1. Call to Order: 3:03 pm

1.1 Introductory Remarks – Senate President Chris Sinclair

President Sinclair welcomed the many students attending the meeting and said senators are very interested in listening to what they have to say. He stressed that we are all part of the same family here at the UO.

**Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) vs. Policy:** Policies, Sinclair said, are the formally-adopted rules that we all must follow while SOPs are recommended procedures for handling particular situations. They don’t have the same status or force as policies. In many cases, Sinclair noted, the university has both policies and SOPs dealing with the same issue. The UO may prefer that campus community members follow published SOPs, he said, but we aren’t required to. As an example, Sinclair cited the administration’s proposal last year to establish a time, place, and manner policy about speech on campus. This did not occur, but the administration went ahead and posted on its website some of its preferences in this area as SOPs. Sinclair said people are free to follow these SOPs if they want to, but it is not a violation of UO policy not to do so. Sinclair also mentioned a recent example involving university-published SOPs for investigating allegations of sexual misconduct. When the university was questioned for not following them precisely, UO President Schill noted that they were SOPS, not policies, so this allowed the university to treat them as guidelines and use its discretion in how closely it followed them.

**Student Conduct Committee:** Sinclair pointed out that the Student Conduct Committee which advises the Student Conduct Director and the Board of Trustees on conduct-related matters has not been fully established, nor has it convened yet, this academic year. This is very concerning now that conduct charges and sanctions have been handed down, because of the protest at UO President Schill’s State of the University speech in October. Sinclair said efforts are being made to get this committee functioning properly and he is determined that the university will not let this situation occur again in the future.

1.2 Remarks – Scott Pratt, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Provost Jayanth Banavar recently merged the Provost’s Office with Academic Affairs and reorganized its administrative structure. There are now three basic components to the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs (OPAA), Pratt said. They are:
- **Provost Operations**: Led by Associate Vice President for Academic Administration and Chief of Staff Melanie Muenzer. This group handles OPAA operations, manages various OPAA projects and issues, and coordinates Student Success efforts.

- **Academic Operations**: Led by Executive Vice Provost for Academic Operations Brad Shelton. This group is in charge of budgeting, institutional research, graduate employee funding, and coordination of the Institutional Hiring Plan.

- **Academic Affairs**: Led by Scott Pratt. This group is responsible for faculty reviews, shared governance, labor relations with United Academics, curriculum issues, academic policies, and programs that foster faculty success.

Scott also detailed many of the specific program areas within each of these branches of the OPAA and noted the administrators involved. The overarching goal for OPAA, Pratt said, is to “promote faculty success through programming, review processes, use of metrics, clear, timely, recorded decision-making, and effective shared governance.” He noted several of OPAA’s priorities, including supporting the work of the Senate’s Core Education Task Force; working with the Senate to improve teaching evaluations; working with units and the Division of Equity and Inclusion to implement diversity action plans; improving the efficiency and value of faculty reviews; working with units to improve tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review standards; and establishing a viable online education strategy. Pratt emphasized the strong relationship OPAA has forged with Senate leadership and encouraged everyone to contact OPAA with their academic needs and concerns.

### 1.3 Remarks – Michael Schill, UO President

President Schill arrived at the meeting directly from the airport after returning from meetings in Washington, D.C. He warned that there are several pending bills in Congress and agency actions that could have serious negative consequences for higher education.

**House and Senate Tax Bills**: These bills are moving quickly and the UO and many universities are opposed to key provisions, such as repealing the exclusions and deductions currently available for student debt, taxing student tuition remissions, and eliminating the deduction for employer-provided education benefits granted to higher education employees. Raising the standard deduction will mean that fewer people will itemize their deductions, Schill noted, which will likely lead to less charitable giving since this is currently the only way to take charitable deductions on tax returns. Universities like the UO that license their logo would now have to pay taxes on the income generated. There is also a proposal to place a 1.4% excise tax on university endowments. As presently proposed, it would only apply to private universities with extremely large endowments, but these is great fear that, once enacted, this tax could easily be expanded.
Title IX Enforcement: Schill reported that one of his meetings featured a presentation by Candice Jackson, Acting Assistant Secretary for the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights. She talked about working through the backlog of pending cases and indicated that the current administration believes the DOE has been too intrusive in its enforcement of Title IX at universities.

Facilities and Administrative Costs (F&A) on Research Grants: F&A charges are how universities recover indirect costs associated with federal grants, Schill said. Currently, the UO’s F&A rate is about 30-40% on most grants. There is a proposal in Congress to limit F&A recovery to 10%, which would significantly impact the UO and all universities. In addition, Schill noted, research funding in general is being sharply reduced at numerous federal agencies.

Recent Anonymous $50 Million Gift to the UO: Schill also reported on how he intends to use some of money from funds from this recent gift. The only stipulation on the gift is that it is to be used to build academic excellence at the university, which means it can’t be spent on regular operating expenses. Schill has identified five projects so far: providing matching funds for endowed chairs when a department raises $1 million for that purpose; funding the Oregon Research Schools Network in the College of Education which will place UO faculty in 10 Oregon high schools in an effort to prepare more underrepresented students for success in higher education; establishing a Data Science degree program and expanding the use of big data to more academic fields; providing funds for the School of Journalism and Communications’ Media Center for Science and Technology which endeavors to increase the dissemination of fact-based science news; and contributing to the funding for the Black Cultural Center, so construction can begin next summer.

Finally, President Schill noted that he has no direct role in the student conduct process. That is the responsibility of the Division of Student Life, so he will not comment on the current process involving students who disrupted his State of the University speech last month. He said he is here today to hear what the UO Student Collective representatives have to say and will be scheduling a meeting in the future so he can hear more.

1.4 Remarks – UO Student Collective

Xander Berenstein (Biology/Mathematics, Undergraduate): Berenstein thanked the Senate for its willingness to hear from the UO Student Collective. He reported that the group would have a motion introduced later in the meeting, which, if passed, would put the Senate on record supporting four proposed actions: 1) End the unfair student conduct process and sanctions; 2) Stop reducing resources for marginalized students; 3) Denounce white supremacy; and 4) Urge UO President Schill to denounce white supremacy. Berenstein said the motion will be posted on the Senate website for discussion and vote at a later meeting and noted that the group had passed out an updated list of its demands.
Lola Loustaunau (Sociology, Graduate Employee): Loustaunau criticized the student conduct process as “targeted intimidation” and a way for the UO administration to avoid addressing the students’ demands. She said it was an administration effort to limit free speech much like the time, place, and manner policies that were proposed last school year. Loustaunau said the investigation leading to the conduct charges was very sloppy and pointed out that she was charged even though she didn’t attend the protest. All she did was check a box on social media saying she intended to be there, but once charged, she feels she now has to prove her innocence. Loustaunau said the university’s actions have caused the involved students much distress and will make it harder in the future for students to organize. She urged the UO administration to punish real violations, not student speech.

Nicholas Hayes (Humanities, Undergraduate): Hayes said he doesn’t feel safe on campus, because of the presence of white supremacy and the university’s refusal to address it. He pointed to violent incidents involving white supremacists in Charlottesville and Gainesville, the recent increase in hate crimes in the United States, and a variety of reports from the CIA, Homeland Security, and an undercover media group describing the expanded capacity for violence among white supremacist groups. Hayes said the UO must take these groups seriously and actively prevent them from coming onto campus or at least make them pay for the security required, if the UO is forced to give them access. Right now, Hayes said, it’s a variety of support organizations that are protecting students from these white supremacy groups, not the UOPD. He criticized the UO for allowing groups like the Genocide Awareness Project on campus, but then charging students with conduct code violations when they interrupt UO President Schill’s speech to point out the need to combat the violence and hatred such groups are promoting. Hayes urged the university to prioritize the safety and security of students.

Fama Gedi (Family and Human Services, Undergraduate): Gedi described an incident last school year involving a prayer group made up of women from the Muslim Student Association (MSA). The 10 or so women met weekly in an EMU room reserved for their religious observance throughout the year until May when they encountered a meditation group using the room. Gedi said a number of white men complained to the EMU that the MSA women were too loud and the EMU ruled that the women would no longer have access to the room without giving them an opportunity to explain the situation or contest the expulsion. Gedi said there is a lot of fear among Muslim students since the election of US President Trump, which is why this group has delayed raising objections about how the EMU treated them. Gedi urged the university to drop the student conduct charges and let the students get back to being students.

Manuel Mejia Gonzalez (Ethnic Studies, Undergraduate): Mejia Gonzalez said he came to the United States at 11 and has been living in the Eugene-Springfield area ever since. He transferred to the UO from Lane Community College where he earned honors and was active in student organizations. He noted that there is a much stronger connection between the LCC administration and its students than there is at the UO. Mejia Gonzalez said even with financial aid the UO is very expensive for lower income students like himself to attend. He and other student workers protested at Johnson Hall
last year about the very low pay they receive, the decision to charge student food
service workers for the meal they eat while working, and the fact that paychecks aren’t
always timely. Mejia Gonzalez said he testified at the Higher Education Coordinating
Commission (HECC) meeting last spring against the UO’s proposed large tuition
increase, because he felt it hurt low income students. He said it is wrong to punish
students who exercised their free speech rights at President Schill’s State of the
University speech when their actions merely caused some inconvenience, but did no
damage or actual harm.

Nicole Francisco (Ethnic Studies, Graduate Employee): Francisco teaches in Ethnic
Studies 101. She said their curriculum emphasizes the fact that it was student activism
that forced colleges to recognize the situation of ethnic students. Francisco noted that
one of the demands of the Black Student Task Force two years ago was to make Ethnic
Studies 101 a requirement for all undergraduates, but this has not occurred. In fact, she
pointed out, the cap on Ethnic Studies 101 enrollment was dropped this year from 200
to 150 students. Francisco stated that there are fewer black students at the UO now
than there were 50 years ago and she said funding and staffing for LGBTQ programs
has been reduced.

Charlie Landeros (Planning, Public Policy, and Management, Undergraduate): Landeros
said there is more involved here than a student protest; it’s really all about what kind of
school the UO intends to be. He said most faculty and senators have a platform of
privilege and at some point we will all be held accountable for our actions. Landeros
said we don’t have the luxury of remaining neutral in the debate; we must act. The UO
Student Collective, he said, is fighting for our future, the right to protest, and even the
right to exist. The UO administration is not willing to give up any power, he said, which
is why we need public resistance. Landeros called for an end to the current student
court process.

2. Approval of Minutes:

2.1 November 1, 2017 – Senator Chris Phillips said he has several changes to suggest.
Because of the crowded agenda, President Sinclair asked Phillips to send his proposed
changes to the Senate Executive Coordinator for review. No action will be taken on the
November 1 minutes until the next Senate meeting.

4. New Business and Reports

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

Sinclair reported that efforts had been made to address the two main concerns that
came up in Senate discussion two weeks ago. The motion text has been revised to
include independent reviews for expedited tenure candidates. Some research was done
into if and how comparator institutions deal with expedited tenure, he said, and the
results were all over the map. Botvinnik urged senators to support the revised motion.
Senator Chris Murray said his review of the comparator data suggested that many of the schools have expedited tenure review processes that look a great deal like their regular review processes, in that they include department and college level reviews. Senator Ed Davis noted that, in order to access the expedited process, the proposed UO policy requires both that a department first offer the candidate a full professorship and that the dean support that offer.

Senator Colin Koopman asked why his proposed revision in Section 2.6 was not included in the new text. It would make the list of materials candidates for expedited tenure “should generally” provide mandatory. Executive Vice Provost Pratt apologized and said that Koopman’s language was supposed to have been added to the revised text.

One senator asked if it was likely that enough faculty members would volunteer for service on the Expedited Tenure Review Committee (ETRC) and was assured that this would be the case. Another senator who is concerned that the ETRC have sufficient time to thoughtfully consider candidates asked if there is an anticipated timeline for handling these reviews. Botvinnik responded that it’s hard to identify such a timeline, since each case is unique and response times from references and independent reviewers will vary.

A senator asked how the proposed expedited tenure process will work in conjunction with the Institutional Hiring Plan (IHP) and whether the IHP might be used to filter those candidates who are considered for expedited tenure review. Provost Banavar said all potential faculty hires will be treated fairly on the basis of academic excellence. He said there will be no screening that prevents potential expedited tenure cases from reaching his office. Banavar said he is ready to talk with anyone who has concerns about the IHP or the expedited tenure review process.

Sinclair said it appeared the Senate wasn’t ready yet to vote on this motion, so he postponed consideration until the next Senate meeting on November 29. He said an updated version of the motion would be posted on the Senate website by next week. Sinclair did, however, ask for a straw poll of senators to gauge how people were approaching the matter. Results were: 21 – Yes; 2 – No; and 15 – Undecided.

4.2 Vote: US 17/18-04: “Confirmation of Committee on Committees Members” – Vice President Bill Harbaugh

Harbaugh explained that a lot of effort recently has gone into recruiting people to serve on the Senate’s Committee on Committees. Getting this group up and running will help ensure that other Senate committees have all their positions filled and are able to perform their functions. The list of proposed committee members was displayed for senators and is posted on the Senate website.

Motion to approve the proposed members of the Senate’s Committee on Committees. Presented by: _______________. Second: _______________.

Vote: Unanimous – Yes. Moved/Seconded/Carried.

4.3 Report on Diversity Action Plans – Vice President Yvette Alex-Assensoh

Alex-Assensoh noted that Angela Wilhelms, Lesley-Anne Pittard, and Vickie DeRose will join her in making the presentation.

Alex-Assensoh said the goal of the unit diversity action plans (DAP) that are currently being reviewed and refined is to embed the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion into the fabric of the university. She wants to implement best practices from among our aspirational peers within the UO context. She expects there to be ongoing dialogue as the plans are updated over time. Alex-Assensoh then reviewed the DAP process and the leadership structure that is guiding the process. She said most plans are in the final stages of review and the DAP team is working with individual communities and departments to complete the process.

Angela Wilhelms, Secretary of the University, thanked senators and faculty for their participation. She described the three levels of review that all DAPs went through – Division of Equity and Inclusion, Review Team, and Final Review by Alex-Assensoh, Karen Ford (Divisional Dean for Humanities), and Wilhelms.

Lesley-Anne Pittard, Assistant Vice President for Campus and Community Engagement, reported that 35 academic and administrative DAPs were submitted and reviewed. Ten administrative DAPs were sent back for revisions and seven have been resubmitted. 22 academic DAPs were returned for revisions and two have been resubmitted; the rest are due by December 1. Three DAPs were reviewed jointly as academic and administrative; two of those have been revised and returned. The last one is due December 1. Pittard said she and others are available for consultation and hold drop-in hours for units every week.

Vickie DeRose, Professor – Chemistry and Biochemistry, described the seven working groups that are dealing with common themes raised by the various DAPs. These include implicit bias professional development; climate survey development and analytics; recruiting processes, outlets, and retention tools; professional development pilot projects; leadership succession planning; onboarding of new employees and supervisors; and evaluating existing workshops and professional development programs/gap analyses. DeRose reported that there is a great deal of interest and energy in these working groups, but they consist mostly of Officers of Administration. She urged more faculty to get involved.

Alex-Assensoh was asked what role classified staff has been able to play in developing and reviewing the DAPs. She said several classified staff were invited to participate in relevant roles and she offered to get those names to the questioner.

5. Open Discussion: None
6. Reports: None

7. Notice(s) of Motion: Arian Mobasser announced that he was introducing a motion on behalf of the UO Student Collective in support of the group, opposing white supremacy, and urging the UO to drop student conduct charges against those who participated in protesting at UO President Schill’s speech. The text is posted on the Senate website.

Vice President Harbaugh said he will be introducing a motion to establish a Senate consent calendar.

8. Other Business: None

9. Adjournment: 4:54 pm
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodora Ko Thompson</td>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Bryant</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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