

PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY



FACULTY ASSEMBLY MEETING **Friday, December 9, 2016 – 4:00 p.m.** Rieke Science Center – Leraas Lecture Hall

Call to Order– Chair Gregson called 146 people to order at 4:04 pm for the regular December meeting.

Opening Prayer – Rev. Jen Rude, University Pastor, offered an opening prayer with a theme of “sometimes it just seems to be too much.”

Approval of Minutes – Minutes of the October 14, 2016 meeting were approved as distributed.

Question and Answer Period – President Krise received 3 questions prior to the meeting, and 1 from the floor. He responded to all questions.

- President Krise began by reading his memo to the faculty and Board of Regents calling for the formation of the Joint Committee for the Reduction or Reallocation of Force. This memo can be found on the President’s webpage: <https://www.plu.edu/president/protected-employee/working-group-proposals/>
- The President commented on the work of the Joint Committee. He emphasized that our current budget situation is not the same as it was in 1995; PLU is not in danger of ceasing to exist and we are expected to meet the current fiscal year operating budget. Rather, he said, the university is considering how to best position itself for the future. He said that establishing the Joint Committee is the formal mechanism to engage a strategic review of our academic programs that follows our faculty governance rules. The President emphasized the importance of transparency and assured the faculty that our collective process will see us through.
- The first question the President addressed was from the Campus Life Committee, seeking the president’s advice on coping in light of the post-election climate. He suggested giving ourselves “time out” from anxiety and work; seeking out PLU counseling center and campus ministry resources (for students, faculty, and staff); and taking advantage of the training and support available via requests to Student Life. Additionally, he was asked about the current status of BIRT and stated that it is currently functional as a documentation tool and the campus is learning how to best use it as a tool.
- The second question inquired about PLU becoming a “sanctuary campus” for undocumented students. The President responded by saying that PLU has several Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival students, that PLU stands in solidarity with marginalized peoples, and that PLU is taking action by not entering into voluntary agreements with ICE or other federal immigration agencies (and will only comply with these agencies if legally required to do so). The administration is exploring legal aid for undocumented students and methods for assisting any student deported in finishing their degree. This announcement was met with applause.
- The third question was regarding if selling real estate holdings could help the financial situation of the university. The President responded by saying that PLU does have certain real-estate

holdings (East Campus, the former golf course & Gonyea House) and several endowment properties, including houses in the neighborhood that produce some income for PLU. The administration is exploring options. Selling East Campus would require breaking a lease with the high school, although there might be some savings with property management. Selling the golf course land—while considered for future growth—might be short-sighted, although PLU is considering all options in light of the long-term opportunity costs and long-term fundraising and growth implications. With respect to Gonyea house, the president explained that it was endowed with the stipulation that it only be used as the President’s residence; therefore a sale of the property would pose difficulty since the donor’s wishes must be honored.

- Craig Fryhle (Chemistry) asked a question from the floor regarding enrollment targets with a follow-up question about whether there is consideration being given to strengthening programs or targeting certain markets. The President said that the university plans to return to previous enrollment goals and to maintain its philosophy of enrollment, rather than attempt to increase. He emphasized the need to make adjustments to the ways in which the university is bringing in students and efforts to retain students rather than continue our old habit of bringing in big first year classes to offset lower retention numbers

Unfinished Business:

- A. Andrea Munro (Chemistry), Governance Committee completed the third and final reading of a motion to revise the Faculty Bylaws, Article IV, Section 4B –.

Whereas, when the language in the Bylaws Article IV, Section 4B 12 & 13, was written, there were only faculty standing committees described in the Faculty Handbook;

Whereas, each member of the faculty standing committees is elected by the Faculty Assembly;

Whereas, the Faculty Handbook language describing the rules for ad hoc, standing, and joint committees should be clear; and

Whereas, a faculty member may serve in an elected position on a standing faculty committee while serving in an unelected position on a standing university committee;

Resolved, that the Faculty Bylaws, Article IV, Section 4B, be revised as presented in Attachment A.

Speaking to the Motion: [None]

MOTION PASSED

- B. Andrea Munro (Chemistry), Governance Committee completed the third and final reading of a motion to revise the description of the General Education Council in the Faculty Bylaws –
Whereas, the description of the General Education Council should be consistent throughout the Faculty Handbook;

Whereas, Faculty Assembly voted to revise the description of the General Education Council in Section II of the Faculty Handbook at the May 2016 meeting; and

Whereas, the description clarifies the relationship between the General Education Council and the Educational Policies Committee;

Resolved, that the Faculty Bylaws, Article IV, Section 5B1, be revised as presented in Attachment B.

Speaking to the Motion: [None]

MOTION PASSED

New Business:

- A. Amy Stewart-Mailhot (Library), Admission & Retention of Students Committee proposed a motion to approve December 2016 and January 2017 degree candidates –.

Resolved, that the Faculty Assembly approve the December 2016 and January 2017 degree candidates, pending completion of all requirements.

Speaking to the Motion: [None]

MOTION PASSED

- B. Amy Stewart-Mailhot (Library), Admission & Retention of Students Committee proposed a motion to revise the Academic Calendar Guidelines –

Whereas, research indicates that early, meaningful connections to faculty and staff are a key factor in retaining students;

Whereas, academic advising provides a required, ongoing opportunity for student interactions with a university representative;

Whereas, group academic advising meetings for new students are now held in the morning prior to Convocation;

Whereas, the annual Involvement Fair hosted by Student Involvement and Leadership is no longer held immediately following Convocation; and

Whereas, a later start time for Convocation will allow a later start time for academic advising meetings, likely improving attendance;

Resolved, that the Faculty Handbook, Section III, Part VII, Section 5, Part D, Section 2d, be updated as:

Convocation is held at ~~9:00AM~~ **10:00AM** on the first day of classes in Fall semester. If this falls on a Monday, classes resume at ~~11:15AM~~ **12:30PM**; if it falls on a Tuesday, classes resume at 11:50AM.

Speaking to the Motion: Amy Stewart-Mailhiot (Library)

MOTION PASSED

- C. Andrea Munro (Chemistry), Governance Committee presented a slate of nominations for special election to fill a vacancy on Educational Policies Committee –. Presented in Attachment C.

Speaking to the Motion: Andrea Munro (Chemistry)

- D. Bret Underwood (Physics), Educational Policies Committee presented a motion to recommend the nomination of Sidney Rittenberg for an honorary degree, as presented in Attachment D –

Resolved, that the faculty recommend to the president the nomination of Sidney Rittenberg for the honorary degree Doctor of Humane Letters, *honoris causa*.

Speaking to the Motion: Bret Underwood (Physics)

MOTION PASSED

- E. Keith Cooper (Philosophy), Educational Policies Committee presented a motion to delete the minor in Electrical Engineering –.

Whereas, the faculty recently approved elimination of the Computer Engineering major;

Whereas, the Electrical Engineering minor continues to use significant faculty resources in the Department of Computer Science that could be better devoted to its other majors and minors;

Whereas, most current Electrical Engineering minors have substantial overlap in their coursework with their Applied Physics or Computer Science majors; and

Whereas, all students currently on track in the minor will be accommodated;

Resolved, that the faculty recommend to the Board of Regents the elimination of the minor in Electrical Engineering.

Speaking to the Motion: Keith Cooper (Philosophy)

MOTION PASSED

- F. Chair Gregson announced that the motion to add a minor in Early Christian Studies was withdrawn.

- G. Keith Cooper (Philosophy), Educational Policies Committee presented a motion to add post-graduate certificates in Nursing – . .

Whereas, the Doctor of Nursing Practice program occasionally has openings arise following the first year of coursework;

Whereas, there are nurses already holding a master's or doctoral degree interested in qualifying as a nurse practitioner who are academically prepared to enter the program at that point; and

Whereas, maintaining a full cohort is both financially and educationally prudent;

Resolved, that the faculty recommend to the Board of Regents the addition of post-graduate certificates to the Family Nurse Practitioner and Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner concentrations in the DNP program. ACTION ITEM.

Speaking to the Motion: Keith Cooper (Philosophy), Sheila Smith (Nursing), Teri Woo (Nursing), Mary Moller (Nursing).

MOTION PASSED

- H. Amy Siegesmund (Biology), Faculty Affairs Committee, and Keith Cooper (Philosophy), Educational Policies Committee, proposed a motion to hold an Informal Discussion on faculty standing committee responses to our current budget issues. –

Resolved, that the faculty hold an Informal Discussion lasting no longer than 20 minutes regarding the collaboration of the Educational Policies, Faculty Affairs, and Rank and Tenure Committees in response to our current budget issues. Introductory remarks lasting no more than 10 minutes will be provided. Discussion to be led by Keith Cooper (Philosophy), Educational Policies Committee, and Amy Siegesmund (Biology), Faculty Affairs Committee, co-chairs of the combined committee.

Speaking to the Motion: [none]

MOTION PASSED

- Keith Cooper (Philosophy) provided historical perspective on the budget issues. He clarified the role of the Joint Committee versus the “Supercommittee” as they functioned in 1995 and 1993, respectively. Amy Siegesmund (Biology) introduced members of the newly-formed Faculty Joint Committee (who stood up), and described the relationship between the Joint Committee, President, and Board of Regents. Keith stated that faculty should take the lead in anything that has academic consequences and have priority in deciding what has academic consequences. Amy described how the Joint Committee will have two tasks at the present time: (1) to identify working group

recommendations related to the academic program and facilitate the process of review; and (2) to establish guidelines for the creation and review of academic unit proposals. The floor was then opened for discussion.

- Kirsten Christensen (Languages and Literatures) asked when we will expect to hear more news.
 - The first formal meeting of the FJC is next week; work will progress rapidly through spring with completion (initial recommendations) submitted by end of spring term.
 - It is hard to gauge timeline before they've met to establish guidelines.
 - The 1995 Faculty Joint Committee completed its work in May; faculty took action the next year to put recommendations in place.
- Katherine Wiley (Anthropology) asked about the role of Faculty Assembly in this process.
 - Faculty will vote on proposals that would normally come before the Faculty Assembly, such as recommendations for the elimination of programs (such as how the minor was just eliminated). The Board of Regents has the final decision on what happens.
- Tarka Wilcox (Geology) asked about the involvement of the proposed office of institutional research.
 - There is nothing preventing the use of this position in the process once we have such an office.
- Terry Bergeson (Dean of the School of Education & Kinesiology) asked a question to clarify the process of making decisions made at Faculty Assembly and then followed up with a question regarding what happens to recommendations that come out of the Joint Committee.
 - Majors/minors (elimination & creation): will go to Faculty Assembly for a vote and then to the Board of Regents for approval (usual process).
 - Faculty Assembly doesn't review all recommendations, just the ones that would be regular business. For example, Faculty Assembly doesn't normally approve personnel decisions.
- Doug Oakman (Religion) asked whether the values of the institution and its mission will be reflected in the work of the Joint Committee.
 - The Joint Committee has not had a conversation yet, but the plan is to come up with a set of guidelines for units to use when drafting proposals and relationship to the mission will be included.
- Joanne Lisosky (Communication and Theatre) asked about the recommendations of working groups and how people could make further comments, suggestions, etc.
 - President Krise responded that President's Council will continue to process the recommendations of the working groups related to non-academic recommendations and hopes that they will also be kept current on recommendations from the Joint Committee.
 - Joanna Gregson (Sociology and Faculty Chair) commented that the Faculty Executive Committee is reviewing the recommendations that are relevant to faculty standing committees and that there will be a new email address for sending comments and suggestions.

- Cameron Bennett (Dean of School of Arts and Communication) commented that the Faculty Handbook is “less than clear” in some places related to the work of the Joint Committee and asked about the definition of “non-tenured” faculty and asked if the Joint Committee will provide an interpretation of this language.
 - The Governance Committee has provided an interpretation of “non-tenured faculty” and there is a plan to consult with university attorneys
 - Andrea Munro (Chemistry; Chair of Governance) explained that most of the section on pages 97-100 speaks about tenured faculty, except “E.” She said Governance’s position is that “non-tenured” encompasses untenured, tenure-eligible faculty and possibly full-time contingent faculty with multi-year contracts. Governance was guided by other language in the Handbook where “non-tenured” applies to people who would receive a terminal contract when released vs. those who would not.)
- Samuel Torvend (Religion) asked whether Faculty would ever be apprised of decisions that affect the rest of the university (non-academic).
 - Allan Belton (Vice President of Finance and Administration) responded yes. His office was creating a spreadsheet that will track all proposals across the university, whether or not there is money attached. Eventually, this spreadsheet will include savings for current and future fiscal years. It will be available to all for review soon.
- Neal Yakelis (Chemistry) asked about transparency and the degree to which faculty will be informed about the work of the Joint Committee.
 - Keith Cooper stated that the Joint Committee from 1995 was committed to err on the side of early disclosure.
- Sheila Smith (Nursing) advocated transparency and avenues for additional input. She asked if the Joint Committee had been asked to meet a specific fiscal target
 - Allan Belton (Vice President of Finance and Administration) stated that the Joint Committee has not been tasked with meeting a specific fiscal target. He reiterated that we are going about this differently than the past, making smarter decisions so that we have a stronger financial situation and need not repeat this process again in 2035.

Announcements and Communications:

A. Fall Grades – Kevin Berg, Registrar

Kevin reminded Faculty that Fall 2016 grades are due by Friday December 23 at 5 pm and that our goal is to break our record of 97% on-time completion.

B. Human Participants Review Board and Student-Faculty Research – Christine Hansvick (Psychology), HPRB Chair

In relation to the Undergraduate Research Symposium on April 8, 2017, Christine reminded Faculty that HPRB approval is necessary for research with human subjects that is going to be

presented publically, and this needs to happen before data is collected. Questions can be addressed to the local unit HPRB Designate, and information is available at www.plu.edu/hprb.

C. Board of Regents Report – Neal Yakelis (Chemistry), Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents

Neal described the Board’s engagement with the Capital Campaign; the student group, a conversation the regents had with the student group “the collective”; the December 3 conversation over coffee with 48 faculty members who were invited to talk one-on-one with a regent; and the importance of shared governance in tackling ongoing budget related issues.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:31 pm, following a congratulatory round of applause in celebration of Christine Hansvick’s last day of teaching after a 40-year career and 38 years of service to the university.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jordan Levy
Faculty Secretary