

**EOU Faculty Senate  
Minutes, April 16, 2013**

**In Attendance:** Jean Morello, Mike Heather, Charles Lyons, Barbara Schulz, Rebecca Hartman, John Knudson-Martin, David Drexler, DeAnna Timmermann, Susan Murrell, Elwyn Martin, Doug Briney, Heidi Harris, **Attending via Google Hangout:** Mary Fields, Mike Pierce, Kerri Wenger, Colleen Johnson, Donna Rainboth **Also attending:** Sarah Witte, Angie Adams, President Davies, Provost Adkison, Lara Moore, Cory Peeke, Allen Evans, Cori Brewster, Shelley Schauer

**Meeting called to order at 3:03 pm.**

**Revisited Sustainability Plan Discussion:**

President Davies thanks group for inviting him to discussion. He notes that we are facing both short and long term challenges. Believes we have a handle on short term issues and will be able to meet requirements for fiscal year. EOU is on trajectory where current expenses will outpace revenues. President Davies wants to be clear that when looking at ways to ensure expenses do not outpace revenues we will be looking at all aspects of institution. There will be a review of academic programs. Review plan has gone out to all vice presidents and directors for the administrative side. This is a continuation of the sustainability plan. We started this plan in 2011 and at that time we had an 8.4% fund balance. We knew that state appropriation would be declining and that changes would need to be made. Some things worked well and others did not. Reviewing the plan is a part of the process. If we do not make adjustments we will continue to have gap between expenses and revenues and will not be sustainable. President Davies notes that he appreciates all of the comments he has received so far. President Davies opens up the floor for questions.

John Knudson-Martin asks if we can continue to recruit and reward tuition through the MESA scholarship award. Lara Moore responds that they recognize that commitments have already been made for next year that they do not want to revoke. The best suggestion is to touch base with Kristen Limb in Financial Aid who will know the budget of different departments. Provost Adkison notes that the MESA scholarship is not a big ticket item. The biggest single issue with fee remissions is that we frequently do not get a return on our investment. Task force is looking at ways to ensure that we are using fee remissions more effectively. Knudson-Martin also notes that it is unclear how construction overrun affected operating costs. Lara Moore responds that they are funded differently and should not overlap, but if a project runs over the overage has to be covered somewhere. Provost notes that it was thought that the cost to renovate the Gilbert Center could be charged largely against transition space costs and capital costs, but it turned out that some of the costs were not allowed. Lara Moore adds that we are getting an advance on next year to finish covering the cost of the Gilbert Center.

Senator asks question on cost of using search agencies. President Davies notes that the search agencies are used for vice president and dean searches when the expertise is needed. Provost Adkison notes that

\$70,000 was spent on the Dean of Business and Education search. This search consultant was not so successful and not inclined to use in future. President Davies adds that search consultants will be used sparingly and only for certain positions.

Barbara Schulz states that at the union meeting concerns were expressed about the three deans in CAS and if this is an efficient model for the future. President Davies responds that this will be looked at and analyzed. The structure came out of task force. Provost notes that we only have one associate dean and two half-time associate deans.

Heidi Harris adds that she deduced from one of the slides from last week that had more of the instructional sustainability plan been implemented we would have been able to remain at 8.4% of fund balance. President Davies responds that even in a perfect world the 8.4% fund balance would have gone down a little bit. We knew that this year was going to be difficult. If entire sustainability plan had been put into place we would likely be at a 5.5% fund balance. The non-instructional side is easier to implement. There are pieces of the non-instructional side that are not sustainable. For instance, we went too far in IT. President Davies adds that we need to be put on trajectory that will be able to handle fluctuations.

Rebecca Hartman asks who makes the decisions to give out scholarship money. The Provost responds that there are different processes for different chunks. The two biggest are the University Scholar awards and the Transfer Scholarships for transfer students. Lara Moore adds that these are decided based on a matrix that in her opinion is not very well-developed. This matrix is being reviewed. The awards look at student's GPA and SAT scores. Also notes that we have some mandated remissions that are not funded, but we have to offer. President Davies adds that with the matrix there is no shut off point and we continue to offer rewards. Strategies that no longer work are in place. There needs to be a shut off point. Provost adds that another part of the problem is that state and federal support has decreased and our students expected family contribution has also decreased. We have picked up larger percentage chunk than most of our sister institutions. Lara Moore states that the process is being cleaned up. It is hard to have single place to monitor budget because they are being awarded all over campus. Hartman adds a follow up question and comment from herself and DSSML asking to confirm that there has not been a shut off point, but there could be. President Davies confirms. There has been a philosophy of give, give, give, and give. Hartman comments that there is some sense around campus that when we talk about accountability we are looking at ways to maybe cut jobs of people who didn't have any responsibility in getting us to this point. There is a discontent with this approach. Knudson-Martin states that it seems there has been lax oversight in overload implementation, construction, and tuition remission. President responds that the point is very well taken. We have had blunt conversations about this issue and the culture of Eastern. Knudson-Martin adds that he thinks faculty wants tough decisions to be made so we are fiscally responsible. President Davies appreciates comment. Provost agrees and takes full responsibility. He will push back in one huge area: overload management. We have been discussing this issue for well over a year.

Cori Peeke asks if we are worse off than schools on a semester schedule. The Provost confirms that this is true. If we could convert, in addition to financial aid costs, administrative structures would be more effective. Everything we deal with would be 33% less than where we are now. Provost Adkison is not

sure why we are still on terms when rest of country is on semester system and he is not sure what should take place to get back to semesters.

Colleen Johnson states that she is curious about way forward and how decisions will be made from now on. We have programs that rely on adjuncts, but at town hall noted that this is not sustainable. She asks what is plan in terms of faculty resources. President Davies responds that we are a small regional campus and our structures need to reflect that. This is being looked at on administrative and academic side. Assumption risk needs to be taken out of quarterly reports which will enable us to make better decisions along those lines. Provost Adkison adds that relative to programs we do not have too many faculty members at Eastern. We do have programs that are dependent on overload, which is not sustainable. Faculty members are spread too thin and we are trying to do too much with what we have. President Davies adds that College of Business recently went from 5 to 4 credits. This could be a cost saving measure. Johnsons asks if one of the elements is moving overload to inload. Provost responds that this is the case, but first need to reduce need for overload. Right now most of need is because we are trying to do too much with the faculty members we have. Mike Pierce asks if cutting back on overload will improve the position of the university even if that is lost revenue. The Provost responds that we are not cutting back on overload per se, but we need to streamline programs which would in some cases result in less of a need for overload.

President Davies thanks the Senate for the invitation and he appreciates input and insights. If anyone has any other questions, concerns, or suggestions feel free to email, call, or stop by the President's office.

### **Presentation of Proposed Tenure & Promotion Handbook:**

Jeff Dense thanks Senate President for the opportunity to present handbook and thanks colleagues, Cory and Allen, for help with document. Feel unanimously that this is a very strong document that serves the long term interests of the university. To understand document Dense suggests starting with summary of handbook. The FPC was tasked by Provost with reviewing handbook. The current document is a 2008 version, 2009 version came up for discussion, but never came up for vote. The word collegiality was one of the primary issues with that draft. This should not be included as criteria and was removed from the draft. We also tried to improve on organizational structure. We looked at peer institutions and how they do things and by doing this decided to leave creation of criteria up to different disciplines. Another big problem with the current draft was failure to integrate Oregon Administrative Rules. Annual evaluations during probationary period were not included. Annual evaluations are mandated by OAR so they have been incorporated into handbook. Grievances also incorporated.

The draft was circulated draft many times and a forum was held for feedback. FPC wanted the process to be open and transparent. Quite sensitive that will never be able to please everybody. This brings us to today's final draft. Dense adds that it was brought to his attention today that training of members of tenure promotion committees may need to be added. In previous version the standards were a bit vague so FPC worked on adding more specificity to document. Dense heard concerns early on about faculty being beholden to new set of rules. Example is provided of a current professor who has been here for ten years who will use old handbook and is not beholden to new standards, unless they would voluntarily like to move. We do not want to change rules in middle of game. Fall 2013 is start date and new faculty will be

beholden to new handbook. When a tenure track professor is promoted to an associate professor Fall 2013 they will jump into new handbook for full professor promotion.

Electronic portfolios made it easier for us to review files, but they are not mandated in this version. We did not include section on evaluation of on-line teaching. This issue may require extensive inspection and did not have time to complete. This document also does not include a timeline for commitment of subject discipline. This will be the first thing in fall and will be added as appendix.

Dense reports that they tried to lay out criteria for how many years it takes to become a full professor. Forum helped them decide on two full years. Two full years is the minimum residency at EOU requirement before one is eligible to go up for full professor. Allen Evans adds that lot of what is in newest draft is the clearing up of procedural issues. Jeff Dense opens the floor for questions.

Sarah Witte asks if tenure track faculty who primarily teach online have existing criteria in teaching portfolio adequate enough to accommodate the online environment. Dense responds that this issue has been avoided. This is an issue that will take more time. Our initial idea was to forward Chico rubric and evaluate in two years, but at this point in time not completely sure about this rubric and need to have robust discussion on topic. We wanted to move forward with rest of handbook. Timmermann notes that there is a section in handbook about online teaching appointments so this topic is included. It is noted that the individual will create a portfolio with framing statement, student evaluations, course syllabi, and sample assessments. Dense responds that it is not delineated specifically for tenure track faculty. They only pertain to adjuncts and online instructors.

Heidi Harris brings two points to the discussion. Her reading of handbook is that it sets up separate sets of criteria based on ranking, adjuncts online will be rated more critically than a person teaching the same course through a different track. This is a concern because modality is modality and why would we assess adjunct and tenure track differently. Harris also notes concern about confusion for those doing promotion and tenure separately and asks if this is clarified in handbook. Dense responds that he does not believe this issue has been clarified. We will need to get back to the table and clarify for who go through those processes at different times.

Timmermann asks if alumni are included in third year and tenure portfolio. Dense responds that alumni are only meant to be included in tenure portfolio. Timmermann notes that this might need to be reworded. Timmermann also notes that in CAS we tend to have CPC review the files and then write letters to give to dean who then writes his letters. The actual process in the current version of handbook is that the dean writes and then the CPC writes their letters. This does not appear to have been changed in new version, but if there is a grievance it says to refer back to dean, but should it be to refer back to CPC. The order of dean, CPC, FPC and then back to the dean seems odd. Evans responds that the intent is for this to be a forward moving process and if some disagreement candidate has option to make a statement. Timmermann suggests that CPC be added to the sentence in Step 8 of the personnel review process where the procedure when there is a position contrary to the college dean is explained.

Mike Pierce states that all these refinements are a good service to faculty. He also asks if the new handbook for post tenure review will be applicable to all faculty members that have tenure and are promoted. Dense responds that the language with regards to post tenure review is from an OAR, which is

quite specific in regards to expectations. We have to be controlled by OAR and any changes are mostly from incorporation of the OAR. Pierce also notes that on page ten of handbook it lists characteristics and maybe should include the word may before include. Dense responds that this is problematic because then we are evaluating faculty members with criteria that are not written down and don't want there to be potential unwritten criteria that could be applied to one person and not another. Pierce also notes that on page eight list professional scholarly or artistic with no comma after professional He asks if a comma should be included. Dense responds that professional applies to scholarly and artistic so no comma is needed. Discussion begins on order of characteristic list on page 10. Dense notes that it was not intent to micro-manage disciplines in regards to criteria and to be guided by list. Pierce suggests that it be stated in handbook that this is the list of characteristics that the colleges will use to develop their own criteria.

Timmermann adds that on page 23 we codify that tenure track faculty will review adjuncts, but not sure if we want to codify at this point in time that tenure track faculty will be the ones responsible. Dense notes that we felt that tenure track faculty are in the best position to evaluate, as opposed to administrators.

Pierce asks if part of this process was to review the tenure review process at other institutions. Discussion ensues. Timmermann confirms that the committee looked at different programs around the country.

Senate President Timmermann confirms that at this juncture the Faculty Senate will only be looking at proposed changes to handbook. Evaluation forms were included, but will be reviewed by the FPC at a later date. The vote on proposed changes to the Tenure & Promotion handbook will take place at the May 7 Faculty Senate meeting. Senate President has some clarification comments and some questions about process. Will gather comments heard at meeting and if any senators have comments not brought up at meeting can send to President Timmermann to consolidate and send to FPC. FPC requests that they receive these comments by next Monday. The final draft of the handbook document will be posted by April 30 for review before the vote at the May 7 Faculty Senate meeting.

President Timmermann notes that documents from the Provost have been posted to blackboard for review. Changes were made to the Emeritus policy and this has also been posted for review. We will vote on this policy on May 7. At that meeting we will also have a ton of EPCC items to consider.

**For the good of order:**

Dense reports that Senate Bill 270 has been gone through series of compromised amendments. If it is the will of the Senate may want to come up with faculty statement in support of faculty membership on institutional governing boards. These issues are moving quickly so may need to complete electronically.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:58 pm.**