

Faculty Senate Meeting

January 17, 2012

In attendance:

Carolyn Bloyed, Doug Briney, Frank Bushakra, Darren Dutto, Jeff Dense, David Drexler, Leandro Espinosa, Mary Fields (remote), Heidi Harris, Rebecca Hartman, Mike Heather, Chris Heidbrink, Colleen Johnson, John Knudson-Martin, Charles Lyons, Elwyn Martin, Mike Pierce (remote), Donna Rainboth.

Guests:

Steve Adkison, Karen Clay, Bob Davies, Sally Mielke, Dan Mielke, and John Thurber.

The meeting was called to order at 3:02.

Corrections were made to meeting minutes of November 29, 2012. Minutes were approved unanimously.

President's Update:

President Davies has made changes to the President's Cabinet to be more inclusive of the shared governance bodies and gather a variety of perspectives. The President indicated that this adds to the foundational goal of inclusion and helps shared governance entities examine the administrative and shared governance structure and the relationship between and among those bodies. Committee review is also taking place. The goal is to understand the role of each committee to ensure they are doing what they need to be doing. An additional overall question he asked is "How can the President and Provost help the shared governance process at EOU?"

The Oregon legislative session can last only 35 days and will center on two topics: the budget and policies and procedures that are non-controversial. Each leader can propose 2, each body 5. On Feb. 8, the revenue forecast comes out. Pres. Davies has heard comments that lead him to believe that the budget will be flat or have a slight dip. We have prepared for a 3% budget cut. If it is near there, we will be ok. We are in a strong position for a modest budget decrease. Pres. Davies thinks we are in a best possible position and that we need to execute our proposed changes. Only two university presidents, at the request of legislative leadership and OUS, will be directly involved with the session and they are Ed Ray (OSU) and Bob Davies. This access demonstrates that we are proactive and acting in the best interests of the state. This access will allow EOU access to legislators. In the last few months, Pres. Davies has been in contact with legislators, who have indicated that they are wanting to meet the needs of Eastern. Education is a priority for them. Pres. Davies remains encouraged and optimistic. Implementing the expanded President's Cabinet now is essential to operating in a fluid and dynamic environment.

Four issues that the state is paying close attention with relation to higher education to are:

- 1) Governance: Legislators would like a bill to have a task force on higher ed in Oregon.
- 2) Textbook prices: A push is at hand to legislate the prices of textbooks in Oregon.

- 3) Western Governor's University: There is possible movement to bring them more fully into Oregon.
- 4) Dealing with STEM, access and success: Are these successful?

Provost's Update:

Update on the Administrative Task Force: we will be sticking with the two dean model. EOU has contracted a firm to search for candidates for the CAS dean.. The BUS/ED faculty will decide about when the dean search will begin. The task force has met twice: once to clarify the charge, which is to clarify the dean searches with the \$250,000 in mind. The task force will continue to meet.

We will structure a search committee according to the constitution and will do through a nomination process. The search consultant will be on campus later this month to finalize the draft of the position or positions based on the constitution. The intent would be to have candidates on campus early spring term with a start date of July 1. Dense asked for clarification about constitution. Prov. Adkison indicated that the constitution specified five teaching faculty from CAS, one each from BUS and ED, one rep from DDE, and one student. The DDE will be someone from what was DDS. The remainder of the search committee will follow the constitutional requirements.

Prov. Adkison has been discussing with Pres. Davies how the Eastern Promise can become real instead of conceptual. They will meet on January 18 on V-Tel to discuss the Eastern Promise. Dan Milke has agreed to take a leadership role in Eastern Promise. Dan's experience with K-12 and dual enrollment will bring a history and a sense of continuity as the Eastern Promise develops this spring.

Scheduling and room adjustments for Winter and Spring have gone quite well thanks to the deans and the faculty and to Carolyn and Debbie in Registrar's office. Much work was done cleanly with few conflicts. Thanks to those individuals.

Prov. Adkison gave the bad news that in responding to concerns about online course evaluations, we made some changes that demotivated students from 57% response rate to 18%. What we have decided to do is open the online evaluations for weeks 9 and 10. They will close Sunday at 5:00 p.m. before finals week starts so that the evaluations don't affect finals. The Provost's Office will do a communications blitz with students. Those who complete online evaluation will see grades Tuesday at 1:00 p.m. after the term ends. If they don't complete the online evaluations, they will have to wait until Friday. Also, the Provost's Office will provide some incentive with random drawings for a dozen i-Pod shuffles. The goal is to get the response rate north of 50%, even if the instrument itself is still being worked on. Faculty need more feedback than they are currently receiving. Colleen Johnson asked what the change was that caused the change in response. Prov. Adkison said that they removed the early look at the grade. And there was some micommunication about when the online evaluations opened and when they closed. We want to make sure because of the changes to the probationary status and because of financial aid letters that grades are accurate. The wait until Tuesday will ensure accuracy. Students who have done their online evaluations will see them as soon as they are dispersed to financial aid. Or they have to wait three days until they can see them. The Provosts Office will provide templates for communicating with students in addition to doing a communication blitz so that everyone is aware of the changes.

Faculty/Staff Club: There will be a faculty lounge area in the Ackerman Alumni Lounge 4-7 Thursdays (5-7 on colloquium nights) beginning in a few weeks. Many people have talked about a place for people to talk and vent and listen and have a good time. We clearly need to, given the variety of problems, have a time to talk with the president and provost present.. The university will possibly provide some food and non-alcoholic beverages with a cash bar, initially. The first one should be within the next few weeks.

The provost indicated that some may have seen the email that went out to teaching faculty and Infoline about adjustments to the registration schedule. Early registration for online students will be removed and online students will register with on-campus students of the same class standing. Will need to closely watch to make sure that online students don't get closed out of online courses, but we need to register all students given our mix according to class standing. This will address a problem where on-campus students are getting closed out of classes that are only online and that they need for their programs. The new registration schedule will be watched for the possibility of unintended consequences.

Faculty hires and services: We have a state freeze on hiring. As of Jan 1, OUS is not a state agency, so technically it doesn't apply. The chancellor said to follow the hiring freeze in spirit. But it is clear that we can't freeze faculty hiring during higher enrollment. We will have increased scrutiny for hiring. EOU will have to articulate to the chancellor why the hire is a crucial need. In short, that hiring freeze does not and has not affected faculty hires, but it has put a decided chill on some staff positions. Don't anticipate any impact on faculty searches.

Leandro Espinosa asked about the details of the change to not being a state agency. Prov. Adkison indicated that the biggest implication is that the fund balance could not be swept by DAS. It can be swept by OUS, but that is not going to happen. The change also means to a certain degree that we have more self-determination over where we get our benefits. The flip side is that we have to manage our own risk and liability. We have more autonomy as a system and are less subject to across the board executive management.

Consent Agenda:

Mike Pierce requested to pull POLS 317. Consent agenda adopted.

Action Agenda:

Colleen Johnson asked about the public administration minor change at last EPCC meeting. Dense placed it on the consent agenda for the next meeting.

LIB 307 and LIB 327. The question was raised as to why LIB 307 was removed from general education last year and was re-introduced as a general education course this year. Karen Clay said that no changes had happened with the 307 course. The course was pulled from gen. ed. with the understanding that the criteria for gen. ed. would be more stringent than they anticipated. With the new criteria, they felt that the LIB 307 course would be fine. Sally Mielke said that when EPCC began the gen ed review, she looked at the requirements, and LIB 307 did not meet breadth requirement. She recommended pulling the course. That was last spring, before the other programs had the reviews. The rest of the programs sent information to EPCC, and at that time,

they were instructed that they were not reviewing courses with the breadth outcome. EPCC only reviewed with the general criteria. Because of that, as the library staff put through LIB 307 with encouragement of others, they looked into whether or not they would fit the criteria. They brought it back with rationale for including it in gen. ed.

The motion to approve the EPCC recommendation for LIB courses passed. Colleen Johnson abstained.

BUS/ECON deletion discussion. Sally Mielke framed the issue. The program deletion came forward to EPCC, and Dean Milke gave the rationale for recommending the program deletion. Sally said that the rationale is posted on the EPCC website. Steve Adkison said that either the senate could approve the EPCC action or send it back with questions; those are the only actions that can take place. We can move to either approve or return to EPCC.

Colleen Johnson argued for returning the recommendation to EPCC, referencing an email she sent to senators the previous day. She was concerned about the decision being based on inaccurate information. There are considerably more majors (70) than were recommended in the discussion at the EPCC, and the research she did indicated that there is no problem with the accreditation of the degree or regarding the titling of the degree. There is a clear assessment, which she completed, and she challenged the duplication charge, saying there is overlap but not necessarily duplication (citing overlap between business administration and public administration as evidence of overlap between other degrees). The last concern during the discussion for deletion was that the business faculty do not want to participate in an interdisciplinary program. In short, the decision seems to be based on inaccurate information and needs to go back to EPCC.

Charles Lyons said that he was unclear about the process for the elimination of a program. It seemed odd that an active program could be eliminated, particularly based on an EPCC vote. Steve Adkison indicated that the program was not in the sustainability plan, and it did go through academic review. The program list from which they built the sustainability plan came from the program assessment portfolio website. There is not nor has there ever been a portfolio assessment for the BUS/ECON program.

Jeff Dense referenced the EPCC handbook, which states that action items cannot go on the consent agenda. EPCC is guided by the handbook to bring program deletions up as an action item.

Steve Adkison said that current policy interacts with union contract article two, but those two are not sufficient. Jeff Dense will be looking at what other programs in the system are doing in terms of curricular process and will move forward with the discussion. Given the current policy, EPCC was within their bounds.

Dean Milke indicated that they posted a written rationale to the EPCC website that should be accessible and lays out the oral arguments from the EPCC meeting. He would argue that several points stated as hearsay are not accurate as to what was portrayed to the committee. The degree has not had a collegiate home and has not been assessed, evaluated, or had any oversight in over a decade. In the program reviews that were conducted last year, it scored among the lowest ratings of any programs on campus in relation to mission criticality and strength of the program. In discussions in BUS/ED, they asked "Why do we have a completely different degree that isn't really

within the college? And why do we need something that can be accomplished in at least three other ways?” He stated that the same outcomes could be attained through an economics minor and a business administration degree, through a liberal studies degree with business and economics minors, or a public administration degree with an economics minor. If one were to look at the difference between programs, the question arises as to why we need to perpetuate this degree. In the past it has been discussed, and no administration in COBA or CAS has taken the initiative to move to the point we are, so BUS took the initiative.

John Knudson-Martin asked a point of order for the discussion. Colleen was not aware that the EPCC would be discussing this, but she had other curricular items that were being discussed. She asked to postpone the items to later. She could not attend the meeting. She would have liked for the memo from the deans to go to EPCC. John clarified that Senate would be deciding whether or not the discussion at EPCC needs to be revisited. Rebecca Hartman said that she appreciates the Roberts Rules of Order, but until she read Colleen's email, she didn't understand the issue. Rebecca indicated that we seem to have conflicting information about the substance of the program, and she thinks it would be irresponsible to just rubber stamp the decision and instead would ask that it would be revisited.

Steve Adkison said that he agrees with Rebecca Hartman. If the Senate has questions, it has to go back with very specific process-focused questions so that EPCC doesn't have to reiterate its work, but rather discuss specific concerns and avoid a loop because a sub-set of senators doesn't want an issue to go through. Specific concerns need to be concretely articulated.

Colleen Johnson said there is a clear issue of numbers of majors in the program. The issue of accreditation needs to be resolved. The issue of administrative housing is an issue; it has had an administrative place for 15 years. However, nothing got done when it was housed in business. The program is under fire because it is ignored. One recommendation for EPCC would be where it could be housed. Jeff Dense recommended that we send it back with a specific set of process questions rather than a list of issues.

John Knudson-Martin summarized that Dean Milke had six issues, and Colleen seemed to counter those six. He would move that we send this back to EPCC to address these specific issues of fact and ask them to bring it back to us. **The motion was raised that the Faculty Senate send this back to EPCC to address the six issues that Dean Milke brought to our attention and that in part Colleen Johnson disputed for further consideration.** The motion was seconded.

Mike Pierce asked if we could discuss the issues at senate instead of sending it back to EPCC.. Donna Rainboth also asked if we needed to discuss it at senate, or if the senate would send the questions back to EPCC, who would just be reviewing the same questions as they previously had. Darren Dutto said that he reviewed the document and said that the points seem to be the same, but the two sides are arguing about the data. The question about sending it back is whether we are trying to resolve the differences. Two groups are using the same data and supporting separate points of view.

Chris Heidbrink asked about the data. He said that it seemed that the two bodies have different information to make a decision. There need to be specific questions that need to be addressed by EPCC. Jeff Dense asked whether the Faculty Senate could access institutional research. Steve Adkison said that EPCC could, but not necessarily the Faculty Senate.

John Knudson-Martin said that the EPCC could address the questions in our charge to them. Steve Adkison clarified that if EPCC has specific concerns to address that clarity would be forthcoming. Charles Lyons said that if the decision was based on inaccurate information, then it should be reconsidered. Frank Bushakra indicated that because it is elimination of a program, an additional discussion might be fruitful for adding additional information. Carolyn Bloyed said that EPCC will go back and argue the same thing. One question raised was, "Who will support the program and where it will go if it remains?" A decision needs to be made about what happens with the program if it is going to exist.

Doug Briney indicated what needs to be examined is whether is is a BUS degree and needs to have that name in it. Leandro Espinosa wanted to verify that the information presented from either side was true.

Chris Heidbrink asked that if it goes back for fact checking, would it open the rest of the issue up for discussion? Sally Mielke said that EPCC would address the six items presented in the motion. Steve Adkison said that if Senate sends it back to EPCC, EPCC would address the concerns indicated by the Senate and send it back with a recommendation. When and if the Senate recommends it move forward, then the Provost will ask a set of questions. EPCC cannot send it to a specific faculty member; the faculty has to request it of the Provost. His signature means that all questions have been asked and considerations have been made and the larger faculty is happy. Dean Mielke wants to address information pertaining to the motion. First, he apologized to Colleen. The items were on the agenda, and they assumed that she knew about the item taking place. Sally indicated that she did not notify Colleen and should have. Dean Milke has a disagreement about the affects of a number of degrees and accreditation with IBAC. There are almost the same amount of credits, short one, between that degree and administration degree. They addressed the issue of oversight, which is on record on the Provost's page as having not been recorded or assessed. BUS believes that it is a duplication of what is already being done or can be done. They do not dispute the statistics in enrollment. But the feeling is not in relation to the number of majors but where we could better utilize our resources within other programs on campus. There have been numerous discussions about this degree and the various college administrations have not done anything. BUS made the decision to move forward. The data are the same. The perspectives are just not the same.

Rebecca Hartman indicated that she appreciated the reiteration of the issues, but she is not clear that Faculty Senate is the place for the discussion. She said that the Senate is simply saying that the decision to delete the program is not clear and that we want to send it back to EPCC to clarify those issues. It does not seem to be simply rehashing. Perhaps communication needs to be clarified between parties before it came to Faculty Senate.

Dean Milke said that he happens to believe that the information was here; if the senate is not prepared, then the motion is not appropriate. But if the Senate is concerned because of due diligence, then the recommendation should move forward.

Questions were called The vote was 11 in favor (Knudson-Martin, Frank Bushakra, Doug Briney, Rebecca Hartman, Mike Heather, Colleen Johnson, Chris Heidbrink, Leandro Espinosa, David Drexker, Charles Lyons, Elwyn Martin). Two were opposed (Mike Pierce, Darren Dutto). Four abstentions (Heidi Harris, Donna Rainboth, Carolyn Bloyed, Jeff Dense)

Dense asked about the EPCC schedule. Sally said that the item should be able to be addressed next week.

University Council report.

Elwyn Martin indicated that the list presented in the last meeting is being considered as a work in process. Anna Maria Dill was reaching out to others to address some of the issues. A significant portion of the last meeting was taken up with conveying things that Pres. Davies already addressed in his update. Camille Consolvo proposed a "tracking form" to keep track of items that have been approved in meetings. An item will get approved but moves on and no one understands what happens to various proposals. The form would indicate what a committee has approved and where it needs to go next. The idea is informal, but the UC recognized that a better idea might be to employ a website updated by a single person that could be covered by that person. Rebecca Hartman asked what plans University Council had for moving forward. Elwyn indicated that the evaluation of shared governance will take time because there are uncertainty about how to proceed. The University Council ideas are mostly brainstorming for that review.

Shared Governance Update:

Jeff Dense reported that the shared governance review timeline for completion has been rendered undoable given the charge, so they have been moving incrementally. A survey was found to not be reliable or valid, and once the EPCC process goes through, more substantive questions of shared governance can come up. CAS mandates a body that governs them, and that body hasn't met for five years. There needs to be verification of the different aspects of shared governance on campus. He will put that on the agenda for the next meeting to see the will of the body to proceed.

Faculty Release Discussion:

Colleen Johnson said she understands this is a management rights issue. Steve Adkison clarified that this is part of institutional management. Under our shared governance model and because they affect faculty, to a point, but the whole point of the College Task force it so deal with these kinds of questions. So it is not completely a management rights issue. Colleen went on to state that the issue is two-fold. One is the issue of transparency. It seems that the release time agreements get done in a "black box." For similar sets of tasks, some have release time, some don't. Examples were given where release time was not allocated equally. Colleen recommended that the release time document go out campus-wide to see what people are getting release time for out of fairness. The other issue is the impact of release time. When release time is given, classes might not get taught. That affects the Student Credit Hours (SCH) number that decisions are made based upon. If release time happens, there should be adjunct money to teach those classes. Classes if not cancelled get rolled into overload, which defeats the purpose of release time.

Steve Adkison agreed on all counts. To clarify the comment about SCH, he indicated that no decisions are made solely on the basis of SCH. Academic review criteria was more granular than SCH. That document the Senate discussed was created for the College Task Force. The work that they are engaged in will take care of quite a bit of the questions surrounding release time. He would be delighted to receive a recommendation from senate regarding transparency of release time.

John Knudson-Martin asked Colleen Johnson what she proposed. Colleen said that it seems that there should be some criteria for release time based on what similar activities might be.

Steve Adkison said that he suggests a charge for FPCC to work with the Provost's Office to develop criteria to help guide release time criteria for each of the colleges. He has spoken multiple times for the need to move from out-of-load service work. When addressing the issue of release time for EPCC Chair vs. Senate President, he indicated that he had not heard of effective shared governance without such release time. Release time is necessary for shared governance to be effective. Jeff Dense said that he did survey faculty senate presidents within the system and settled on comparator institutions. Steve clarified that the Faculty Senate President's release time was his idea, not Jeff's.

Doug Briney said that he noticed that we are getting more release time to do those things that we used to do as part of our job. Understanding when release time is appropriate is an important issue.

Darren Dutto said that pulling release time and then pushing regular teaching into overload needs to be addressed. It goes to the quality of the education that we are providing when overload is piled on top of release. The arguments go together.

Jeff Dense will place this on the agenda for further considerations.

IFS Representative Discussion:

April Curtis has decided to step down from being the alternate representative to the IFS. Shari Carpenter has one year remaining on her term. Jeff Johnson as the immediate past president is honorary member, but according to constitution of IFS, those persons can participate in meetings without a vote after their year of service. How do we proceed in terms of being adequately represented?

Colleen Johnson asked for clarification about whether we were voting for a representative or an alternate. Also, Ruthi Davenport was elected to a three year term, and April Curtis may have moved into her term. John Knudson-Martin asked for more information. Charles Lyons recommended that if Ruthi is not retired, she might be in the position.

Colleen Johnson suggested sending out a call to faculty to see who might be interested in serving. Steve Adkison said that the discussion regarding Senate Bill 242 makes our representation important. Shari Carpenter and Jeff Johnson will be at the next IFS meeting. Jeff Dense said that we just need to have two voting members at the meetings. Dense asked for senators to go back to constituencies to cultivate interest, and Ruthi Davenport needs to be contacted regarding her involvement in IFS.

The next senate meeting will be February 7, when all EPCC items will need to be approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:08.