

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

February 21, 2012

Meeting was called to order at 3:02.

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

Guests: Shari Carpenter, Mary Koza, Sally Mielke, Peter Wordleman

Minutes from February 7 were approved.

Faculty Senate President Update:

Jeff Dense returned from a conference in Washington D.C. and reported that we are ahead many schools in relation to distance education and civic engagement. Dense will be attending OUS Faculty Leadership Council in Eugene next month.

University Council Update:

New chair from financial aid committee reported about the change from a 3 to 2 term probation policy. Once a student is on academic probation, their aid is revoked in the second term. At the end of fall quarter, they had 57 appeals.

University Council will meet 2nd & 4th Tuesdays each month. Updating to UC website has now been delayed. Oversight of web content is through university advancement. UC wants to amend the constitution to delete the description that requires membership of at least two administrative faculty, at least one from enrollment services and one from student affairs. Revised language will just say two representatives from administrative faculty. UC will send a proposal to us using the new tracking form. Colleen Johnson asked about the constitutional change. When we went from assembly to current structure, it was intentional to have particular groups represented on the University Council. It sounds like more than housekeeping if it takes away the intent of who is represented on the committee. Johnson asked who decided if it was really a housekeeping change or who decides what is housekeeping. We should anticipate the recommendation from the University Council next week. Chris Heidbrink said that he understood that there was no other group to fill that role, so that it was a housekeeping issue.

Inter-institutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Report:

Shari Carpenter reported changes that will be in effect as a result of Senate Bill 242, which created the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC). The state can no longer sweep our tuition, and accountability standards have now been created in the form of performance compacts. These compacts create measurable standards focused on education and research. Every school district, community college, and university has to sign a yearly achievement compact. The HECC creates a CEO with authority over education leaders and boards.

Carpenter reported that Kitzhaber did this to try to create a seamless system from childhood through college. The HECC has two parts: childhood programs and achievement compacts, which

are well-detailed on the OUS and OR.gov websites. The Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB), chaired by the governor, is overseeing the creation of these compacts. The charge created a structure that will result in more accountability for all educational systems. EOU has a compact agreement with OUS, who has a compact agreement with OEIB. The OUS institution has a board that will approve campus compacts, and then OUS will then recommend to OEIB that they accept our compact. Carpenter then detailed EOU's compact.

Charles Lyons asked about the metrics, but he does not see the goals, whether faculty has input to selecting goals, and where faculty input comes in.

Carpenter said that the mission alignment was submitted to OUS. The Provost then worked with Sonja Andrews, the Vice Chancellor, who worked up matrices to work with mission alignment. Lyons said he understood it generally but not specifically. For example, there is a % of enrollment increase mandated for distance education. Is that a goal that we set, that we talk about? Shari said that would be a good question for Provost Adkison. The perception is that the goal will be established this summer. John Knudson-Martin said that some of the goals would be working in opposite directions. Rebecca Hartman indicated that the timeline was that March 1 it goes to Provosts' Council. So is that where faculty input is going? Jeff Dense said that there has been some discussion at cabinet level about goals and aims. Hartman registered her concern with the percentage of students who are high-school dual-enrolled. The path is problematic because it gives us students who are ill-prepared. We could be setting ourselves up for problems in terms of performance evaluations if we are being assessed according to those students. Dense will raise this issue in Dean's Council. Colleen Johnson asked how similar our metrics are to other OUS groups. Carpenter said that there is some cross-over. All universities have enrollment from their primary geographic area as a metric. Every school, except PSU and UO, have as a goal to increase distance education. Dense said that there is a set of system-wide metrics and each institution generated institution-specific ones that are tied to their individual mission. Johnson asked if the CEO was a single education officer over the entire system. Carpenter said yes. Johnson asked how that person's functions differed from Susan Castille. Dense said that she is K-12. This person will be K-16. The governor hired a firm to hire for this position, but that position has not been formalized.

EPCC Consent Agenda:

Agenda approved.

- BA 347-DPD status
- BA411 Course Change-title, description
- BA416 New Course
- MA 343-New Course
- MATH 040-Course Change-Credit
- BIOL 350 Course Change-title
- BIOL 341 Course Change-prerequisite
- BIOL 345 Course Change-prerequisite
- LIB 387L Course Delete
- LIB 388L Course Delete

Action Agenda:

Last meeting, we did not approve the minor for geography. The Media Arts program is requesting a name change. Minor for Geography and Media Arts name changes approved. Jeff Dense abstained.

A motion was made to move items from the table. Discussion ensued on the music program. Peter Wordleman explained why the music major change was necessary. We are allowing students to use a minor and convert that back to their music degree through their senior project. Those minors and degrees have tracks toward graduate school. Matt Cooper talked with all of the programs affected by this change. The big question was that Music specified certain minors. Concerns were raised mostly from minors that were not specified. Music came to the realization that they might need to incorporate additional minors. Students are getting other minors as well, and there will need to be a process for doing so. Jeff Dense asked Wordleman what that process would be. Wordleman explained that Music will need to develop a written proposal for the faculty. Colleen Johnson asked Wordleman to discuss the issue of abandoning the Bachelor of Music and going to a BA/BS instead of keeping the BM with the minor opt-out. Peter said that the BM was different because it was a 120 credit hour major. The arts are used to taking a large number of credits in their area. When they did the BM structure, they removed the BS or BA options. They don't want to go through the process to change the major again. The new structure has the potential for great integrations in the future.

The intention of the motion was to consider the whole MUS package in one vote. Motion carried. Dense abstained.

Student Evaluation Document:

Heidi Harris presented the document and indicated that Elwyn Martin, John Knudson-Martin and herself met to implement the changes Faculty Senate requested from the previous iteration of the document and are bringing it back before senate before sending recommendations back to FPC to address. The current document was put in place due to urgency from accreditation. Knudson-Martin said that we need something robust enough to use for both online and on-campus courses. There needs to be consultation on the college level. Charles Lyons said that FPC was tasked with this, but it did not get through the colleges. We need to be sending it back to FPC. Rebecca Hartman asked how the ad hoc was formed to revise the document. Jeff Dense said that he put together the ad hoc committee to get the discussion started and to move the process forward. The FPC still has to approve a version of the evaluation tool. Colleen Johnson said that there needs to be clearer direction for FPC to go back to their constituents to get feedback and incorporate those comments from faculty. If substantive comments could be forwarded to Dense, he will take them to FPC to address. Informed comments would help to complete this task. Knudson-Martin said that this is a frustrating situation because we need this evaluation tool and we are sending it back to committee when we need something now. Johnson asked Lyons and Martin if the number of categories for the instrument were optimal. One of the comments indicated was that there were too many categories for selection. Lyons and Martin clarified that five options is standard. More than 7 is excessive. The scale is ordinary. Hartman asked if there was a more appropriate committee that could do this work. Dense said that this is the appropriate committee. Martin asked if we put the document through FPC and bypassed the college level, whether there was a chance that we could put it into implementation and get kickback. Hartman said that an argument could be made that FPC has too much work and an ad hoc committee might bring together faculty from the colleges who would be interested, so it might be a faster and more productive process. Dense will take that recommendation under advisement. He wondered if tasking FPC with this would be counter-productive at this point. We as Senators should be seeking input of our constituents. He would like Martin and Harris to co-chair a task force on this issue. Leandro Espinosa asked about the idea of whether getting it perfect at this point was just stopping the process to save time, which we are not doing. Jeff asked for substantive comments regarding the instrument.

Colleen Johnson questioned item number 6. What is the difference between concepts and ideas? On She indicated that Question 7 about communicating the importance of the subject matter was a question that many faculty find insulting. Why do we have to justify the importance of the concept we are discussing? Question 11 should be changed from e.g. to i.e. And Question 12 is a sentence fragment. She also recommending rearrange items so the instrument addresses course content and delivery, then instructor assessment, then personal assessment.

Chris Heidbrink asked a question about the course comparisons. He thinks we can do it well. Rebecca Hartman pointed out that words make a difference. We need to make the entire instrument significantly and substantively better. The instrument should not be a customer satisfaction survey. Students should be able to evaluate the courses in relation to others and be able to say something substantive. Frank Bushkara said that this evaluation was better than what was sent up before. This is much more coherent than those. He also asked if this evaluation instrument is supposed to be utilized in both on-campus and distance ed. That should be addressed. John Knudson-Martin indicated that anything ends up with a qualitative tool. This is a volunteer response tool to collect highly questionable data. Not that this it is not important, but it fits into a flawed system that relies on qualitative data. Heidi Harris said that she just went through the third year review, and she was told that the tool was primarily one to set up a reflective response from the teacher. Hartman responded that if, in fact, we are just using this for individual reflections, then we do not even need a standard form. Leandro Espinosa wanted to clarify that he has always heard that they are for reflection, but people have gotten into serious trouble because of the evaluation forms. Colleen Johnson said that one of the reasons that this evaluation tool matters so much is that independent of what has happened this year, in the past this evaluation has been used as an instrument to specifically evaluate faculty in their third-year review and tenure. These things do not really help, but they can hurt. So it is important to get it as right as we can. She suggested that we sent it back to FPC with a timeline on it. It might be ready to be used Spring term. We could mandate it for use in Spring, request it come back by May 1 to be looked at and used Spring term. Knudson-Martin indicated that the system can not be improved by improving the instrument. The problem that needs to be addressed is that FPC and CPC cannot use a flawed instrument. Johnson asked again why we are wasting our time on this.

Jeff Dense indicated that response rate is the issue. Less than 20% of students responding is an issue. Doug Briney suggested that as part of the process that faculty involvement is important, input is necessary, but not approval. Charles Lyons said that the reason we can not put this aside is because we were dinged by accreditation for using separate evaluations. The evaluation needs to evaluate both online and on-campus. Darren Dutto brought up the response rate again. Even with the paper responses, we do not get 100% response rate. Usually the kids at the top and the low end are those that respond. The data that we take away is not a complete sample. If the population is not giving a good response, then the data cannot be interpreted. Spending a lot of time on it is not good. Only compulsory 100% will give us a good picture.

Jeff Dense requested to continue discussion at the next meeting. Carolyn Bloyed said that if we want to get a true opinion, we need to get student feedback about questions to see if students understand and can answer the questions.

Policy and Process Discussion:

Rebecca Hartman said that when the history program meet with the dean, the dean was not aware of the stopping-the-tenure-clock policy. There is no mechanism in place for doing so. What is the point of faculty/shared governance approving policy if it is not implemented? The policies and handbooks on the website are unclear. They are not updated and can be outdated. The administrator third-year review process is unclear. What do we do to be sure that policies that we have in place are carried through?

Jeff Dense asked about the tenure clock. The AAUP Red Book is specific about the policy. Our current procedures do not require any kind of documentation. At the end of each policy, it should provide a date it was implemented or became effective. It might be difficult to recreate what we have on the books. Charles Lyons asked about who in particular makes policy. Dense said that in terms of shared governance review, clarifying who makes policy should be at the top of the list. We are an advisory body to recommend action. The University of Oregon has a model that makes them the legislative body that creates the policies. The president has veto and then goes to negotiation. Right now at EOU, decisions go up the chain of command as recommendations and do not come back down if we do not like them.

Rebecca Hartman says that those facts still do not address the implementation of policy. Does the tenure clock stopping policy go through the dean's office? Does it go through HR? Dense said it is also an issue of implementation and education. We do not get a hard copy of the handbook, and even if we did, we might have trouble finding policy in that document. Heidi Harris asked if we sign a document indicating that we understand and will abide by the faculty handbook. Hartman asked how we can make the administrative structure implement the policies that we have to put in place. Dense indicated that once it is clear that we make policy, then the rest will follow. John Knudson-Martin asked for us to ask administration to provide a list of policies in place. Dense said that part of administrative support from shared governance, including the record-keeping aspect.

Colleen Johnson recapped two policies that we could track: the stop the tenure-clock policy and the 3rd year review for administrators. Those two policies we can ask about in particular. She recommended that we put those on the next agenda and invite the Provost in to discuss them. Leandro Espinosa asked if we just need a place to inform and publish a handbook. Jeff Dense indicated that the faculty staff handbook needs to be taken on, but questioned whether or not we wanted to do it. David Drexler asked if there was anyone tasked with maintaining the document. Chris Heidbrink said that he thinks that it is something that we should task ourselves with.

Jeff Dense handed out a sheet with four models of faculty senates. He asked what model we want to be and what we are right now. Dense indicated that the heads of the shared governance review were tasked with reviewing the committee structure, composition, size and reporting lines. We need to look at our bodies: are we too big? What are the duties or responsibilities? The constituents of all bodies will be a part of this process. For example, we are violating the CAS bylaws. There is a body called the college council that consists of all the discipline reps meet, which has not happened in years. ED/BUS have no set of bylaws. President Davies wanted the shared governance review done by March 1, but Dense said that there was no way a task this big could be done by that time. Elwyn Martin wanted clarification on who was charged for what roles. Is faculty senate to be intimately

involved? If so, that has not happened. Dense said that the time for shared governance review has been put off time after time so that other important issues could be addressed. Martin said that we have not engaged in a discussion of shared governance review yet. Dense said that he could be more assertive in sticking to this agenda item. Colleen Johnson said that it seems that there should be a broader group of people involved in the shared governance review.

John Knudson-Martin said that Jeff Dense has been prioritizing our time well. Trying to squeeze all of the issues that Senate needs to address is a no-win. If we are going to be a decision making body, then we are going to have to spend more time doing it. Jeff Dense said that the time needed for deliberation on these issues communicated by the president was unrealistic. If we need to have specific time for discussing these issues. Knudson-Martin asked a question about how discussion time is flowing and how the process works. Jeff said that he is leery of adhering to Robert's Rules, and if we do so we have to have a parliamentarian.

Rebecca Hartman asked why we are examining shared governance. We do not have a set of goals and questions to address. So how do we do it and achieve anything? Doug Briney said that we need to create and delegate a sub-committee to review it. Colleen Johnson said that the membership of a committee should not just be from faculty senate. We need to have a broader base to draw on. We need to ask inclusive participation. Darren Dutto asked if the review of the faculty handbook would be a part of the charge. Dense said that structure and content was the concern. Dutto said that the task becomes large when it relates to shared governance and documentation. The reporting structure and the committee membership seem to be very limited. Hartman asked if it would not be better to address problems and then start for there. The picture for the constitution was pretty clear. It might be more effective if we identify places of breakdown and start there instead of looking at the holistic picture. Dense said that perhaps we need a brainstorming session with regard to potential issues and then frame a charge to the ad hoc committee. Hartman also asked us to put out a call to our colleagues for input on what is problematic with the shared governance structure.

Heidi Harris recommended that she draft an email to send around with a particular time limitations for response. Jeff Dense asked if we wanted to talk about this at the next meeting.

Rebecca Hartman asked if we had decided to send back the evaluation document to FPC. Darren Dutto asked how important it is to deal with this issue immediately as opposed to giving it to FPC. Jeff Dense said that that a document needs to be in place for the next year. Doug Briney said that we could also gather feedback from our colleagues on the evaluation document. Hartman indicated that we might handle feedback on the survey document on Google Docs outside of the meeting. Dense asked for us to spend time on shared governance each week, and that we need to meet every other week for the remainder of the year.

Good of the Order:

Chris Heidbrink indicated that ASEOU approved a referendum about Hoke renovations and whether a fee is acceptable for the renovation of Hoke. Rebecca Hartman said basketball playoffs are this week.

Meeting was adjourned 5:10.

