

Faculty Senate Meeting
November 29, 2011

Meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

In attendance: Doug Briney, Frank Bushakra, Darren Dutto, Jeff Dense, David Drexler, Leandro Espinosa, Heidi Harris, Rebecca Hartman, Mike Heather, Colleen Johnson, John Knudson-Martin, Charles Lyons, Elwyn Martin, Donna Rainboth.

Guests: Linda Jerofke, Carolyn Bloyt, Sally Mielke, John Thurber, Mary Koza, lady on Provosts Council, Doug Kaigler, Heather ?

Meeting minutes for Nov 1 were approved. Meeting minutes for May 3 and May 31 were approved with three abstentions (John Knudson-Martin, Rebecca Hartman, Colleen Johnson).

EPCC Consent Agenda

Consent agenda was brought forward. Colleen Johnson requested that the Library courses be removed from the consent agenda and moved to the action agenda for the January meeting. The consent agenda with the removed Library courses approved. One abstention: Leandro Espinosa.

Child Care Task Force Draft Memorandum

President Dense brought forward the child care task force memo he drafted to President Davies. He will make two changes, one to indicate that OIT has shut down their child care center, and changes to typos in the footnotes will be fixed. Dense will add a source for potential grant funding as well. The letter was approved as amended.

PEBB Draft Memorandum

Dense discussed the issues related to the PEBB benefits changes in regards to the letter to the Chancellor that he drafted. He opened the letter for discussion. Charles Lyons had questions about the nature of the rural subsidy and whether or not it was still in effect. Dense indicated that it was not and involved repayment to providers that might have been out-of-network. Dense is not sure that the letter will make any difference, but he thinks that going on the record as showing concern over the Health Engagement Model and the other issues mentioned in the letter is important. Lyons asked if other campuses are making these specific points, and Dense said "no." The contract will be up for renewal and rebidding in the next biennium, so framing these issues now will hopefully influence those deliberations. Lyons wondered if we should bind together with the other institutions and perhaps send our concerns to Providence. Leandro Espinosa wondered if combining with other campuses might also help our voice be heard more than sending our letter separately. Frank Bushakra indicated that he had read the PEBB Board minutes from the meeting where the decisions about these issues were made seemed to be rushed, so there might be some issues with concerns over the timeline for implementing the changes and the legality of informing members about those changes.

Dense will send a letter to other Faculty Senate Presidents about combining to create a joint letter.

Administrative Task Force Report

Dense called Provost Adkison, but he could not be reached. Dense asked Doug Kaigler to review the process that the Administrative Task Force (ATF) went through to reach its recommendations.

Kaigler indicated that the purpose of the faculty senate discussion of the Administrative Task Force Report was twofold: to provide Provost Adkison more feedback from faculty about the Task Force recommendation and for the ATF to receive feedback from the Senate. When Kaigler wrote the document, he tried to outline the system the ATF used to be able to engage with the question openly and collectively as well as communicate the ATF's preference for the two-dean model. He opened the floor for questions or feedback.

Colleen Johnson indicated that within Arts and Sciences, the two dean model might not be unanimously endorsed but was certainly largely favored. She indicated that at some point, faculty were told that they would be able to discuss or evaluate the model internally in Arts and Sciences and she hoped that this was still the case.

Kaigler said that he does not assume that the Provost has made up his mind in terms of the structure of the administration. He said that he felt that the Provost respects the process, but until a final decision is announced, nothing can be assumed. Decisions must be made regarding the sub-structure for the one dean or two dean model once the model is decided upon.

Leandro Espinosa indicated that he, too, felt that the two-dean model was the appropriate choice.

Charles Lyons asked if the task force was unanimous, and Kaigler indicated that even though there was not a vote, the committee indicated that they unanimously supported this recommendation.

Dense indicated that the only comments he received from outside were from Les Mueller, who advocated for separate deans for Business and Education, and from Espinosa. Kaigler wants to go on record as being impressed with the Provost's effort to receive feedback from Faculty across campus in diverse circumstances.

The deadline for submitting comments to the Provost is next Tuesday.

Rebecca Hartman brought up the difficulty of the search for a dean and asked if that was addressed in the task force. Kaigler said that the Provost prioritized the Dean discussion for the ATF first because if the two-dean model is the route we want to go, the search will be initiated the beginning of next term. The Provost has permission to engage a search facilitation group to expedite the search. If the two-dean model is chosen, it is unclear as to whether the deans will be searched for simultaneously. Dense indicated that the CAS dean would be searched for first in the case of two separate searches because of the lack of sustainability of the current dean model for CAS. Hartman said that there was some concern that if we didn't move quickly enough, we would not have optimal candidates. Linda Jerofke said that the Provost indicated that we could push back the timeline if we hire a search organization. If we have people who are professionals at headhunting, the process will move more quickly.

Dense handed out a model for dean structures at comparable institutions. Each of the universities and colleges were different, so imposing a single structure or model on all colleges at EOU might not be the best course.

Hartman indicated that the Task Force did an amazing job in a short period of time of laying out and articulating the reasons behind the two-dean model.

Dense approved of the Provost's openness to the two-dean model. Colleen Johnson asked what the main point of the one-dean model would be. Kaigler said cost savings, conceivably. But the ATF demonstrated in its report that there was no way one person could attend to all duties. John Knudson-Martin talked about which duties were and were not delegatable, and indicated that they would need to be paid for and done, no matter how many deans were hired. Leadership arose as an issue where the two-dean model would clearly work best. The next task the ATF will take on is to look at the sub-structure of whatever model the Provost chooses. A Business Center model would also help to regulate and bring together services as a part of that sub-structure.

Colleen Johnson asked what the timeline would be for the discussion. Kaigler said that his assumption is that the Provost will make up his mind by the end of the term. The Task Force is scheduled to begin meeting again the first of next term to discuss implications based on the structure the Provost selects. At some level, money will be a part of the decision making, which will make it more difficult and complex. Dense also clarified that he will make a recommendation to the President in terms of how to proceed. Johnson said that the next steps, at least within CAS, would be more contentious. She hopes that members of the task force can go to their constituents and gather information to make informed decisions. Darren Dutto indicated that individuals need to go to their representatives to provide input into this next step. Dense and Kaigler both indicated that the advice was sound.

Frank Bushakra said that the document was so detailed that his anticipated questions were answered.

Dense indicated that Darren Dutto came up with an innovative approach, but the charge was to evaluate the pros and cons of the one- vs. two-dean model, so the task force did not have sufficient time to tease out the alternative model.

Donna Rainboth seconded what all had said and said that the document was very clear. David Drexler said that the Library was a little outside the parameters of typical faculty, but he was happy with the document. Mike Heather also said he was happy with the model.

Heidi Harris hoped that the three campus entities (on-campus, online, and onsite) would be more integrated in the next steps. The single dean model would have difficulties overseeing all three populations equally, so the two-dean model seemed a viable choice for those currently disparate populations.

Dense indicated that he has a greater appreciation for the differences in the colleges and the way that they operate. He has an increased sensitivity to the outside demands of ED/BUS as the university also works to juggle equity and support structure demands for the separate colleges. He would also like to commend Angie Adams for the work that she did for the Task Force.

Dense asked one final time that the Senate come forward with anything to support the one-dean model. All were in support of the two-dean model recommended in the report. The vote went forward with unanimous approval to support the task force recommendation.

University Council Report

Elwyn Martin reported that the last University Council (UC) meeting was spent discussing their goals for the assessment of shared governance. need email from Elwyn with the details...

Questions were raised about the nature of the Faculty Senate UC Representative on UC. Rebecca asked about having a UC rep on Senate. Dense clarified that there is no person from the UC who comes to senate. There was perceived disparity in power with 4 faculty on UC while other constituencies having 3. Another issue of shared governance is how ex-officio members voted, which needs to be clarified. John indicated that he was on UC for a few years, and it seemed redundant to have someone from Senate to Council and a rotating member to senate which UC decided to stop doing because it was redundant considering that the leadership met at least once a month for communication. Charles clarified that it seemed from their standpoint unnecessary. CJ said that there are different dynamics from someone sitting in a meeting than if leaders meet. CJ clarified that UC has chosen not to send someone and so they want us not to send someone as well. CJ said that it seems to be a matter of whether we see it as necessary rather than if they seem it is necessary. Doug Briney said that he wasn't aware that it was in the constitution that a UC rep was allowed at the FS meetings. Dense clarified that it isn't in our bylaws. CJ indicated that in the constitution indicated that a member of the Senate would go to UC but not in the UC. Dense clarified that there is an increased expectation of committee work, and some supervisors have been reticent to let them participate. They want to make sure that they have the ability to do those tasks.

Rebecca clarified that we have an administrative faculty representative on FS. It is currently vacant. It was previously Dennis Hopwood.

Public comment period:

Dense had a discussion with Davies and he will send out a budgetary update based on what happened and a comment with regard to the most recent plan and his intent to go ahead with implementing that plan.

Professor Johnson raised an issue about people not coming to meetings. Shari Carpenter will step down but continue as IFS Senator. Colby Heideman will try to make an adjustment to his lab schedule. Administrative faculty contact will be contacted about replacing them.

Rebecca asked to taking the EPCC action items, but Sally Mielke was not present. CJ indicated that the issue of the GEC is in play, but with regard to those classes, the LIB 307 had been GEN ED, and at the end of the year, the LIB pulled it because they felt it didn't fit GEN ED. The question would be what has changed. LIB 327 was brought to CAS and someone asked if they would ask for GEN ED and they said "no." Dense talked to Karen Clay and related issues with affected programs and the process and where library enters the process. There needs to be a discussion of how programs at the margins of the colleges are handled. Rebecca noted that we need to have Sally here to ask her what is happening in terms of GEN ED and DPD at EPCC. There is a perceived problem with DPD courses not having enough online and the possibility of a waiver. Dense indicated that those are policy issues that will require Faculty Senate action and won't be part of a consent agenda. One issue is with transfer students who come in with AAs but need to take a DPD course, which is similar to a GEN ED course. Darren indicated that the students should be informed at the beginning of the process that they need to take the requirement. The issues might also be that there are 3 and 5 credit courses, but the option is 5 credits, so students might need to take two courses instead of one. Rebecca indicated that the issue might be communication and that things that needed to be taken care of after the requirement was put in place weren't. CJ indicated that the discussion needs to start at EPCC because it is curricular policy. Dense asked for someone to list and articulate what our concerns are so that something doesn't come forward to Senate and

then have to go back to EPCC. Rebecca recommended that Sally come speak to us about the issues for the policy. Dense will ask her to come and speak to us at the January meeting. DPD perception that there are inadequate DPD opportunities resulting in a request for waivers. The DPD link was updated in July and the link has an updated list. There might possibly be multiple lists in play. And there might be problems with browsers. John indicated that there might be an issue of requiring 5 credits but not providing 5 credit classes so that students have a logistical mismatch that adds to the credit shortage. Dense indicated that there is a more general issue with taking extra credits as opposed to just meeting the minimums. Heather discussed the transfer credit evaluation and some CC have diversity requirements. It might be nice to see if courses that students have taken elsewhere that might qualify. Also, online students plan their coursework from the point of entry and might not have planned it in. Rebecca asked how other OUS schools do it as all of them have DPD requirements as well.

Dense requested that we meet twice a month in January and possibly February so that we can process EPCC items in advance of publication and to get through action items.

CJ brought up the issue of release time for the agenda. It will be placed on in January. Dense asked if it would be appropriate to circulate