

Meeting Minutes
Faculty Senate
April 17, 2012

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

Guests: Steve Adkison, Molly Burke, Allen Evans, Doug Kaigler, Sally Mielke, Ken Watson.

Meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

Meeting minutes from March 6 and April 3 unanimously approved.

Faculty Senate President Update:

Jeff Dense would like to continue the experiment to limiting to two addresses to the body for major discussion items, and only one until everyone has spoken. In addition, the multiple meeting times at the end of the year are an issue. Please send feedback to Jeff or Heidi regarding meeting preferences.

University Council Representative Update:

The bulk of the last meeting was dedicated to two issues: the proposed constitutional change for membership for the planned budget committee and the removal of the Faculty Senate Representative from the University Council. Anna wanted to note the non-voting status for the budget and planning representative because she felt that commonly people interpret "ex officio" as non-voting, but "ex officio" actually means "for the sake of office." In addition, the position of EOU Budget Director has been eliminated, necessitating the removal of that language. A joint sub-committee that includes Faculty Senate members and University Council members has been convened to discuss eliminating the Faculty Senate rep to University Council. A rationale for eliminating this position was read aloud at University Council. The statement indicated that the position is redundant, and communication between the two bodies can occur in the review committee. Elwyn said that he mentioned at the meeting that a new rationale might need to be proposed in order for Faculty Senate to approve the amendment.

Colleen Johnson said she had heard that there was a proposed amendment discussed at that meeting to make the change to get rid of the Faculty Senate member. Elwyn Martin said that at one point there was a written amendment. Some of the wording in the rationale for the amendment was not going to be accepted by Faculty Senate. Jeff Dense said that a rationale was proposed for removal of the Faculty Senate Representative to University Council that contained language that was not acceptable. Dense indicated that a conference committee has been convened to address the language for proposed amendments. Senators Charles Lyons, Darren Dutto, and Leandro Espinosa will be serving on the ad hoc committee to deal with this one issue.

Mike Pierce asked if the issue of the Faculty Senate Representative had come up before, and if the rationale was important enough to change this role. Jeff Dense said that members of the University Council said the role has not been effective before Elwyn Martin. Anna Maria Dill felt there was an imbalance because the Faculty Senate Representative meant that four faculty members were on University Council, even though the Faculty Senate Representative did not vote. Given the shared governance communication changes, and support for a more robust

website, the impetus is coming from University Council rather than FS. Pierce said that this would not be acceptable to Faculty Senate, but this has not been before Senate before. Maybe this is the opportunity to discuss this. Dense said that he can put it on the agenda for new business.

Leandro Espinosa said that he did not see how the Faculty Senate Representative is redundant. Jeff Dense asked for that to be a part of the charge to the ad hoc conference committee, to tease out that rationale.

Elwyn Martin made a point of clarification. He said a rationale was read outloud, not the amendment. His impression is that the draft language for the amendment was put together, that language was not accepted, and the rationale at the last meeting was to regroup and provide a new rationale.

Provost Update:

The Dean Search Committee will be doing airport interviews with the CAS semi-finalists this week. By the end of the week, we should have finalists for that position.

College Task Force: The recommendations are remarkable in terms of the clarity of the items given the complicated nature of the task. Adkison was delighted with the work and thanked the Task Force members. The next step is to begin considering the implementation of various elements of the Task Force recommendation. He would like feedback through the Faculty Senate or directly to him. The feedback was rich in fall term with Phase I, and he looks forward to feedback on Phase II as well. He will discuss the concepts as a broad overview with the CAS Dean candidates.

Colleen Johnson asked if it was the intent of the Provost for the Task Force recommendations to go back to the colleges for discussion. Adkison said that yes, the document went out to the teaching faculty. Once feedback is gathered, he will sit down with the deans, administrative executive assistants, and probably a few other people in terms of advising and come up with an initial draft of what will happen for each college, and that will go back out to teaching faculty for further comments. Once that feedback comes back, he will set in place a plan for the operational structures for all colleges and finalize that at the end of the spring term. The Task Force document could be discussed at the CAS meeting this Thursday.

Oregon Education Investment Board Achievement Compacts Update: Adkison passed around the OUS achievement compact, followed by the institutional OEIB achievement compacts. The OEIB achievement compact is different from our state board of higher education-approved OUS institutional compacts, which he updated the Faculty Senate on last time. The big difference is that the OEIB took out all the institution-specific measures, although there is allowance for "local priorities" optional for each institution in the draft disseminated. OEIB was concerned that they would have too much on their hands to manage all the K-12, community college and university compacts, so they basically simplified all the OUS compacts and took out all the institution-specific measures proposed and approved by the state board of higher education. Adkison then passed out talking points for discussion. He has examples of the final K-12 and community college achievement templates. They are not posted on the Provost's website because they are expected to change in the next two weeks. They changed in the last week. Mark Nesbitt, the Governor's Chief of Staff, is as of last week serving as the OEIB interim Chief Education Officer while the search is being completed. The board is within two weeks of finishing that search.

These discussion points give the framework and the intentions behind the OEIB achievement compacts. We don't really know anything beyond what we have in terms of specifics.

Adkison reported that there are links in terms of the compacts and the budget, but no one has any concrete idea of what those links entail. In spite of his predictions, we have three categories: completion, quality, and connections, OEIB at once simplified and made those measures more granular by looking at disadvantaged students in those categories. What we have are all the draft docs, and they are all identical. The one change that we had as an institution-specific measure had to do with newly admitted students or freshmen entering with dual enrollment or existing credit; OEIB made that a requirement for all schools. The quality achievement measures are based on the percentages of graduates vs. non-graduates unemployed compared with the percentage of the workforce overall. If anyone has any insights as to how that relates to quality of education, pass that on. Conventional wisdom means that they will remove or rename that category. EOU suggested that we could get close to program quality by looking at program assessment activities in the same way that Northwest does with regional accreditation, which would serve us well because we are ahead of the curve in relation to Northwest, even with their new standards. And we could make a pretty good argument that the state could use that to look at quality. None of the other Provosts were open to putting Northwest standards in the achievement compact. Quality is not a category in the current final version of K -12 and community college compacts.

Adkison finished by stating that EOU should have these compacts submitted to the state by early July. No one knows what will be submitted for measures. He will keep Faculty Senate posted at all future meetings as this situation develops. He indicated that Nancy Knowles sent an interesting communication through East Talk. It misrepresents the chancellor's comment somewhat. It could be read as a sigh of hopeless resignation. We still have a strong voice at the system level, but no one is sure what influence that voice is going to have until the state CEO is in place and we find out how the relationship with other agencies will work. The chancellor, the Head of Workforce Development and the state K-12 officer will report to the CEO instead of to their respective boards. It is pretty clear that as a result of these discussions, U of O and PSU will get institution-specific boards. No one knows if those boards will be under the state board of higher ed or how they will relate to the CEO.

TSPC is a part of this. Dan and Michael are giving a presentation tomorrow morning in Salem. Other schools cued up behind us for TSPC certification are wondering what their process will be like, so they asked EOU to develop a presentation to help everyone understand what that will look like. No one knows how these pieces will fit together. Right now, there is no intention that the OEIB will be making program or curricular decisions; however, there is yet another body out there called the Higher Education Coordinating Committee, and they will probably get underway between now and next legislative session to make sure state universities do not duplicate resources and offerings, which the OUS system has already been doing for years. It is not clear how the HECC is going to relate to the OEIB. By the time fall term starts, we should know those things, but that is another piece floating around. In the meantime, the institution-specific measures that were part of the last but not the final were approved by our State Board of Higher

Education. They consist of measures we were held to by OUS. Those are still in place. We will at least continue to report those through Institutional Research at the institutional level, and IR functions at the system level. It is clear that those are between us and OUS. Those may show up as local priorities, but we are not sure yet how that will happen. What Adkison hopes to avoid are 5-6 parallel efforts running but not connecting. We have enough to do with regional, system, and state level reporting without separating and making those different. He sees a good deal of hope that we will end up in a productive place.

Dense asked about being a member of an underrepresented racial or ethnic group. A previous draft (3/20) listed underrepresented groups as African Americans, Hispanics, Latinos, Alaskan Natives, Multii-racial and Multi-ethnic individuals, and disadvantaged populations (Pell-receiving) but that is not articulated in the document. Adkison said as of April 6, the breakdowns are still the same. They are asking if we submit local or institution priorities if they can be disaggregated along those lines. We will be able to do so with some but not all. He would encourage everyone to stay abreast of what is happening but not get bogged down in details.

Leandro Espinosa said that in terms of this draft, quality means having a job. Adkison said he thought it was an indirect measure. What quality apparently means is the lack of being unemployed. Under this version, someone with an English degree goes to work at McDonalds will mark program quality. At the least, they could talk about those employed in their fields. The intentions here with the OEIB, compacts, and funding horizons are fundamentally exactly what we want to see at the state level. We are going to move ever closer over the next couple of years. But it is a complex undertaking.

EPCC Consent Agenda:

Approved. Jeff Dense abstained.

EPCC Action Agenda:

Liberal Studies BUS/Gender Pre-approved Program Deletion: Nobody signed up for the program in the last five years. Heidbrink said it looked as if it began in 2010, then it disappears. Dense asked Mielke to correct the data. Sally Mielke said that it is a pre-approved program within Liberal Studies, so it is not a program deletion, just a change within a program. Johnson commented that this is now the second pre-approved program in Liberal Studies that Faculty Senate or EPCC has deleted or not approved, which seems to highlight a structural problem in Liberal Studies. Because the default is the two-minor approach, students run up against time constraints and choose the two-minor option. The deletion was approved. Deanna Timmermann opposed. Dense abstained.

Administrative Task Force Report:

Jeff Dense invited Doug Kaigler to the table. Dense asked for clarification questions. Given the late release, the entire community might not have had time to go through the document. Several members of the Task Force were at the table to field questions.

Charles Lyons asked for clarification about the nature of the recommendations. Are they recommending one particular model? Kaigler said the Task Force Recommendations are not consensus models. Lyons asked about model number four (2.0 FTE) for the College of Arts

and Sciences. Under the bullet, there was a note about the Discipline Representatives serving on College Council. Jeff Dense clarified that College Council is a body from the CAS bylaws that is the governing organization of the college but has not met in a number of years. Lyons observed that it is not mentioned under the other models. Kaigler said that Dense wrote that section of the narrative. Dense said that with the elimination of the Division Chairs, there was a need for faculty input in terms of governance issues. The Chairs Council would go away, and this College Council would take the place of that. Adkison asked if the Chairs Council was in the bylaws. Dense indicated that it was not. Deanna Timmermann indicated that the Chairs Council had been implemented by Marilyn Levine but not formalized in the bylaws.

Doug Kaigler commented that, fourteen weeks ago, the first Task Force Recommendation came before the Faculty Senate. He remembers walking away being surprised that there were few questions. What that seemed to indicate was that the recommendation of the Task Force was close to what members of the Faculty Senate and what the faculty at large believe. This Task Force Recommendation is different because it involves significant potential change. The feedback being received and relayed for this report is crucial. Dense asked that, irrespective of whatever feedback we give at the current Faculty Senate meeting, senators solicit further feedback from our constituents.

Colleen Johnson said she had not had a chance to read the whole document. When she looked at the current administrative structure description for the College of Arts and Sciences, what carries through all models is the Discipline Representatives. While they do different things in different areas, she was surprised at the number of duties listed as their responsibility. Doug Kaigler clarified that much of what the Task Force found after a survey of Discipline Representatives and Division Chairs was the diversity and disparity of duties related to specific disciplines. Someone as a representative in the Social Sciences would not be involved in purchasing equipment because there are not facilities associated with those programs. However, in fine arts, they deal with those physical realities. Part of the dilemma expressed in the narratives is that the disparity exists and the Task Force wanted to make sure that they discussed that reality, but they did not make a recommendation for how the Provost can solve that. But it is a morale issue for some Discipline Reps.

Colleen Johnson said that it seems like the list of duties for the Dean does not seem like that much, especially compared to the list of duties for the Associate Dean, which seem more detailed and substantive. She would like to see more attention on the college and less attention on the community. Adkison said that is exactly the kind of feedback he is looking for. He thinks that the Dean's first job is on the campus. But another larger part, if you go back to the Phase One report, is that the Task Force members were appreciative at the range of duties that deans have to undertake. Doug Kaigler said that part of what the Task Force tried to take a look at was the historic turnover of deans in arts and sciences. On his part, it was felt that part of the reason that we have a dilemma with turnover is the responsibilities of the job. As they tried to grapple with the range of duties, the turnover had to do with the scale of the job.

Colleen Johnson commented on the second model for CAS, which seemed to add a third layer of bureaucracy. Darren Dutto reiterated what Doug Kaigler said, that the Task Force wrestled with the distribution of duties, and they tried to portion out the duties, but those duties are not set in stone. The Task Force was trying to figure out how best to proportion the duties so that the overlap would be reduced, and so that administration and teaching responsibilities could have a stronger line, and so that the duties would not overwhelm a single person. Deanna

Timmermann asked Kaigler to describe how the two Division Chair model would divide the divisions. Also, if we had two divisions and a dean, we would be keeping three office specialists, so where would that other position go?

Doug Kaigler addressed the first question by saying the Task Force spent time on what would be involved if there were two divisions. That would not be an easy change. It would initially be problematic, but if the Provost adopted that model, that would be a concern he would need to address. The Task Force did not make the assumption that it was the Task Force's role to make that decision. If that model was adopted, and it could operate with two rather than three assistants, that would also be an issue for the Provost to address.

Kaigler said that this was a huge task: the Task Force met every week for two hours and beyond that in specific college committees. They realized that they could have taken an entire year to engage with just this question. Frank Bushakra said that this document is going to go out to faculty and the report is amazing. There are some things that he likes about one and others he does not like. What is the most effective form of feedback? Choosing one particular model? Analyzing each part of the models? Kaigler said that it is a valid question. Adkison said that it could be suggestions like Colleen Johnson made, points that individuals or Senators might want to make. We are also not bound by the specific model, but we might address the components of each model. What he does not want is to accept the least-objectionable model. If feedback suggests that the best solution is some combination of models, then we could take the set of "tinker toys" that the Task Force has given us and put it together in different ways. He does not see anything that was missed. Once he has collected feedback and comments, the recommendation from the Provost will go back out again.

Frank Bushakra said that one model said it was revenue-neutral. How much time should faculty address looking at the revenue parts?

Doug Kaigler said that as we look at various models, the approximation looks at administrative FTE, but does not break down into specific dollars. The recommendations are useful in a comparative but not absolute sense. Steve Adkison said that the Task Force struggled with that same question, and the end result was for the Task Force was to help him understand what the best structure was. Right now, it is clear that the best structure is three separate deans, but we are not going to get there this time around. The single dean model would have helped us reach sustainability model, and we could have saved money, but it would not have been sound. We should not suggest things outside of the ballpark presented in this document, because we do not have the resources for three separate deans. But our envelope is bounded by the FTE in parenthesis in the document. It is clear that we are not going to get the 250K savings. Where else we will save that is the Provost's problem. He will have to know once the structure is finalized. The structure is going to be equitable, but the models for the colleges will not look the same. Whatever we have needs to free the faculty to do what they need to do. The one box that is not in there that the Task Force members are clear on is the substantial amount of work that ineffective structures push down onto faculty members. We cannot do that anymore.

Colleen Johnson said that it seems that the two most important issues are personnel and curriculum. The curriculum never rises above the Discipline Representative level. How did that come about? That should be a priority and should bring cohesion among the colleges. There seems to be some duplication with the dean and the associate dean regarding adjunct and faculty evals vs. tenure and promotion evaluations. Doug Kaigler said that one of the findings that was a clear problem for turnover was the personnel process, the magnitude of the responsibilities for the personnel process. At a certain point, some of those personnel

responsibilities that were in the dean's office got pushed down to Division Chairs. In the process of those responsibilities in the office of the Division Chair, it created an ambiguity contractually. They imagined the Associate Dean and the Dean sharing personnel responsibilities, and the responsibilities would be worked out between the two of them, but the final authority for promotion and tenure would have to remain with the Dean. One advantage was eliminating the ambiguity in the Division Chair position. Johnson said it seemed that the problem at the Dean's level was just pushed down to the Associate Dean. Kaigler said that in many models, the primary facilitation in personnel process would alleviate the pressure on the Dean and could be shared in a new manner that would be different than Division Chair and Dean model now. The authority currently is stretched.

Steve Adkison said a useful piece for him was on the second page, which is the list of central issues. If we look at that as a framework, we can understand how each set of recommended models and pros and cons worked. Who deals with what differs, but they are all bounded by the concerns. The bulleted list is one of the most useful pieces. Doug Kaigler said that for faculty feedback, that is a good place to comment on and add to that list as well.

Jeff Dense will place this item on the agenda for the next meeting. He urged Senators to meet and discuss with constituents and in the college meetings.

Personnel Process and Procedure Handbook:

Allen Evans joined the table. He handed out a historical chart. The current personnel handbook was most recently revised in 2008. It is an edition that has been around for a long time. Subsequent to the earliest editions of the current handbook, we have had contract language come into place, interim letters of agreement with library. There was an attempted revision in 2009 (the red letter revision), and we received outside feedback from the Chancellor's office. We have a number of different elements of the process that need to be aligned and put into one cohesive, coherent document. Dense posted on the agenda several different drafts, including the current 2008 handbook, the 2009 attempted revision. As he best understands it, the 2009 policy revision was not revised because it got bogged down in the process. The 2012 revision, which Dense posted on the agenda attempts to pull all the above issues. There are a number of changes from each addition in addition to AAP contract language, so it is difficult to mention the changes. The committee feels that everyone needs to read the entire draft in context. It is not an issue of which parts changing as much as how the whole thing flows. They are bringing this before the senate for consideration, not as an action item. Senators should elicit feedback and send it to Evans. FPC will meet one more time to consider the feedback and make final drafts and edits before bringing it back as an action item on the agenda.

Jeff Dense indicated that according to the contract is that changes need to be in writing by May 1. The changes will be made by FPC next week, and it will bring back the draft as an action item May 1. If we don't act, it will wait a year.

Steve Adkison said that one of the questions we should ask is how the revision will affect themselves, particularly new hires or in the first three years. The answer is that it shouldn't affect those in the process. Whatever handbook revision we arrive at by May 1 should affect those hired and in process from this point forward. It can help us understand how to deal with people currently in the pipeline, but we can't change the pipeline for these people. It should apply for people moving forward, not retroactive.

Jeff Dense recommended distribution on Infoline and that we come back May 1 for a final up

or down vote. The executive summary does a good job of the changes in the document. Evans concurred. Some of the changes were minor. Some of the recommendation was to put pages on the document. Some of the changes are more substantive. Some of the revisions are things that have been kicked around by CPCs and FPCs and some are points of clarification in case of disagreement between levels of the process. When faculty provide feedback, there are line numbers on the pages. Those line numbers are helpful for providing comments. Please refer to page numbers and line numbers.

Adkison said that he is ever more convinced that the reasons that undergraduates are successful is the range of research and creative projects that they can engage with. He is impressed with the parade of perspective colleagues in Ed and Business, and one of our greatest strengths is that we have articulated a commitment to discipline. The opportunity that our students have as undergraduates and graduates because of the expertise of our faculty at the program level. We want to reinforce the commitment to discipline. We do not want to move in a faux-research school direction that plays to our weaknesses instead of our strengths. We don't need to move in a direction where the numbers of publications are the primary demonstration of commitment to discipline. We need to articulate that the commitment to discipline can be articulated in a multiplicity of ways.

Colleen Johnson asked about the second page of the Executive Summary. Strengthening the requirements for full professor does seem to ask for strengthening research in particular. Dense said that the committee will engage in a conversation with the Provost with that. He encouraged sending that feedback to the FPC. Johnson said that she agreed if you are talking about promotion to full professor as related to tenure. Dense said that it is a substantive change. Within the academy, being productive in many forms was an important criteria for being a full-professor. Adkison said that external peer-review is important, but we should be careful how FPC or CPC asks for external letters. What we have here is unusual, because if we ask for specific feedback relative to our expectations, then those letters can be problematic.

Colleen Johnson said that the language for above average teaching ability was questionable. Dense said that there was language in a former draft that asked Institutional Research for numbers across the university and that average teaching experience was a requirement.

Dense asked for Senators to work through the draft and forward concerns to Allen Evans to craft a final draft, which will be posted shortly after the next FPC meeting for consideration May 1.

Budget and Planning Constitutional Change:

Ken Watson joined the table. Watson said there were few changes made. The no longer existing position of EOU Budget Director and being explicit on the voting membership. Deanna Timmermann asked if the Vice President for Facilities has always been non-voting or if that position has voted in the past. There has not been a clear history of that, according to Watson, which was one of the reasons for clarification. Timmermann said if it was just a change in position, it is a housekeeping change. She recommended that there needs to be clarity because of the logistics of posting constitutional amendments and the complexity of getting all members of the EOU community to vote on it. Watson said that the problem is the role of ex officio members, which doesn't imply voting membership. When UC approached that question with the VP of Finance and Administration, he wished not to be voting. Is that constitutionally what we want to say, that all ex officio members are voting?

Jeff Dense clarified. According to Roberts Subsection 49, 11th edition, "Frequently boards

include ex officio members...if the ex officio member is under the authority of the society, there is no distinction between him and the other board members." Under those rules, ex officio members have the right to vote. This is not a housekeeping change. When you are changing the voting status from a voting to a non-voting state, that institutes more than housekeeping. Also, one of the issues he raised in shared governance was to do a review of the ex officio members of all committees for consistency across all committees. The president of looking at Budget and Planning alone would be a concern. We need to not be bound by this issue. He is opposed to a set of piecemeal changes not only for logistical issues, but also worries about ballot fatigue if we take each issue separately. He encourages labeling this proposal. If we go forward, this should not stand as a precedent for review of other ex officio members.

Charles Lyons asked how many more constitutional amendments we should expect. Dense said that there is the removal of the FS rep from the UC. Lyons said that there would also be a counter removal of the Admin faculty rep from the Senate. Lyons said there would be two possible amendments? Dense agreed. Johnson asked why we couldn't pass this amendment here and then address the rest later. Dense clarified that it wasn't an issue that the two current issues were related, but that the review of the ex officio review be consistent. Whittaker is recused from all votes at this point. Johnson asked what the repercussions of not taking the vote away were. Watson said that it wouldn't affect the workload. The positions that would be reduced would be from voting to non-voting and the elimination of the position that had already been eliminated. Timmermann asked for clarification that under assembly, ex officio was a non-voting member. We took the committee structure from assembly and moved it into shared governance. What Dense is pointing out rightly is that instead of going through each position, we could have a statement that the ex officio is a non-voting position, then we wouldn't have to review each position on each committee. Heidbrink said that the move from 14 to 12 was just specifying who was voting, not changing the composition of the committee. Dutto asked about what language was changing. Can we vote if there is confusion about whether or not ex officio is non-voting? Johnson said that we already have committees that say ex officio non-voting. EPCC for example. Other committees have different language. She doesn't see why we can't go ahead with the budget and planning committee go through now and then clean up the other language next year. Heidbrink said that the purpose of the review of these committees is to address the issue of committees more comprehensively. That process would be the one where we would decide what the ex officio definition would be.

Dense would like to commend the committee for their thoroughness. We need to get away from micromanaging committees. He is in support of the substance of the proposal, but is concerned about the process for this review.

Doug asked if there is shared governance review that will address this already taking place. Dense said that the last item on the agenda is the shared governance review, but time has regularly been given up to deal with more pressing concerns. The intent is to form a committee to address issues, or perhaps having joint meetings between FS and UC to discuss shared governance review. The President wanted us to complete the task this year, but granted an extension for us to complete this until next year.

Dense gives up the time set aside on the agenda.

Public Comment Period: None

Good of the order: None

Meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.