specific as to if something is to be received or voted on so the Senate Chair knows when to attend UC meetings. The Faculty Senate will meet in HPC in August and January. Chapter 2 of the University Handbook needs to be updated on the website. The changes approved last year were never posted to the website. Changes should be posted annually. The Chair recommended looking into the possibility for follow-through of Senate work over the summer. The Executive committee could meet during the summer to move things along in the fall. The Senate has provisions for emergency meetings during the summer, however, and may only consider information that has been received during the regular session; votes do not go into effect until fall. May meetings may need to be mandatory. There needs to be reform of University Council composition and function. The Senate needs more meaningful information about the budget. Carole Timpone is outgoing as Chair in August, but will continue as a senator for another year. The Senate thanked Carole for her leadership.

### **Provost/Vice Provost's Reports**

The Provost said it has been an honor working with the Faculty Senate. He arrived at Pacific with the advent of the new governance structure. A major part of his orientation to Pacific and its history has been getting to know faculty and leadership. He is looking forward to getting to know Kevin Johnson and has enjoyed working with Carole Timpone and Jeff Seward. The shared governance has strengths and opportunities for change and improvement. The Provost is committed to finding more time to spend with the University Council and Faculty Senate next year.

The Budget Advisory Committee will change the process for presenting Strategic Initiatives for next year to ensure more time to receive feedback. They will present the Strategic Initiatives in November or December and make that information accessible to those unable to attend via podcast. The presentation of the budget to the Board will be in March. Presentation to governance will take place in January or February. The Senate can request the BAC make an annual presentation to the Senate at a time that makes sense in the budget process.

The incoming Chair of the University Faculty is interested in finding the University Council's niche. An ad hoc committee has been put together to assess UC performance this year. Representatives from each constituency will be involved, including the founders of the shared governance system, to share what the original vision was. The committee members are:

- Convener- John Miller
- Administration- Eva Krebs
- Deans- Mark Ankeny
- Faculty Senate- Carole Timpone
- Graduate Students- TBA
- Staff Senate- Ralph Vasey or Bill Ray
- Undergraduate Students- Kathryn Watson
- University Faculty- Jay Thomas or Karl Citek, as outgoing Co-Chairs  
Chuck O'Connor, as incoming Chair
- Ex-Officio-Will O'Shea
- Administrative Assistant- Karla Staihar

Currently the Faculty Senate leader does not serve on the University Council. The University Faculty leadership role needs to be better defined. The Professional student group will be changing its name to reflect it is a senate. The committee will make recommendations to the UC in the fall.

### **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

### **Attachment #1**

Verb tense changes are highlighted in purple.

## **4.2 The Staffing of New and Vacant Positions**

Pacific University affirms that staffing of faculty positions is primarily a faculty responsibility and thus requires faculty participation and consent. The responsibility for initiating and directing the search for suitable candidates for faculty positions lies with the **appropriate** dean or **program** director. For all full-time appointments, search

committees ~~are~~ ~~will be~~ appointed by the ~~appropriate~~ dean or ~~program~~ director, with the approval of the ~~appropriate~~ college personnel committee, or in the case of Arts & Sciences, the College of Arts & Sciences Council (CASC).

Voting members of search committees ~~are~~ ~~will be~~ full-time faculty members, a majority of whom ~~are~~ ~~will be~~ tenured, tenure-track, extended-term-track, or extended-term, or in the case of programs that rely primarily on term contracts, relatively senior members of the faculty. Students may also be included as voting members of search committees as the faculty of the unit considers appropriate. Search committees ~~are to~~ ~~will~~ consider any candidates from within the University as well as from outside it and ~~are~~ ~~will be~~ responsible for selecting candidates and forwarding a recommendation to the ~~appropriate administrator~~ ~~dean or director~~ for appointment by the university President. In no case ~~shall~~ ~~will~~ ~~should~~ a candidate be hired or shifted to tenure-track status without approval of either a search committee or the ~~appropriate~~ personnel committee.

The search committee ~~may~~ ~~will~~ rely upon the ~~appropriate administrator~~ ~~office of the dean~~ ~~or director~~ for many of the details of the search, including advertising the availability of the post, the handling of correspondence with candidates, and the arranging of interviews.

The responsibility for initiating the hiring and selection of suitable candidates for part-time positions lies with the ~~appropriate~~ dean or ~~program~~ director. For each such appointment, the candidate ~~is~~ ~~will be~~ selected with the agreement of the faculty within the affected unit.

...

**4.4.1.e.** When a faculty member has appointments in more than one academic unit, the financial obligation ~~is~~ ~~will be~~ divided proportionately among the units according to FTE. The pay rate ~~is~~ ~~will be~~ determined by the salary schedules of the respective units.

**4.4.1.f.** Participation in faculty affairs ~~is~~ ~~will be~~ governed according to the rules of each academic unit where the faculty member holds an appointment. Normally, university service ~~is~~ ~~will be~~ conducted within the FTE of the primary appointment. Other arrangements must be specified by the appointment letter.

**4.4.1.h.** The terms and conditions of contracts for every appointment and reappointment must be stated in writing and ~~shall~~ ~~will~~ ~~must~~ be in the possession of both the University and the faculty member before the appointment commences. Subsequent extensions or modifications of a contract or job description and any special understanding must be stated in writing. Copies of any letters of appointment, reappointment, extension, or modification ~~will~~ ~~must~~ be given to the faculty member and ~~copies will~~ ~~must~~ be placed in the faculty member's open personnel file.

**Attachment #2**

March 30, 2009

Dear President Creighton:

The Faculty Senate discussed the Football Business Plan at its March 19th meeting to provide feedback, per your request, regarding the proposal's strengths and weaknesses and to make a formal recommendation, reflecting the deliberation of the Senate. The following is a summary of the results of that deliberation.

### **Discussion of the Business Plan for the football initiative-**

The Senate engaged in a wide-ranging discussion of the Business Plan (BP). Administration officials present had an opportunity to provide additional information or viewpoints in response to questions and concerns raised by Senators. The following is the list of concerns, areas identified as in need of further study and verification, and recommendations raised by individual Senators, as a result of these deliberations:

- The timeline moves too quickly, from first introducing the final proposal to the faculty in February 2009 to consideration by the Board of Trustees in May, to allow sufficient faculty study of the issues and needs to be extended to permit this study and deliberation.
- The BP does not make clear if the in-hand funds and pledges raised to date are sufficient to cover the \$1.5 million startup costs, described as one of the President's two "triggers" for deciding the football issue.
- Is there enough money allocated in the BP to provide adequate infrastructure support, both human and physical, that the program would require?
- Does the data reported in the BP with respect to gender ratios, injury summaries, women-only colleges and other details contain factual errors? Some have been found by the Senate. The Board of Trustees should undertake an accuracy check on their own or hire an outside consultant to review the data presented in the BP.
- The BP does not examine other possible ways of growing A&S enrollment.
- A primary goal of the BP is to improve gender balance in the A&S student body. Why doesn't the BP include a careful, substantial analysis of other possibilities, besides football, for addressing that issue?
- More study is needed regarding the assumption that gender imbalance is an issue that needs to be targeted.
- The BP proposes recruitment of male students that discriminates against women by focusing on a program that completely excludes women. Explore other programs such as computer science or engineering.
- The BP does not include any serious, systematic analysis of available professional literature to assess the risks of football with respect to Title

IX lawsuits and enforcement action, health risks to students involved in football, and the social/cultural impact of a football program on campus life. Has it also been reviewed by the Pacific University attorney?

- How urgent a priority is the creation of a football program? BP should include a discussion of what consequences would occur if football is not adopted or if the start of a football program is delayed by a year.
- Is there data about student opinion with respect to the BP for football?
- What positive or negative impacts would football have on the Forest Grove community and its relationship with Pacific University, especially in terms of impacts on parking, town culture, spirit of town?
- BP does not include enough analysis of why football was unsuccessful in the past at Pacific and how to prevent those same issues happening again.
- Current BP does not adequately address how much money might be lost in the program over five years if the program is unsuccessful. Dollar amount costs of a failed program need to be attached to a more fully fleshed out exit strategy.

In concluding these deliberations, the Faculty Senate passed the following motion:

"The Faculty Senate at this time is unable to arrive at an informed and independent judgment about the merits of the proposal to establish football at Pacific. We have heard and studied the basic arguments of both proponents and opponents but have had no real opportunity to gather the sort of information from administration officials and independent sources that would allow us to assess in a responsible way the competing claims that have been made. Both those of us who are sympathetic to the proposal and those of us who are not sympathetic to it have serious, unanswered questions about whether the impact of football will be positive or negative for University finances, Title IX compliance, the long term health of student participants in the sport, and/or the quality of campus culture and social life.

The Senate, therefore, has come to the following conclusion:

In light of the need for broader and fuller deliberation by the faculty and its representative body (the Faculty Senate), on the issue of reinstating football, we propose that the football issue be submitted to the regular governance process by the new administration during the 2009/2010 academic year. More specifically, we propose that the timeline in the Business Plan be altered so that the full campus community has the opportunity for greater deliberation on the issue of football during the Fall 2009 semester; with a final advisory recommendation from the Faculty Senate to the President by the end of February 2010, in time for a final decision by the Board of Trustees in March 2010."

May 14, 2009

## **The Faculty Senate Chair Report—First 1 ½ Years in Review**

### Accomplishments:

1. Established Senate By-laws Spring 2008; first revisions Fall 2008
2. Began the process of Review/Revision of Standing Committees that Report to the Senate
  - a. University Standards and Appeals Board
  - b. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
  - c. University Honors and Awards Committee
3. Deliberated/Approved Major and Minor Revisions to Chapter 2 in conjunction with the University Council, per the new governance process.
  - a. Staff Senate
  - b. Reconciliation of Chapter 2 with the addition of Faculty/Staff Senates
  - c. Placing items on the All University Faculty Meeting Agenda
4. Deliberated/Approved Revisions to Chapter 4
5. Discussed several Proposals in Progress
  - a. University Assessment Document
  - b. Conflict of Interest Document
  - c. Football Business Plan
6. Developed and maintained the Faculty Senate Web site, including password access Discussion Blackboard
7. Developed and filled the position of Administrative Aide to the Pacific University Governance
  - a. Improved timeliness of communications/minutes/posting to Web site, senate meeting set-up, retrieval and organization of materials from committees, and coordination between all governance bodies.
  - b. Creation of New Faculty Senator Packets

### Recommendations for the Coming Year:

1. New Senator training in governance process, responsibilities, and expectations to occur at the August Senate meeting. Senators, as elected representatives, are expected get organized with their constituencies at the College level to exchange information in a timely manner.
2. Annual By-law Review, as provided for in the By-laws, to occur at the August Senate meeting.
  - a. Recommend revision of the timeline for Minutes, that reflects process—Draft Minutes received by Chair-elect from Aide to Governance on Tuesday immediately following Thursday Senate; Reviewed/ revised by Chair-elect and received by Chair for final review prior to distribution by Wednesday; Draft Minutes posted to Web site and emailed to Senate members by Thursday, Noon, one week following senate meeting.
  - b. Recommend separation of rules and procedures from actual by-laws, so that the Senate can take advantage of options, as provided in Robert's Rules of Order, to set aside or suspend certain rules, when desirable, with 2/3 majority vote.
3. Improve communication and flow of documents between the UC and FS

- a. Further develop the Shared Governance Web site to include the UC, with its posted Agenda, Draft and Final Minutes, documents for consideration, etc., posted by Tuesday Noon, one week following UC meeting.
  - b. Agenda of both FS and UC to be detailed and specific enough so as to indicate if documents/proposals are ready to be received/voted on/in progress, or informational only. This will alert the officers of each body as to when to attend other governance body's meeting.
4. Continue to review and revise, as needed, the committees that report to the FS: (Curriculum and Standards Committee; University Personnel Committee)
  5. Discussion/approval of Student Senate (received by UC May 12<sup>th</sup>). This will also require further reconciliation of Chapter 2.
  6. Timely updating of the online University Handbook beginning this summer, then ongoing.
  7. Complete and update FS Web site with Bios, photos, descriptions, etc., over the summer.
  8. Plan to hold at least one senate meeting in Hillsboro each semester.
  9. Relook at possibilities for follow-through of Senate work over the summer months; possibly via an "Executive Committee." This would require revision of By-laws.

I would like to take this time to thank all the Senators, and Karla Staihar, Maggie Olivos, and Provost John Miller for their contributions to the progress the Faculty Senate has made and to the operation and success of our shared governance. Good work!

It has been an excellent and enriching experience working with all of you.

All the Best for the Future,  
Carole Timpone  
Faculty Senate Chair, outgoing