

## STANDARD FOUR FACULTY

---

*“What significant changes have been made in policies affecting the faculty? Have the characteristics of the faculty changed? How have faculty salaries and other benefits been improved? How does the institution conduct a substantive performance evaluation of all faculty? See **Standard Four—Faculty and Commission Policy 4.1—Faculty Evaluation.**”*

### Proposed Changes in Policies<sup>1</sup>

- A. The Assembly Personnel Committee (APC) submitted changes to the *Faculty/Staff Handbook* for Assembly approval at the June 2, 2003 Assembly. Due to lack of time, proposed changes were tabled until the first Fall 2003 Assembly. Proposed additions to Steps 1, 3, and 6 in the “Procedures for Reviews” section of the Handbook include the following:  
<http://www.eou.edu/assembly/CurrentTopics/Tenure%20and%20Promotion.htm>
- **Step 1.E. Voluntary Tenure and/or Promotion:** The candidate is encouraged to consult with the School Dean, the Division Chair, and other appropriate faculty members for guidance in deciding to apply for voluntary tenure or promotion.
  - **Step 3. Preparation of the Review Portfolio:** The candidate is encouraged to consult with the School Dean, the Division Chair, and other appropriate faculty members for assistance in the preparation of the portfolio.
  - **Step 6. School-Level Consultation with the Candidate:** When a faculty member makes a voluntary application for tenure or promotion, the candidate may elect to either a) proceed with the application process, or, b) terminate the application process, as follows:
    1. To proceed with the application process, the candidate signs the dean/School Personnel Committee (SPC) letter of evaluation. The letter of evaluation and portfolio are then forwarded to the Assembly Personnel Committee (APC) (See Step 7). Once the letter and portfolio are forwarded to APC, they may not be withdrawn.
    2. To terminate the application process, the candidate may either withdraw all application materials, including the Dean/SPC letter, or retain the Dean/SPC letter in the candidate’s personnel file, as follows:
      - 1) If the candidate wishes to withdraw all application materials, the portfolio is returned to the candidate and the Dean/SPC letter of evaluation is destroyed. No record of the application for voluntary tenure or promotion will remain on file.
      - 2) If the candidate wishes to retain the Dean/SPC letter of evaluation for possible future use, the portfolio is returned to the candidate, the Dean/SPC letter is signed by the candidate, the original copy of the Dean/SPC letter is retained in the candidate’s permanent personnel file, and a copy of the letter is provided to the candidate.

The reason for the change is to create a procedure that will allow candidates up for “voluntary promotion” (mainly those seeking promotion to Full Professor, but also those seeking “early” promotion to Associate Professor) to withdraw from the process without prejudice.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Exhibit 43, Proposed Changes in Faculty Policies.

## Interim Accreditation Report 2003

- B.** Proposed new language for the process section of the “Faculty Scholars Program” in the *Faculty/Staff Handbook* were submitted for approval at the June 2, 2003 Assembly. Due to lack of time, the proposal was tabled until the first Fall 2003 Assembly. The revision increases the involvement of APC in the selection process of Faculty Scholar awards, and reads as follows:

Interested teaching faculty should, using the form obtained from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, submit a short proposal outlining proposed projects (along with a summary of prior objectives and accomplishments — including copies of papers, articles, grant proposals — if awards were received in either of the preceding two summers) to their School Personnel Committee. The deadline is announced by the Provost’s office at the beginning of each academic year. The proposal must clearly specify an outcome or product of the project and show the relationship of that outcome to the criteria for award of the stipend as listed in the Guidelines and Selection criteria below. The SPC, in consultation with the School Dean, will evaluate the proposal(s) on the basis of the criteria and make a written recommendation that will be prioritized with the other proposal recommendations from the school and forwarded to the APC. Proposals must make clear whether a full or partial stipend is sought.

1. The Provost will consult with the Deans of the Schools and will, if they disagree with the SPC’s proposal recommendations, prepare a second prioritized set of recommendations that will be forwarded to the APC.
2. The APC will review all proposals and recommendations and will select awardees.
3. Awardees will be announced by the President.

- C.** Proposed changes to the Constitution and Bylaws include language and provisions for the creation of a Faculty Senate in the shared governance system at the University. Changes were submitted for approval at the June 2, 2003 Assembly. Due to lack of time, proposed changes were tabled until the first Fall Assembly in 2003. For elaborated detail of proposed changes, see <http://www.eou.edu/assembly/CurrentTopics/Faculty%20Senate%20ConstitutionR2.htm> <http://www.eou.edu/assembly/CurrentTopics/Faculty%20Senate%20ByLawsR2.htm>.

- D.** The Constitution was amended to include election procedures and term limits in the Diversity Committee description (<http://www.eou.edu/assembly/CurrentTopics/DiversityCommitteeDescription.htm>).

- E.** A Salary Equity Policy was developed and approved at the April 29, 2003 Assembly. (See <http://www2.eou.edu/assembly/current.htm>).

### **Faculty Characteristics**

Table 4.1 shows that full-time faculty have increased and part-time faculty have decreased in the past two

**Table 4.1 Institutional Faculty Characteristics**

Characteristics	Full Time		Part Time		Total	
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2001-2002	2002-2003	2001-2002	2002-2003
Total Instructional Faculty	87	91	42	34	129	125
Men	55	57	20	22	75	79
Women	32	34	22	12	54	46
Minorities	8	8	4	1	12	9
Resident Non-Aliens	0	4	0	1	0	5

**Source:** EOU Common Data Set. (The 2000–2001 Common Data Set numbers appeared anomalous due to a shift in the formulation model and thus were not used for comparison.)

Table 4.2 Institutional Faculty Profile—Eastern Oregon University

Eastern Oregon University  
Six Year Teaching Faculty Headcounts by College--Fall Terms

Teaching Faculty	School of Education & Business			School of Arts & Sciences			Other Division*			Total University		
	1998	2000	2002	1998	2000	2002	1998	2000	2002	1998	2000	2002
Full Time Teaching Faculty	24	25	29	57	58	80	1	1	4	82	82	93
% of Teaching Faculty	77%	74%	91%	83%	79%	79%	100%	100%	80%	81%	77%	82%
Part Time Teaching Faculty	7	9	3	12	16	16	0	0	1	19	25	20
% of Teaching Faculty	23%	26%	9%	17%	22%	21%	0%	0%	20%	19%	23%	16%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>113</b>
Indefinite Tenure	10	11	10	29	34	38	0	0	0	39	45	46
% of Full Time Teaching Faculty	42%	44%	34%	51%	61%	60%	0%	0%	0%	48%	55%	49%
% of Teaching Faculty	32%	32%	31%	42%	47%	47%	0%	0%	0%	39%	42%	41%
Tenure Track	2	5	5	16	13	14	0	0	0	18	18	19
% of Full Time Teaching Faculty	8%	20%	17%	28%	23%	23%	0%	0%	0%	22%	22%	20%
% of Teaching Faculty	6%	15%	16%	23%	18%	16%	0%	0%	0%	16%	17%	17%
Fixed Term	19	18	17	24	25	28	1	1	5	44	44	48
% of Full Time Teaching Faculty	79%	72%	59%	42%	45%	43%	100%	100%	125%	54%	54%	52%
% of Teaching Faculty	61%	53%	53%	35%	35%	34%	100%	100%	100%	44%	41%	42%
Professor	8	8	7	18	18	17	0	1	1	26	27	25
% of Teaching Faculty	26%	24%	22%	26%	25%	22%	0%	100%	20%	26%	26%	22%
Associate Professor	6	7	6	22	16	20	0	0	0	28	23	26
% of Teaching Faculty	19%	21%	19%	32%	22%	26%	0%	0%	0%	28%	21%	23%
Assistant Professor	9	12	15	16	26	27	1	0	1	26	38	43
% of Teaching Faculty	28%	35%	47%	23%	36%	36%	100%	0%	20%	26%	36%	39%
Instructor	8	7	4	13	12	12	0	0	0	21	19	16
% of Teaching Faculty	26%	21%	13%	19%	17%	16%	0%	0%	0%	21%	18%	14%
No Rank	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
% of Teaching Faculty	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	60%	0%	0%	3%

\*Other teaching faculty are those who teach courses not in Arts and Sciences or Education and Business. This report does not include adjunct, resource, temporary, or emeritus fixed term faculty wage appointments. Part time faculty have position FTE less than 1.0.

## Interim Accreditation Report 2003

years. Full-time faculty have not grown as rapidly as expected due to an unanticipated decline in state support (about 20% in the past two years). The result is that because of growing demand for access off- and on-campus, a significant number of full-time faculty teach overload.

A major challenge for EOU over the next five years will be to:

- Maintain the current faculty-student ratio (15:1);
- Reduce or stabilize overload; and
- Explore creative alternatives to the lecture/seat-time formula for teaching and learning.

Because of the broad involvement of faculty in innovative technology-based instruction on- and off-campus and the diversity of blended course delivery modalities, EOU is well-positioned to respond to this challenge. This subject is a top agenda item for the Center for Teaching and Learning, as well as a topic currently under discussion by the Deans and Provost.

There is only slight attrition in faculty numbers for women and minorities. Women faculty members now occupy more leadership positions than during the 1998 Accreditation Review, and more women are earning full professorship rank.

### **Standard 4.A.3-4—Faculty Workloads, Salaries, and Benefits**

By certification of the Employment Relations Board on February 24, 2003, all teaching faculty and librarians are represented by Associated Academic Professionals, an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL/CIO. Collective bargaining with AAP, currently underway, involves both the OUS and EOU. (See Standard 6 for further elaboration of agreement on collective bargaining).

With the certification of AAP as the sole bargaining agent for teaching faculty/librarians at EOU regarding employment issues such as working conditions, salaries, and benefits, EOU must clarify the respective roles of the union and other faculty governance organizations. The collective bargaining process itself can assist EOU in this clarification.

#### ***Workloads***

APC addressed faculty concerns about equitable workloads across campus during AY 2002–03. The matter is currently part of the collective bargaining process.

Increased DDE enrollments have increased the inload and overload responsibilities of faculty. APC has suggested that differential workload credit be given to faculty teaching DDE in intensive delivery modes (e.g., online). As well, faculty desire adherence to published Overload Compensation and Overload Teaching Limits policies. (See <http://www.eou.edu/academic/handbook/SECTIONS/7A15.HTM> and <http://www.eou.edu/academic/handbook/SECTIONS/7BOVERLO.HTM>). Faculty teaching beyond the limit have been approved by the Provost based upon recommendation of the Deans.<sup>2</sup>

Faculty have identified an increase in class sizes to accommodate increased enrollments, an increase in administrative duties shared by faculty, and an increased reliance on resource and fixed-term faculty as

---

<sup>2</sup> See Recommendation Six.

## Standard Four

primary areas of concern. APC proposed the rank of senior instructor and it has been discussed over the past two years. In AY 2003–04 APC plans to follow up on the report.<sup>3</sup>

### Benefits

The University has maintained an excellent health insurance package at no out-of-pocket cost to employees (except for part-time classified staff). What has been lost is the choice of plans. Until two years ago, employees had three Blue Cross plans to choose from; there is now only one. Cash-back has been eliminated, which some consider a decrease in benefits, but the trade-off benefit was cost containment. Public Employee Benefits now include an option for long-term care insurance.

Rising insurance costs with reduced benefits and an ongoing legislative process to reduce retirement benefits (PERS) are cause for concern among faculty.

### Salary<sup>4</sup>

The University's salary levels are far below national norms for teaching faculty and administrative-support faculty, a situation that can make recruiting qualified faculty at current salaries difficult.

**Table 4.3 2002-2003 Faculty Salary Data (in thousands) for EOU and Comparator Institutions\***

	Average Salary				Average Compensation				
	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Instr	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Instr	
U of Mich, Flint	72.4	60.1	50.2		89.1	74.3	63.0		
U of Wisc, Parkside	69.9	59.3	49.2	40.3	90.7	78.1	66.1	55.7	
CSU Stanislaus	81.4	62.4	47.9		100.1	78.7	60.3		
Eastern Washington U	62.5	51.0	46.5		78.8	64.9	59.0		
Plymouth State College	68.7	54.7	46.4		90.0	73.3	63.8		
SUNY College at Fredonia	69.6	55.2	45.1	32.9	90.6	71.1	57.9	40.0	
SE Missouri State U	64.0	52.6	44.3	36.0	78.4	65.1	55.2	45.6	
Fort Hays State U	61.5	50.3	41.9	36.4	75.9	62.6	52.8	46.3	
SOU	56.0	46.4	40.4	32.9	75.4	62.7	56.5	49.9	
WOU	60.7	49.7	40.3	34.5	80.4	67.9	55.9	49.6	
Southern Utah U	60.1	50.9	40.2	39.1	78.7	67.9	55.2	53.9	
Mary Washington College	72.7	55.7	39.4		89.4	69.6	50.4		
EOU	50.9	42.1	36.1	29.7	69.0	59.2	50.1	43.0	
Summary Statistics	Minimum	50.9	42.1	36.1	29.7	69.0	59.2	50.1	40.0
	Average	65.4	53.1	43.7	35.2	83.6	68.9	57.4	46.0
	Median	64.0	52.6	44.3	35.3	80.4	67.9	56.5	48.0

Source: *Academe, Bulletin of the AAUP*, March-April 2003

\* Average Compensation includes the employer contribution to retirement, medical, etc.

Repeated attempts by OUS to remedy this problem during legislative sessions have been unsuccessful. Nonetheless, faculty and administrative faculty salaries remain a priority issue for the University. Since 1998, the following administrative actions have improved faculty salaries:

- In January 2001, a 2% raise was applied across the board, with some equity adjustments made in consultation with AFPC and APC.
- In January 2002, a 2.5% raise was applied across the board, with some equity adjustments made in consultation with AFPC and APC.

<sup>3</sup> See Exhibit 44, Proposal to Establish the Rank of "Senior Instructor."

<sup>4</sup> See Exhibit 45, Improvements in Faculty Salaries January 2001–July 2002.

## Interim Accreditation Report 2003

- In July 2002 a 4% raise was applied to all instructional and non-instructional faculty. At this time adjustments were made to alleviate compression between ranks. (See Salary Calculation Policy at <http://www2.eou.edu/academic/handbook/SECTIONS/7BSALARY.HTM> and Salary Equity Policy at <http://www.eou.edu/assembly/CurrentTopics/Salary%20Equity%20Policy.html>).
- In 2002, the University committed an additional \$50,000 beyond the 4% raise to bring everyone up to the salary formula line.
- In December 2000–2001, the President provided \$500 recruitment and retention bonuses to instructional and non-instructional faculty. These bonuses were not added to the base salary.
- Merit awards have increased by 2% each year since AY 1999–2000.

Payment for summer school and DDE overload instruction is based on a “flat rate” model where teachers, regardless of rank or experience, are paid a flat rate either by credit hour or student enrollment.

Faculty concerns focus on low fixed term salaries, merit monies, and offset salaries that could potentially violate the new Salary Equity Policy.

### **Standard 4.B.2—Communication of Policies and Procedures**

The published notification schedule for the Faculty Scholars Program needs to be reviewed contingent on changes to the process section tabled at the June 2, 2003 Assembly (see Changes in Policies, B).

To optimize internal communication about matters affecting faculty, APC favors returning to the University’s practice of reserving Tuesday and Thursday afternoons (3:00-5:00) as meeting-only times; however, increased enrollment and limited classroom space restrict this possibility.

### **Faculty Evaluation—Policy 4.1**

Internal plans and procedures for faculty personnel evaluation and development have been under review in the University’s APC throughout AY 2002–03.<sup>5</sup> The impetus behind the review was to clarify the criteria by which faculty members are evaluated.

- APC wants to clarify criteria in the *Faculty/Staff Handbook* regarding faculty expectations for evaluation, tenure, and promotion. APC recommends that a task force be created to undertake the task of such handbook revisions. A top priority will be to clarify an increased emphasis on the area of scholarship and research and a decreased emphasis on community outreach. Review of post-tenure faculty needs reevaluation for consistency between schools. Since there are currently no procedures in place for review of resource and fixed-term faculty, APC will need to develop a proposal for faculty discussion.
- Tenure and Promotion portfolios show improved quality over the past three to four years, and decisions have become more stringent than in previous years. To help faculty prepare for more rigorous expectations, in Fall 2002, APC sponsored a “Portfolio Workshop” to ensure that faculty receive uniform instructions on the completion of a portfolio. The quality of portfolios was noticeably improved in 2002-2003. APC expects the Portfolio Workshop to become an annual Fall event on the personnel review calendar.
- The “Teaching Evaluation” section of the *Faculty/Staff Handbook* details criteria used in the evaluation of faculty teaching performance. No substantive changes have been made in this area. Administrative, peer, and student evaluations provide adequate data to document teaching performance.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Exhibit 46, Assembly Personnel Committee Agendas and Correspondence, 2001-2003.

## Standard Four

- Administrators and personnel committees use multiple indices to evaluate faculty performance in the areas of teaching; scholarship, research, and artistic creation; service to the institution; and outreach to the community. (See <http://www.eou.edu/academic/handbook/SECTIONS/7BCRITER.HTM>>). Annual “Green Sheets” provide summaries of faculty performance in all four areas.
- Personnel committees review student, alumni, peer, and administrative assessments on faculty members’ teaching performance. However, APC needs to establish benchmarks for above/below average performance so that faculty know what their performance is being evaluated against. APC needs, as well, to address a discrepancy between schools in the interpretation of peer review by the School of Arts and Sciences that has been extended to include interviews with colleagues. This is in violation of the *Faculty/Staff Handbook*.
- Personnel committees review and make peer judgments on scholarship as evidenced in publications, artistic creation as evidenced in performances and juried exhibitions, and research productivity as evidenced in success in securing external funding. Although APC would like to see more clearly defined criteria for scholarship, there are no plans to undertake redefinition.
- Personnel committees review service to the profession, the institution, and community outreach. However, expectations in the area of service to the institution need to be made clearer in order to maintain global fairness for faculty in both the School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education and Business. Expectations in the area of outreach to the community need to be reviewed and clarified in relation to institutional mission.
- The Schools have a system in place for addressing major problems in a faculty member’s teaching performance. This involves working with the appropriate dean on a development plan in area(s) of concern. However, personnel committees need to provide clearer recommendations that target even minor areas of improvement for faculty at all levels of review.

### *Exhibits*

*(available on campus)*

43	Proposed Changes in Faculty Policies
44	Proposal to Establish Rank of “Senior Instructor”
45	Improvements in Faculty Salaries, January 2001-July 2002
46	APC Agendas and Correspondence, 2001-2003