

Faculty Senate Minutes May 8, 2018

Willamette Room, Werner University Center

Primarily paperless, wou.edu/facultysenate

3 p.m.

Special meeting

- 1. Budget presentation, Rex Fuller, University President, and Jay Kenton, Interim Vice President for Finance & Administration
 - Stakeholder have certain rights and responsibilities
 - o Betting on employees to do right thing
 - o Everyone that works here has a stake in the community
 - o Right to know what's going on, right to be involved
 - VPFA conducted a burn rate analysis
 - o Found a surplus, not deficit as expected
 - o In the past, all surpluses transferred at end of year to various accounts including the university reserve
 - Current surplus a moving number
 - This end-of-year surplus is a one-time fund
 - Projecting to accrue about 4 million into reserves
 - Admin decided to make some one time investments with some of those funds
 - If there are reoccurring surpluses, there will be reoccurring investments
 - New Paradigm
 - o President Fuller's March 15th email
 - Link to 4 page document talking about budgeting process
 - Travel policies have been changed
 - o Starting with a decentralized budgeting process
 - Implementing a different way of managing—going from top-down to bottom-up
 - More focus on value-added work as opposed to multiple signatures
 - Better alignment of authority, responsibility, and accountability
 - Stakeholders have right to know
 - Transparency
 - WOU's current academic program mix not well aligned with State and societal needs
 - o By developing new programs, we can draw new students to WOU
 - o Need more STEM, business, health care, and other professional programs
 - Doing degree programs in Salem
 - Want to get to the point where can invest in development of students and programs
 - o Flexible degree paths; more innovative programs and pathways
 - Respond to needs of Gen Z, Working adults
 - Accessible and affordable options
 - 35% of Gen Z create businesses before graduate High School
 - Parallel: OSU had hardly any online programs 10 years ago
 - OSU online will generate \$100 million in online tuition in 2018
 - Future Financial Concerns
 - o PERS increases in 2019-2020 will be between \$1.5 and \$2 million and it is



expected to increase every biennium for the foreseeable future

- 26% increase the year after next
- Will happen every two years
- 3% tuition increase only generates 1.5 million
 - Just approved a 4.25% tuition increase
 - Will have \$400,000 in remission for students who can't afford tuition
 - In 2019-20, a 4% tuition increase will barely cover the PERS increase
- OPE rates could be 70% plus in ten years
- Enrollment
 - O Down about 950 students since peak, or over \$8 million in tuition alone
 - Seeing more competition for residents
 - o Flat high school graduation population
 - Need to increase participation rates
 - o Rate of decline has flattened out
- Affordability Index: Can students afford to go to college?
 - o Total cost of attendance/median family income
 - o Have to invest more dollars back into tuition packages into what students get
 - 40% of WOU students are on Western Promise on fixed tuition
- Tuition moderation is critical
 - o Remissions package as part of tuition increase
- New Budget Process 2018-19
 - Added transparency and consultation (UBC)
 - o Changing the manner in which budgets are managed
 - In past, units managed 20% of their budget
 - In future, 100%
 - Much depends on deans and how they choose to do business
 - o Salary savings are one-time savings
 - One-time funding
 - Could do professional development/training, equipment, start-up costs, etc.
- At end of March, \$1.8 million projected salary savings
 - o Number is still in play
- Future
 - Additional money to possibly reinvest
 - o \$2.4 million excess revenue
 - Is about \$3.3 million in new or reoccurring revenues
 - Have savings, saved about \$450 thousand a year
 - Bad debt reserve (don't need as much as we have, cut down)
 - o Spent some money
 - Talked to every division
 - Haven't changed student pay budget since 2007
 - Building base budgets that are more realistic around level of services as opposed to set dollars for student workers
 - Increased OPE rate and other S&S adjustments
 - o Certain things were not even in budget but now they are
 - Willamette Promise program
 - Child development center
 - Run a deficit in past



- Put money in to support it
- Resources are finite
 - o Not enough to cover everything everyone wants
 - o Haven't adjusted compensation yet
 - Contract negotiations are ongoing
 - Haven't dealt with PERS increases
 - Would like to set aside half of it each year
 - Budget in development
- UBC recommends consideration of approximately \$1 million of investments
- Question: Slide about salary savings, some departments have deficit?
 - Library has deficit
 - Means overspent, can happen for multiple reasons
- Slide: projected budget, almost 30% cut in S&S
 - Question: How is that justified, where is it coming from?
 - \$450 thousand for USSE used to be S&S, \$2 million for bad debt was S&S item
- Question: Self-imposed deadline of finalizing the budget? Projected final decision is when?
 - o Board meeting April 18th approved tuition
 - O July meeting: will approve budget
 - Gave budget committee the deadline of April
 - Month of May/end of spring term are fine tuning
 - Continuing to work on labor contract
 - A finalized budget will be presented at board meeting in July
- New Budget processes for 18-19
 - o Salary savings would be good source of funding for other things
 - Comment: Seems like there is potential for accountability/mismanagement issues
 - These are changes that occur within a budget year
 - Expect investments to be consultative and that achieve mission
 - Expecting decisions to be aligned with overall mission, goals, departments, stakeholders
- Comment: Faculty morale something urgent to consider
 - Question: How as divisions will we gain extra money? Sounds like right now will stay the same but with more responsibility and more costs
 - Want salary increases
 - Salary increases and OPE increases are centrally funded
 - Division won't have to find percent increase that is outcome of process
 - o Question: Will there be incremental salary increase for divisions' budget?
 - Yes
- Will do debrief on how it is working
- Send further questions to Adele



3:45 - 5 p.m.

Business Meeting

1. Call to order: 15:54

2. Call of the roll (by circulation of sign-in sheet): Adele Schepige; Bob Hautala; Camila Gabaldon; Chloe Hughes; Cornelia Paraskevas; Elisa Maroney; Erin Baumgartner; Ethan Mcmahan; Gavin Keulks; Greg Zobel; Jeff Templeton (For M Baltzley); Karen Haberman; Kathleen Connolly; Ken Carano; Kimberly Jensen; Kit Andrews; Laurie Burton; Marie Lejeune; Margaret Manoogian; Mark Van Steeter; Mary Harden; Matthew Nabity; Michael Phillips; Paul Disney; Scott Tighe; Sue Kunda; Thaddeus Shannon; Tom Kelly

3. Corrections to and approval of minutes from previous meeting

• Minutes approved as posted

4. Institutional Reports

- 4.1. Adele Schepige, Faculty Senate President
 - 4.1.1. 2018 2019 Faculty Senate Officer Elections
 - Greg Zobel as President
 - Breeann Flesch for Vice President
 - Stewart Baker as Secretary
 - 4.1.2. 2018 2019 IFS Senator and Senator At-Large Nominations
 - Tad Shannon willing to run again for IFS senator
 - Election in two weeks for IFS senator at large and senators at large
 - Senator At Large Nominations: Leigh Graziano, Emily Vala-Haynes

4.2. Rex Fuller, University President

No additional report today

- 4.3. Stephen Scheck, University Provost
 - Tomorrow Willamette room 330-5, Pastega award
 - Emeritus policy reviewed
 - o Will be up for re-examination in 2019
 - Self-Study evaluation for accelerated learning for Willamette promise submitted to HECC
 - o Will be on 6 year cycle for accelerated learning
 - Spring Dance Concert Thursday, Friday, and Saturday

5. Consideration of Old Business

- 5.1. BA/BS Proposal, BA/BS Task Force
 - Motion to table until Faculty Senate Meeting July 2018, to talk about further
 - Seconded
 - o 15 in favor
 - o 5 opposed
 - o 3 abstain



- Motion carries, tabled until July meeting
- Comment: Would like more time to find out how this aligns with accreditation standards
 - o Valuing second language was not held by all divisions
 - Would like more discussion or to see more evidence of that
- Comment: Curriculum fatigue at end of year
 - Would hate to pass to just pass it
 - o Still feels not all the way integrated
- Comment: Wondering if summer poses some complications and all new senators
 - Wondering if Fall would make more sense
- Comment: Respect need for everyone to get comfortable with what going to do
 - Having adopted new Gen. Ed, and having adopted removal of minor, and implied program reviews around 30/60/90 structure, if don't come up with BA and BS are, will move forward and definitions will be gone
 - No problem putting off a little while but caution against believing can push off indefinitely
 - Task force isn't going to keep meeting
 - If going to have discussions, need to figure out how to have discussions
- Comment: Gen. Ed not implemented until fall of 2019
 - o Plenty of time to have town hall meetings
- Comment: Do need to have time to think through more thoroughly
 - o If don't act, perhaps will be dictated?
 - Would hate for the senate to race in with a lot of uncertainty
 - Are some other things that could be fine-tuned
- Comment: Don't have a lot of time
 - o Pretty tight turn around in fall for curriculum proposals
 - Concerned with putting off
 - BA/BS task force has done a lot of work and created a very flexible system
- Comment: Slight proposal change to explain BA/BS depending on division
 - Don't see delaying is going to change a lot of what has already been established
- Comment: Just want more time to have thorough discussion
 - Whether or not major or minor changes is to be determined through thorough discussion
- Comment: Programs that are undergoing revision—if wait until fall, puts revision behind, too?
 - If we can wait until next division meeting (gives until June division meeting, vote in summer)
 - Gives time for programs undergoing division time
- Comment: A lot more questions than answers
 - Would like to think about making a decision on a hard deadline
 - If have deadline, maybe would solve some issues
 - Concern about timeliness
 - Would like to know how working through this
 - If just in divisions, don't have enough time or space to



work through

- Comment: Concerns if this is pushed to next academic year for how programs that undergo program revisions.
- Comment: Seems already have set definition for BA/BS
 - o BA/BS now has math requirements separate from LACC
 - Cannot go-exist
- Question: How much time was available when BA/BS was working on this, with feedback?
 - Task force started in December
 - o Has been working on for 6 months
 - After presentation in March, heard back from Creative Arts, Business, Teacher Education outside of own division and members of task force
 - Continued to hear back from those divisions
 - A lot of feedback incorporated
 - Seemed all members of task force departed with something sounding reasonable
- Comment: If all programs want to impose BA/BS requirements as own requirements, could keep old requirements
 - o Is time to do things
- Comment: A lot of objections to not tabling have to do with curricular revisions
 - o Which will not be implemented for over a year
 - If it has a hard deadline (Nov. 1), allows everyone to discuss further to extent, will still move forward with proposals before fall 2019 deadline
- Comment: November 1st deadline is not great
- Comment: Not everybody has a major that is housed entirely within own division
 - o Looking at using summer to do Gen. Ed
 - Not knowing BA/BS will be much harder
 - o Makes it challenging to plan, account for iimpacts
- Comment: Need to be doing this planning sooner rather than later
 - o Don't think more discussion is a bad thing
- Comment: Summer meeting, often have quorum problems
 - For the past four summers, have had no problem reaching quorum over summer
- Comment: Task force has completed charge and run out of funding
 - o Part of process should be deciding who is having the conversation
- Comment: This seems like a task that would be well placed with Academic Requirements Committee
 - Will bring idea to academic requirements committee to get response
- Comment: Some divisions may want to just tinker with, not change radically
 - o Some division may be ready, some may not be ready
 - Could just be little things
 - Could be things done in division meetings

6. Consideration of New Business

- 6.1. Faculty Senate committees' listings, proposed update, Executive Committee
 - Put committee pages in comparison document



- All other changes presented prior have already been implemented on Faculty Senate page
- Urge to read and take back to divisions
- For each change, for each committee, is now several bullet points for rationale
 - o Changes recommended at top
 - Removing all references to LACC, D,Q, and W
 - If want to see what looks like at draft page, is linked to faculty senate website
- Question: Can divisions choose to opt out of committee participation?
 - o That is the proposal, what happens already (unofficially)
 - o If division formally wants to opt out for year, quorum rep goes down
- Comment: On very first page: Is not advisable to assign new faculty or faculty on sabbaticals to curriculum heavy committees
 - o Isn't that advisable for all committees?
 - Maybe "new" faculty should be better defined
- Question: Was there a chance to speak with each committee chair?
 - o No, did not get chance to do that yet
- Comment: Could move from October 1st to first faculty senate meeting a year
 - o Comment: October 1st variable is weakness, could be tweaked
 - Honors committee are proposal heavy
 - Comment: Once fix October 1st, currently everyone can opt out—can just not show up
 - What if division wants to keep seat, but just not show up?
 - If miss all fall term meetings, do you keep the seat, or do you lose it?
 - If division decides not to send anyone, just need to know about it—everyone has a seat
 - o Comment: Don't want to suddenly have vacancies in committees
 - Is perhaps being overcomplicated a bit
- Comment: There are cases where knowing how many people are participating is important
 - Wouldn't say you're not interested in showing up for committee if you might be, but just didn't feel like it
- Comment: Talk about what committee does, looking at committee charge and purpose
 - Next step is looking at whether or not need committees
- Question: Are committee member and chair duties posted on website?
 - o Have been there for years
 - Most committee members show up and expect some type of orientation
- Comment: Seems to be a lot of organic committees
 - At next Faculty Senate meeting, will show what have found with other committees that don't show up on committees list
- Comment: By-laws
 - o Article 7, section 2
 - May need to activate a committee on Committees
 - Next step
- Question: If do committee on committees, are people okay with having information with secured privacy passed on to more people?



- o They have graphs; they don't need the individual data.
- Comment: This is a new proposal, more a question of process
 - Comment: This provides objective 3rd party review
 - Has to be procedural integrity in bylaws
 - O Comment: This is to have a set-up to function next year
 - Can't afford to have another dysfunctional year
 - Not trying to dismantle whole committee system
 - Very specific task to help get through next year
 - o Comment: This has flaws
 - Don't like the process by which this has come forth
 - Comment: Not trying to rush, not trying to check boxes
 - o Comment: Have objection based on procedural laws
 - Bylaws were disregarded
- Comment: Totally disagree, this was not a wholescale overhaul
 - o Just significant change to Honors committee
 - o Other committees are just summarizing what has already been stated
- Suggest issues should be worked out
 - Not necessarily the most productive place
- Add Honors to list of proposal heavy committees

7. Informational Presentations and Committee Reports

- 7.1. Advising Center Update, Jesse Poole, Student Success and Advising Interim Director
 - Office has gone through a lot of changes since September
 - o Former director took vice provost position at another campus
 - Name change
 - No longer Academic Advising and Learning Center
 - Now Student Success and Advising
 - Location Change to Advising Center (formerly Student Health and Counseling Center)
 - Tutoring is still in APSC
 - Conversations about trying to centralize
 - Sharing space with student enrichment program
 - Encourage students to come by center
 - Not just for trio student
 - Physical plant renovated space
 - o Computer lab with 9 computer stations
 - Staff break room now kitchen for students to use
 - Put up coffee bar and full fridge
 - New furniture
 - TV
 - Students can come in and study, can make coffee or store stuff in fridge
 - o Baby-step toward student success center
 - Extended hours in Student Success and Advising
 - o Changed operating hours from 8-7 Monday through Thursday
 - Office Mission has not changed
 - o Don't subscribe to transactional advising
 - Work with pre-nursing and exploratory students as well as transfer students
 - Work with students on academic warning or probation
 - Have student absence notification
 - Specifically for unforeseen circumstances where student was



unaware something was going to happen

- Success referrals—manage wolf connection system
- Official open house on Wednesday, May 16th at 11am
 - Will have hot dogs and building tour
- Working on helping increase academic advising across campus
 - Us and OIT are the only schools without University Academic Advising Council
 - Will be to help represent entire institution

Move to extend meeting to 5:15

- Seconded
- Unsure as to quorum at this point
- 7.2. Transfer Articulation Manual, Kristin Mauro, Transfer Specialist and Amy Clark, Registrar
- Provided in advance of meeting
 - o Hoping for feedback and questions of this document
 - Wanting endorsement from Faculty Senate
 - Have had vetting conversations
 - Next step to getting vetted on campus
- Page 3-5 of manual explains why need articulation manual
 - o Allows for follow-up
 - o Would also like to have this manual because it then goes into a queue
 - Would fill out, send, review would be done
 - If having a class impacting another department, would review to be sure departments talked
 - Decision would be made
 - Helps to coordinate entire process
- Struggled to get ducks in row
 - o Trying to create coordination academically and administratively

Meeting adjourned: 17:01

5 - 5:15 p.m.

Better Know a Colleague (informal gathering continued, optional)