

PACIFIC UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

for March 19, 2009

Revised by Carole Timpone, Chair

Draft not yet approved by Faculty Senate

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. by the Senate Chair, Carole Timpone.

Roll call.

Senators present: John Miller (Provost), Gail Aamodt, Mark Bailey, Dave Boersema, Jim Flory, Tiffany Boggis (for Linda Hunt), Nancy Henderson, Kevin Johnson, Jennifer Jordan, Shereen Khoja, James Lane, Rick London, John Medeiros, Mike Millard, Martha Rampton, Victor Rodriguez, Ed Alkaslassy (for Lori Rynd), Jeff Seward, Carole Timpone, Rick Whiteley, Lorne Yudcovitch

Via telephone from Eugene: Mark Szymanski

Senators absent: None (Mark Bailey left before the end of the meeting)

Guests present: John Hayes, Darlene Morgan, Bill Ray

Staff: Karla Staihar

Approval of the minutes.

Minutes of February 26, 2009 meeting were approved unanimously without correction.

University Committee reports.

Deferred to April meeting

Miscellaneous announcements and reminders.

The Chair reminded Senators whose terms are expiring that their units need to select replacements. She also noted that the Senate needs to elect a new Chair Elect at our April meeting and, following Senate practice, that person should be from one of the professional school faculties since next year's Chair will be from Arts and Sciences.

The Chair gave an update on UC action on the change to Chapter 2 that would permit the Faculty Senate to put items on the agenda of University Faculty meetings. The new language approved by the UC requires that the University Faculty chair must be given notice of such items at least 30 days prior to the meeting. The UC added language that would permit, at the discretion of the University chair, items to be placed on the agenda with less than 30 days notice (see attachment #1).

Three candidates for the Alumni Board have been nominated by their respective colleges: Dave Boersema from A&S, Fraser Horn from Optometry, and Tamara Tasker from the College of Health Professions. Mark Bailey reported that Education had not been clear that they should definitely nominate someone and promised to find a volunteer to serve from that college.

Discussion and Recommendation on Football Proposal, per the President's request.

Discussion of the role of the Senate and the decision-making process- The actual discussion of football was preceded by a set of exchanges of information and perspectives from the Senate officers and the Provost, about the process the Senate was engaged in at the request of the President and how it came to be in place. The Chair gave a history of her conversations with the President that culminated in his decision to go forward with the electronic referendum of University Faculty opinion (scheduled for March 30-April 2) and to solicit input from the University Council, the PUCC, the Staff Senate, and the Faculty Senate prior to March 30. She read the letter from the President to the Senate asking the Senate to provide him an analysis to "address the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and make a formal recommendation, reflecting the deliberation of the Senate," that would be sent, along with the electronic faculty vote and other materials, to the Board of Trustees for their consideration at their May meeting.

The Chair then reminded the Senate of the original intentions of our new governance system, stressing its commitment to deliberation, cooperation, and transparency. The Senate, in facing the challenges of its first full year of operation, needed to understand how difficult it is to change the culture of a large, complex organization. In that process, challenges will test the ability of the Senate to respond in a cooperative, constructive way or in a confrontational, destructive way. The Chair stressed that, to meet these challenges, it was important to remember that whatever the Senate decides is ultimately only an advisory opinion for the Board of Trustees, and the key to the Senate playing a successful role in governance is to take special care to respect and be respected by the main officials of the University administration. She urged the Senators to approach the discussion of football with these principles in mind.

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, a motion was made and seconded by Dave Boersema and Kevin Johnson for the Senate to approve a resolution; the final text of the resolution after a couple of friendly amendments by Rick London and Martha Rampton, which were accepted by the movers, was as follows:

Senate motion with respect to football BP-

"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."

After a brief discussion, the motion was put to a vote and passed by a 14-5 margin.

Senators voting for the motion: Dave Boersema, Nancy Henderson, Kevin Johnson, Shereen Khoja, James Lane, Rick London, John Medeiros, Martha Rampton, Victor Rodriguez, Ed Alkaslassy, Jeff Seward, Mark Szymanski, Rick Whiteley, Lorne Yudcovitch

Senators voting against the motion: Gail Aamodt, Jim Flory, Tiffany Boggis, Jennifer Jordan, Mike Millard

Senator absent for vote: Mark Bailey (who left prior to the making of the motion)

Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair at 6:35 p.m.

Attachment #1

Chapter 2: The Pacific University Governance System

2.6.3 All-University Faculty Meetings

The full University Faculty will have only two regular annual meetings – one at the fall conference in August and a second in early February. These meetings will be devoted primarily to community building, workshops and seminars for professional development, and broad ranging discussion of major issues and opportunities facing the University. They will also deal with any policy decisions formally referred or appealed to the full faculty from the Faculty Senate. However, if there are no such decisions pending that require a vote of the University Faculty and the administration feels no urgent need for a February faculty meeting, the February meeting will be cancelled. A special meeting of the full University Faculty may also be called by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty, via the faculty chairs, will determine dates for the faculty meetings in consultation with the deans and directors during the Fall of the previous academic year. Colleges will arrange schedules to enable all full-time faculty to attend each conference. Written notice of a faculty meeting together with an agenda must be submitted at least seven (7) days in advance of the meeting. ~~The Faculty Senate may place an item on the official agenda of the University Faculty Meeting by informing the Faculty Chair of that item, at least thirty days prior to the scheduled meeting. Within thirty days of the meeting, adding Faculty Senate or other items to the agenda is at the discretion of the Faculty Chair.~~

Deleted: can add business to

Deleted: Agenda

Deleted: business

Deleted: The Faculty Chair will then incorporate that business into the meeting agenda.

2.6.4 University Faculty Officers

1. The faculty will be chaired by one full-time member of the university faculty elected by the university faculty. That person will serve a term of one year.
 - a. The Faculty Chair will be responsible for officiating at university faculty meetings, sitting on the University Council as a voting member, organizing all-faculty meetings and conferences, facilitating communication between the administration and the university faculty with the Faculty Chair-Elect.
 - b. The position of University Faculty Chair will alternate between the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional programs
2. Each year the university faculty will elect a University Faculty Chair-Elect at the All Faculty Conference the year before the term of office begins. That person will serve a term of one year and after that one-year term will become University Faculty Chair.
 - a. The Chair-Elect will be responsible for taking minutes at university faculty meetings, maintaining the all-faculty list-serve, sitting on the University Council Steering Committee, sitting on the University Council as a voting member, organizing all faculty meetings and conferences and facilitating communication between the