

Faculty Senate Minutes

March 6, 2012

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

Visitors: Steve Adkison, Anna Maria Dill, David Komito, Dan Mielke, Sally Mielke, Rosemary Powers, Deanna Timmerman

Meeting was called to order at 3:03.

Minutes from the February 21 meeting were approved. Jeff Dense abstained.

Dense proposed an experiment in keeping with Robert's Rules of Order. Any person can speak two times. Everyone should have an opportunity to talk before a speaker speaks the second time. This should help us keep to the schedule and allow everyone time to speak about issues.

Consent Agenda: HWS 198 and ART 261 were placed on the action agenda for the next faculty senate meeting. Consent agenda carried. Dense abstained.

Action Agenda:

Religious Studies minor program change was discussed first. David Komito joined the table. David said that the dean asked the religious studies faculty to move some courses to higher levels and then rotate other courses to maximize staffing. He indicated that the Judaism course was added as a response to a Faculty Senate question about that course. Christianity was also requested to be added as a separate course, moving the History of Christianity to an elective. Motion approved. Dense abstained.

University Council:

Anna Maria Dill came forward to discuss the housekeeping proposal. The members of the Division of Distance Education are now spread out over three different entities, which makes the language in the constitution irrelevant. Using the term "administrative faculty" instead of using the specific titles would solve the problem. University Council felt it was more fair to identify members as administrative faculty rather than identify entities. Anna Maria consulted with the relevant parties whose committees would be affected by the language change. The three chairs agreed that administrative faculty as a descriptor would be adequate. There will be an issue with those members who will need to be elected for ASC soon. She is concerned by the interpretation of the intent of the language. She asked Doug Briney for language that would clarify the intent of the movement. The problem of keeping the erroneous language will eliminate the people who can go forth under nominations. She would like this to be considered as a housekeeping change so that administrative faculty can serve in the capacities. After discussion with Doug Briney, they approved the change "administrative faculty appropriate to the committee."

Dense clarified the language of the housekeeping nature in the constitution. Thus, this wouldn't go out for a vote. Anna Maria indicated that she was bringing forward the document for approval. Timeliness is the issue, so the academic faculty feel confident in nominating and voting for appropriate representation.

Moved to approve.

Colleen Johnson raised the issue that she would like to support the motion with the language caveat included. John Knudson-Martin indicated that no other element had that caveat, so we could trust the administrative faculty to select appropriate representatives. Darren Dutto asked whether the elections could come forward without us approving this change. Anna Maria said that one seat could not be filled because enrollment services no longer existed. Charles Lyons said that the old language required an understanding of distance students. He wondered whether that kind of language would be helpful for this as well. Anna Maria indicated that regional directors have been elected to positions who have served online. She feels that administrative faculty are very aware of the needs of online students and that on-campus administrative faculty have also been given the charge to better integrate DDE, so all sections are held account. Heidi Harris recommended a friendly amendment to remove the language "appropriate to the committee." Rebecca Hartman indicated that the issue raised would be who determines appropriateness. The language for the dean's search might also need to be changed to be more like the language for the EPCC, specific to administrative faculty but not departments. Anna Maria clarified that the person chosen for the current search, Tracy Hayes, the Director of Enrollment Management, was chosen to serve on the search committee. Dense said that CAS bylaws were dean search.

Doug Briney asked Anna Maria if the UC had already proposed the language. If we approve with the original language, does it have to go back.

Motion: Approve recommendation with regard to constitutional housekeeping passed at University Council on February 14, 2012, which does not including the amended language.

John Knudson-Martin called questions. The motion carried. Johnson opposed. Dense abstained.

Informational item: Medical Marijuana

Anna Maria Dill indicated that student affairs presented the policy to the University Council on February 28. It's first reading was at President's Cabinet March 5. Medical marijuana is defined by ORS 475.300. The questions that were asked at UC had to do with accommodations for students who have medical marijuana cards. We do not currently have any students in that situation, but Disability Support Services would work with this policy to ensure that the policy was maintained in regard to any individual who had medical marijuana privileges. A student would have to be supported in a way that would not violate the policy. Another question was related to students living on campus who had a medical marijuana card. Students would be exempt from living on campus and would not be able to live in housing and use marijuana medicinally. The policy was approved by U.C.

Steve Adkison asked to clarify for federal financial aid availability. Anna Maria said that we

would be in danger of losing federal financial aid. Steve pointed out that no state has challenged that federal law. Chris Heidbrink indicated that the issue has arisen with students. This policy would not conflict with any of the campus policies. The students involved with the measure have been ok with that.

Information Item: Military Call Up Policy

Up until now, we haven't had a military policy. The question arose of whether a military leave policy met with the academic standards we hold all students to. The language indicates that we will work with the student, but the onus falls on the student to communicate with faculty in order to complete their coursework. The power of attorney clause is different. There are times when students do not have much turn around time when they are called to active duty. This would entail National Guard students as well who have emergencies that conflict with their class schedule. The other portions of the policy that are well intended would be that support that individuals get when understanding their financial responsibilities. This policy was reviewed by the Registrar and Vice President for Student Affairs, was approved by University Council, and had its first read yesterday at the President's Cabinet. It will be reviewed again once this body has forwarded questions/concerns.

Steve Adkison requested that, because this is a matter of academic policy, that the Faculty Senate have this as an action item. Jeff Dense said that this policy crosses both sides of campus and requires a degree of collaboration. Dense will make that into a formal motion. Steve said that Academic Standards needs to take a look at the Academic side of the policy.

Motion carried. Dense abstained.

BUS/ECON program deletion:

Motion moved to the floor for approval.

Steve Adkison said that in issuing a call for consensus from program faculty that house the BUS/ECON, no program stepped forward. His intention is that, if this is approved, there is a substantial teach out. They would remove it as the BUS/ECON from College of Business, but not from Banner. The teach-out period can be used to engage in discussions about the program and where it might be housed. It is not in the Provost's purview to force BUS to own the program. Lyons asked about the lack of connection between this proposal and the mission statement. We continue to receive information that is inaccurate. We see a quick correlation between major and degree completion. Those numbers indicate between 2005 and 2011, the program had a total of 25 graduates. In the same attachment, there was a total of 52 graduates in the same period. But the numbers are still inconsistent. He is troubled by the fact that we are rushing to get rid of a program because no one wants it, but we have no solid reason to do so. Adkison said the university data that is presented is the official data. Carolyn Bloyed clarified the numbers of students enrolled and the number who have completed the program. Jeff Dense asked Dean Milke to join the table. Doug Briney said that the numbers are misleading because 70 people have declared that major but have switched once they came in. The question of who is graduating from the program should be addressed.

Jeff Dense entered into the record Banner numbers from the day of the meeting.

Colleen Johnson had a point of clarification about no program faculty stepping forward. She

indicated that PPE had a lack of consensus. There was interest on the part of two faculty members in PPE. It was not a complete lack of interest. Steve Adkison said that he was clear about his intent. We will not run programs based on the desire of individual faculty. There was no consensus from the coherent faculty. Adkison said that the two faculty expressing interest in keeping the program were retiring, and there was not the basis for supporting a program based on students' best interests. He said that we have 2.5 years to make a decision on the program. But to move the decision down the road again is not acceptable given the amount of time that BUS and EPCC have put forward. He rejects the notion that the program is no additional cost when 34% of the student credit hours are taught via overload.

Doug Briney said that we should respect the process. Charles Lyons said he wasn't considering the process. He said that starting a program would need to be connected to mission, and to discontinue should be the same process. Jeff Dense indicated that he has been in discussion with the Provost to change the process, but we can not change the process in mid-process. Leandro Espinosa is not convinced of the rationale for eliminating the program. What is distracting is the emotions. He asked what business is based on if not economics. Doug said that business does relate to economics. Adkison indicated that the rationale for hiring the current ECON faculty position by faculty and the dean was driven by need to have public administration program because of its crucial role. The same argument could be made for the Business Admin degree. Programs can choose where and how to focus their efforts. The Business Admin program graduates in excess of 175 students while another program graduates 10 students average a year. Where should the College of Business dedicate their resources in a strategic sense?

Doug Briney said that the debate took place at COBA and at EPCC. We have the opportunity to reconsider here and reexamine the facts, but that communicates that we don't have faith in EPCC.

Chris Heidbrink said that there are only two programs that say business and asked for clarification of others. Briney indicated that Business also oversees the Fire Services Administration and the MBA.

John Knudson-Martin called questions.
Roll call vote:

Ayes: Dutto, Heidbrink, Bush, Bloyd, Briney, Rainboth, Knudson-Martin, Heather, Drexler, Martin, Pierce

Nays: Hartman, Espinosa, Lyons, Johnson

Absentions: Dense and Harris

Faculty Senate recommends elimination of the BUS/ECON program.

Provost update:

Adkison asked Rebecca Hartman to update the Faculty Senate on the Dean's search. Hartman said that the committee will be looking at the portal system. The position is open until filled. The ad is not yet up on our HR website. She encouraged anyone to nominate people who are interested. The position is posted in the Chronicle of Higher Education and some other places, just not internally on our site. The ad is about to be on both HR website and CAS website. If

your constituency is aware of potential candidates, put them in touch with Rebecca Hartman or the search consultant.

Adkison updated on the College Task Force, which is nearing the end of their deliberations. The Senate should receive a document in spring. Senate can expect in spring term to receive draft plans from regional operations task force about how to tie regional operations to our strategic plan.

EOU will have to sit down and figure out how these recommendations interact, particularly around advising, intake, professional advising, and how that connects to faculty advising in the majors, both on and off campus. Adkison asked Anna Maria Dill to talk about the review process. President Davies presented the administration's triannual review before UC and will bring it before this body soon. The big change is that anyone under the president and provost will have a tri-annual review. The president clarified the individuals affected as senior leadership, the executive members under the leadership. Deans, vice presidents and the athletic director have an annual review. The tri-annual review seeks input from individuals that work directly with vice-presidents and deans. He is not sure exactly how those individuals are selected. Adkison clarified that the document referenced people who no longer exist or whose roles have changed. Several that are direct reports have had annual evaluations. The intent is to maintain annual evaluations but to also have everyone who reports to the provost to have reviews similar to the deans. He is reviewing several files in Academic Affairs, and there are few tri-annual reviews. The question is how we need to proceed in terms of feedback relative to the deans' evaluations. He has a draft survey that he would like to run past Faculty Senate. That instrument will probably also serve for the Provost tri-annual review. Individuals subject to tri-annual review are subject to review by faculty as a whole.

Jeff Dense said this issue will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

The policy review process mentioned in President Davies' message to campus relates to several policies that need to be reviewed for adequacy, housekeeping changes (e.g., DDE). There might also be more substantive changes. Vice-presidents are charged with sorting out the policies. University-level administrative policies will go to the University Council, faculty policies and governance will go to the Faculty Senate, finance and administration policies will go to Budget and Planning. The intent would be for the vice-presidents to do a first rough sort to identify policies that need to be reviewed, and to start next fall term with reviews through the relevant bodies. This underscores the importance of the shared governance review that the three bodies undertake. Policy review cannot take place without collaboration across bodies.

OUS and EOU Achievement Compacts: Faculty Senate last discussed these, but discussions were not complete given the status of the compact discussions. The board approved campus-specific contracts. The criteria were already a part of the performance measures that we report every year, including the one related to dual-credit. The three criteria are completion, quality, and connections. The discussion began a year ago. The agreement was that each campus would have a compact with the system, and the system with the state. The last legislative session created the OHEB. Discussions with that board are developing regarding the appropriate relationship with K-12, and what the relationship with community colleges and the OEIB is, and what the relationship with OUS will be. Rather than having a single compact with OEIB and the OUS and CCDB, the sentiment now is that the OEIB wants individual compacts

with all 7 universities 17 community colleges and with every school district. It is not clear what the relationship of the OEID and OUS with the NCCWD and the state department of ed will be and how TSPC, which affects teacher certification, is affected is not clear. Sona Andrews, Vice-Chancellor, will be presenting OUS compacts to the OEIB this week. It's clear that the metrics are specific for completion, 6 year graduation, 3 year transfer graduation rates, retention, the connections piece (e.g., community college partners, community partners, service learning, early college). Those are robust and specific. We do not have direct metrics or measures for quality. He made the argument that if we construe program quality/effectiveness, we could tie that to program effectiveness on each campus. We are well positioned to talk about program quality in those programs. AACU cited us as an exemplar for our program mapping and outcomes and discussions for program assessment meetings. We are unique in the OUS. Sona believes that if we have to go down the quality road, she should be able to pull this information out of her back pocket. The most concrete criterion for quality from compact achievements is survey of alumni and survey of employers. It is highly likely, given the templates that came out for CC and K-12, which did not contain a quality criteria, OEIB is probably going to drop that from their compacts. Those OUS performance measures construed with those categories will still be reported, not clear what will happen with those metrics at OEIB. The long term intentions for funding are tied to these achievement compacts, most specifically completion. Not just funding for FTE, but they will peel parts away for completion for 6 and 3 years. Credit for intra-OUS transfers need to be discussed. We get a fairly high number from OU and OSU along with CC transfers. That has been factored in. With the partial exception of U of O, we are the only one whose performance compact is tied to our institutional scorecard, which is articulated in the sustainability plan, which we are using for mission fulfillment to accreditors. OU is a year behind. The other five universities are going to have to do that but are not yet.

John Knudson-Martin said this sounds like bureaucracy building. Is this helping?

Adkison said having spent a year in Idaho with a single oversight body, it is a discussion of concern. The discussion is tied up with U of O for institutional boards instead of a state board. It is clear that the functions the system serves must be maintained. How the system moves forward is not completely clear. Leandro Espinosa noted that his impression is that the system allows for some individuality. Adkison agreed. We are particularly well positioned with respect to the regionals. It is better to have a strong system, which is better statewide for higher education. Having said that, if we are forced to go down individual board route, we will be in a fairly strong position. Steve said that the intent of the person who will report to the OHEB, the state superintendent, etc. will report to the Chief Educational Officer. They are looking for someone with K - 16 experience, but they will probably not find one individual that they are looking for. 40/40/20 suggests that the focus should be on secondary.

Jeff Dense moved on to shared governance review. Yesterday, Bob Davies sent out a memo to shared governance review. The memo will be posted in the Faculty Senate folder on Google Docs and link will go out. At this time, Dense has met with FPC and EPCC in terms of giving a charge for committee review. He is scheduled to meet with APC first week of next term. Last week, he held an open forum with CAS to get feedback, pros/cons, for the shared governance review. During the last meeting, senators were tasked with soliciting comments from your constituents.

Rebecca Hartman reported that DSSML gave a lot of input. In general, they said that we need a senate of the whole. Everyone who responded said that we need a faculty senate of the

whole to create genuine participation in the shared governance process. SMT reported one response: that there were too many people on the committees. Arts and Letters reported that communication was also an issue, but the responses did not necessarily agree that the answer was to return to the assembly model.

Adkison asked for clarification about whether the senate of the whole issue was tied to communication. Hartman indicated that senate of the whole helped collaboration across colleges, as with the assembly. The colleges being separate was a concern.

David Drexler reported that in the library, two concerns were raised. One was the role of the committees and how action gets taken on committees. What are the options when something comes to Senate? There was a concern that a lot of what gets done at committee level can get wiped out or stalled at senate. The other concern was the role of the library. Language in the constitution treats library somewhat analogous to a college, but not consistently. Curricular changes go through colleges and through a process. But the process for library courses is not clear. T & P concerns indicated that library language has been proposed but not enforced.

BUS reported that regional entities felt completely left out.

EDU reported comments about transparency during the process, not after the process. Several situations had occurred where they were informed of what the decision would be but constituencies were not involved in decision-making. Communication back to constituents and then communicating from constituents back up.

Dense thanked members for outreach.

Public comment period: none

Good of the Order: Basketball teams playing in national championships. Athletics is organizing a viewing party. Possibly with refreshments.

Chris said that today is last day for Hoke renovation vote. So far, 420+ students had voted, so this vote will stand.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:38.