

University Senate Meeting
Wednesday, November 1, 2017
3:00-5:00 pm
EMU – Crater Lake Rooms

Attendance can be found at the end of the minutes.

1. Call to Order: 3:04 pm

1.1 Introductory Remarks – Senate President Chris Sinclair

Consent Calendar: President Sinclair said he would be creating a consent calendar for dealing with UO policy actions relating to academic matters as the Policy Advisory Council (PAC) begins acting on more policy proposals. The idea is to group multiple non-controversial policy actions together and pass them as a group. Sinclair stressed that any senator could ask to have any item on the consent calendar removed and discussed on its own merits. Sinclair also noted that he will be submitting legislation to the Senate to formally establish a consent calendar.

Reports vs. Legislation: President Sinclair remarked that there would be several reports at today's meeting as there have been at the first two meetings, but noted that such reports often "foreground" upcoming legislation. He said the Senate is following the informal policy of having motions introduced at one meeting, discussing them at the next meeting, as we are doing today with the expedited tenure motion, and voting on them at a third meeting.

Free Speech and Student Protest: President Sinclair noted that the UO administration has decided to bring student conduct charges against 8-10 students who took part in the protest at UO President Schill's State of the University address on October 6. Sinclair reiterated his recommendation that the university not do so, since he considers the university community as all "part of the same family". Instead, Sinclair feels the administration should be doing more to make the protesters feel included. He suggested that the administration instead lay out its expectations for future conduct and work with the protesters to understand and address their concerns.

Expedited Tenure: President Sinclair offered his thoughts on the expedited tenure motion that will be up for discussion today. He supports the idea of making it easier to grant tenure to certain eminent people the UO may want to hire and feels the process proposed by the provost and Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) will remain faculty-driven. He noted that the UO president already has the power to unilaterally grant tenure, but neither President Schill nor the faculty wants him to exercise that power. Sinclair urged senators to work with the administration to develop a workable expedited tenure process.

1.2 Remarks – Jayanth Banavar, Provost

Honors Task Force Report: Provost Banavar commended the task force on its thorough and thoughtful report. He noted that the report is timely, because of the changes going on in the Clark Honors College as it conducts a search for a new dean. Banavar said he wants to assist the college in its efforts to provide more offerings for students interested in the natural sciences and will certainly include the larger faculty and Senate in those efforts.

Expedited Tenure: Provost Banavar said the UO is already at a competitive disadvantage in its efforts to attract the very top faculty, because of our limited resources, which is why he feels being able to expedite the tenure process will benefit us. He said the proposed process will still be faculty-driven and will maintain the same core principles we currently use in non-expedited cases. Banavar asked that anyone with concerns about the proposed process contact him directly.

2. Approval of Minutes:

2.1 October 18, 2017 – Senators offered no objections to or corrections of the minutes as currently posted, so President Sinclair declared them approved.

4. New Business and Reports

4.1 Discussion: US 17/18-02: “Expedited Tenure Process” – Boris Botvinnik

FPC Chair Boris Botvinnik briefly reviewed the proposed expedited process. He noted that the new Knight Campus will give the UO the opportunity to compete for some of the best faculty in the world and said the regular tenure process would not be “quite productive” in these kinds of cases. He noted that the trust level between the UO administration and the faculty has improved in recent years and suggested that if there are concerns with the proposed expedited process, they could be worked out.

Discussion: A senator asked why we hadn’t tried this sooner and wanted to know if we had lost anyone we had sought to hire, because we couldn’t offer them a quick tenure review. Botvinnik said in the past we haven’t had the resources to go after these top faculty. Scott Pratt, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, said he was not aware that we had lost anyone, but he knew that several people had been put in an uncomfortable position by the absence of an expedited process.

Several senators expressed concern that there was insufficient independent, external review in the expedited process. They noted that reference letters from colleagues selected by the candidate would not provide the same level of candor as contacts with independent reviewers, which could reveal problems with personal behavior that a focus on scholarship and productivity would miss. It was suggested that this could be done expeditiously by making phone calls to independent reviewers.

A senator asked if the candidate must already have tenure somewhere else to qualify for the UO's expedited process. Botvinnik said "No" and noted that there are Nobel Prize-winning researchers working at prominent universities without tenure whom the UO might want to hire, if they were interested in coming here.

A senator remarked that the FPC should be transparent and publish in its annual report to the Senate the names of everyone who goes through the expedited tenure process. He also urged that FPC members who are not on the proposed Expedited Tenure Review Committee (ETRC) be allowed to offer input on expedited tenure decisions.

One senator asked what safeguards exist to prevent misuse of this expedited tenure review process. Botvinnik said the basic safeguard is the fact that there will still be several levels of review – from the department, dean, and ETRC. Another senator said he trusted the current administration to use this expedited process, but noted that they will not always be in positions of authority here and urged senators to make the process as explicit and clear as possible, so there will be no misunderstandings in the future. He suggested changing the wording in 2.6 about materials the candidate "should" be asked to supply to "must include at a minimum". He also emphasized the importance of securing real external evaluations.

Several senators asked about expedited tenure practices at other universities and how their systems compare to what is being proposed here. They were concerned about "reinventing the wheel" and hoped to receive comparator data before the Senate vote. Provost Banavar noted that two places he's worked – Penn State and Maryland – both have expedited tenure review and that those systems work well. Sinclair pointed out that the ETRC retains the right to require expedited tenure candidates to go through the regular tenure review process, if they have any concerns about their tenure-worthiness.

One senator said the main interest here seems to be in attracting top-notch researchers, rather than top-notch teachers and stated that our current tenure review process already undervalues teaching. Botvinnik respectfully disagreed and said teaching skills are already a key part of the FPC's discussions. He thus expects the ETRC would place a similar value on teaching.

A senator asked a series of questions that he would like addressed. These included: Has the proposed process been reviewed by a Senate Committee? What's the shortest length of time it has taken to grant tenure under our current system? Can this expedited process be inserted into the current tenure review policy, rather than existing as a separate policy? Why will this expedited policy only apply to full professors; we're talking not only about tenure, but also rank? It's not clearly stated that all members of the ETRC will also be members of the FPC. Will ETRC members receive a stipend, if they are asked to perform expedited tenure reviews during the summer?

President Sinclair urged anyone with suggestions for strengthening the proposed process to submit them to the Senate website or send them to him, so adjustments can be made before the vote on November 15.

4.2 Report on the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) – Dean W. Andrew Marcus

Dean W. Andrew Marcus said that, at the provost's direction, CAS leaders had spent part of the summer developing a vision statement for the college. He said they reviewed dozens from other institutions and found most of them long and incomprehensible. Instead, CAS has settled on a short, practical statement which posits that by 2020 CAS will become a national leader in developing collaborative, interdisciplinary approaches to address major social concerns and in providing groundbreaking programs for success in the liberal arts.

To accomplish this mission, Marcus said CAS will be pursuing three basic strategies – targeted faculty hiring, increased philanthropic support for research, and radically reimagining the curriculum. Marcus also highlighted some of the positive developments in CAS in recent years, such as cutting its deficit, improving science labs, increasing fundraising, changing its administrative structures, expanding student advising, and strengthening programs in the Humanities.

4.3 Report from the Honors Task Force – Jeremy Piger and Josh Snodgrass

Jeremy Piger described the task force and its work. This was a joint Senate and Provost's Office undertaking and the task force included administrators, faculty, and students. It was charged with assessing the current landscape of honors at the UO and imagining what it ought to look like. The group met during April and May 2017 and its report is posted on the Senate website.

The UO has three forms of honors – Latin honors, department and college honors, and the Clark Honors College. Among the colleges, CAS, LCB, SOJC, and COD award honors, but COE and SOMD do not. In reviewing data from 2013-16, the task force found that the level of honors awards remained stable with about 14% of students receiving some form of honors. 10% of students received Latin honors, 5% received department or college honors, and 3% of students received honors by way of graduating from the Clark Honors College.

The task force reached several conclusions, Piger said, including:

1) Honors are reasonably and appropriately rare at the UO; they go to the top performing students. Only 4% of the students receiving CHC, department or college honors don't also receive Latin honors.

2) The level of department and college honors over all programs ranges from about 3 – 10% of graduates. No individual unit is particularly high or low.

3) Honors requirements in the 35 department and college programs are similar to those in the Clark Honors College. Nearly all require both a high GPA and significant other work, such as a thesis, a research project, or extra coursework.

4) Those receiving department or college honors are clearly the top-performing non-Clark Honors College students. They earn Latin honors at the same rate as the

Clark Honors College students. Department and college honors programs are clearly needed to allow these non-Clark Honors College students to demonstrate their skills.

Josh Snodgrass reviewed the task force's recommendations:

1) They'd like to see more standardization among the department and college honors programs using a common set of guiding principles and tying honors more closely to the UO's research mission.

2) Those few department and college honors programs that award honors based solely on GPA should be eliminated or strengthened by adding further requirements.

3) Departments and colleges that don't currently offer honors programs should establish them, so their top-performing students can also receive honors.

4) Departments and colleges need to do a better job of communicating to students about the existence and requirements of their honors programs.

5) There should be a common document describing all honors programs that academic advisors can use.

6) There is no reason to expand pathways into the Clark Honors College for students who don't enter that program as freshmen.

7) More planning is needed to ensure that any growth of the Clark Honors College does not degrade the current student experience.

8) The UO needs to do more to support its top scholars, such as fostering undergraduate research and connecting faculty outside the Clark Honors College with CHC students.

9) There should be a central point for coordinating honors programs. This could be a task for a new Senate standing committee, the Undergraduate Council, the Provost's Office, or someone else.

One senator noted that students pursuing an honors designation often deal with a high level of stress and urged that more be done to help support them. Snodgrass said this was not part of the task force's charge, but acknowledged the legitimacy of the concern.

5. Open Discussion:

Several students representing the UO Student Collective attended the meeting and asked for an opportunity to speak about their concerns and the recent decision by the Student Conduct Office to bring charges against them.

Xander Berenstein (Biology/Mathematics): The UO administration is too optimistic about what life for students is like on campus. Lower income students have reduced access to an education, because of increasing tuition and the freshman live-on requirement.

The administration is ignoring the increasing presence of white supremacy on campus, including the posting of over 300 Nazi stickers the past year. It's especially troubling that the administration protects this kind of group's right to a platform based on free speech principles, but doesn't allow students who oppose them or administration policies the same kind of platform. For example, the administration tried to impose time, place, and

manner restrictions on speech activities last year. They also allowed Muslim students to be kicked out of their prayer space. Students like me have raised these issues with the UO administration, but we've been ignored, rejected, and condescended to, which is why we felt the need to take the stage at President Schill's State of the University speech.

Now the Student Conduct Office has brought about 10 of us up on conduct charges for disrupting President Schill's speech. If President Schill pre-recorded his speech, sent it out to campus by email, and got himself an op-ed piece in the New York Times, because of the disruption, was his right to free speech really violated? We're not trying to remove his platform; we want him to stop ignoring our demands. I had blocked off yesterday afternoon to do my homework, but instead I had to spend my time figuring out how to defend myself against student conduct charges.

Caroline Crisp (Philosophy): The UO Student Collective sent a letter to the New York Times in response to President Schill's op-ed piece, but they didn't print it, so Crisp read it. (See US 17/18 – 02 Resolution to Support the UO Student Collective: Related Documents.) She said students at the UO have no power, but they refuse to be ignored. The UO is focusing only on our means and not our message. Crisp said the UO is not "queer-friendly" and cited as an example the loss of staff support for the campus LGBTQ organization. When students protested this cut, President Schill met with the group, but left the meeting early before anything was resolved. She also criticized the Board of Trustees for ignoring student opposition to last year's initial 10.6% tuition increase for resident undergraduate students. Crisp said President Schill is refusing to meet with the UO Student Collective now that they have disrupted his speech.

President Sinclair announced that it was 5:00 pm and that Senate rules require djourning the meeting at this time.

Motion to suspend the rules and continue the meeting until the third and final student has an opportunity to speak. Presented by: Colin Koopman. Second: Jay Butler.

Vote on suspension of rules: Unanimous – Yes. Moved/Seconded/Carried.

Dan Fielding (Sociology, graduate student): This is not just a problem for students; the impacts on the university are much broader. Students are certainly concerned about the actions of President Schill, but they also believe the Board of Trustees is taking power away from the University Senate. They are asking senators to:

- 1) Defend the power of the Senate by taking power back from the administration and the Board of Trustees.
- 2) Make a personal commitment to this fight regardless of any potential risk to your careers. We need your help. We knew the university would find a way to punish us for our protest.

3) Focus on the real issues, the demands we've raised, not free speech. Most of our demands are simple and straight-forward. For example, why is the UO getting a \$50 million gift and still forcing a big tuition increase on students? Help us make the UO a safe and equitable place.

6. Reports: None

7. Notice(s) of Motion: President Sinclair announced earlier in the meeting that he would be presenting legislation to create a Senate consent calendar.

8. Other Business: None

9. Adjournment: 5:05 pm

Attendance:

University Senate Members – 2017-18				Date: November 1, 2017			
Senators	Pres	Abs	Exc	Senators	Pres	Abs	Exc
CAS – Natural Sciences				School of Music and Dance			
Elliot Berkman	X			Jack Boss			X
Ilya Bindeman	X			Toby Koenigsberg	X		
Hans Dreyer	X						
Jennifer Freyd	X			Clark Honors College			
Tom Greenbowe	X			Monique Balbuena	X		
Anthony Hornof			X				
Huaxin Lin	X			Other Academic Units			
Christopher Minson	X			Edward Davis	X		
N. Christopher Phillips	X						
				Librarians			
CAS – Social Sciences				Elizabeth Peterson			
Bill Harbaugh (Vice Pres.)	X			Lori Robare			X
Katie Meehan	X						
Madonna Moss			X	Officers of Administration			
Eileen Otis			X	Cheryl Ernst	X		
Mike Urbancic	X			Keith Frazee	X		
				Amanda Hatch(K.Bumgardner)			X
CAS – Humanities							
Lowell Bowditch	X			Students			
Cristina Calhoon	X			Luci Charlton	X		
Pedro Garcia-Caro	X			Cali Hodge	X		
Alison Groppe	X			Arian Mobasser	X		
Colin Koopman	X			Alexandra Pear	X		
Beata Stawarska			X	Keegan Williams-Thomas	X		
Alejandro Vallega		X					
David Wacks	X			Classified Staff			

				Theodora Ko Thompson	X		
College of Design				Terry McQuilkin	X		
Liska Chan	X			Valerie Mickelson (Jay Butler)			X
Laura Leete			X				
Richard Margerum	X			Career NTTF Research			
TBD				Greg Bryant	X		
College of Education				Academic Council Chair			
Beth Harn	X			Frances White	X		
Christopher Murray	X						
John Seeley	X			Ex-Officio			
				Chris Sinclair, Vice President	X		
Journalism and Comm.				Michael Schill, UO President	X		
Christopher Chavez	X			Jayanth Banavar, UO Provost	X		
				Amy Schenk, ASUO President	X		
School of Law				Angela Wilhelms, St.Fac.Ex.Crd	X		
Susan Gary	X			Stephanie McGee, Parliamen.	X		
				Betina Lynn, Sen. Exec. Coord.	X		
College of Business				Kurt Willcox, Sen. Prog. Asst.	X		
Jennifer Ellis(Robin Clement)			X				
Ali Emami	X						

Guests: Mariann Hyland, Kyle Henley, Hannah Kanik, Jimmy Murray, Rob Kyr, Chuck Triplett, Sierra Dawson, John Bonine, Kevin Reed, Scott Pratt, Boris Botvinnik, Josh Snodgrass, Jeremy Piger, W. Andrew Marcus, Sierra Dawson, Michael Dreiling, Caroline Crisp, Trenten Meyer, Ellen Gardon, Lola Loustaunau, Xander Berenstein, Kyra Solis, Dan Fielding, Daniel Rosenberg, Aviva Kaye-Diamond, and Amira Borders.