

Lewis & Clark College  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Faculty Meeting  
March 7, 2012

- I. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the February 1, 2012 meeting were approved with no additions or corrections.
- II. Announcements
  - a. Director of Advising Daena Goldsmith announced that faculty may submit midterm deficiency grades for any student currently earning a C- or worse in a course. The deficiency grade allows the advisor to be brought into the loop. Peter Drake asked if midterm grades could now be submitted, and Dr. Goldsmith answered that it was now possible. She added that instructors could also submit advising alerts in addition to midterm deficiency grades, particularly in order to explain in more detail why a student is receiving a deficiency grade.

- III. Reports of Standing Committees

- a. CPT (Paulette Bierzychudek, chair) – Dr. Bierzychudek began her report by stating that in addition to reviewing tenure cases, CPT also considers matters of policy regarding promotion and makes suggestions for changes. They also receive information about the frequency with which colleagues are promoted from associate to full professor. Dr. Bierzychudek projected a graph indicating that more promotions to full professor took place in the years before 1991 and that most colleagues who received tenure after that have never even been reviewed. In particular, within the middle two cohort groups, 65 to 70 percent of tenured faculty members have not put themselves forward for promotion.

According to the faculty handbook, associate professors are reviewed in the sixth year following promotion, but that does not seem to be happening. Dr. Bierzychudek described it as problematic for so many colleagues to be stalled at the associate level.

CPT has several hypotheses regarding this phenomenon. In 1989, at the start of President Mooney's tenure, the criteria for promotion were made considerably more stringent with regard to scholarship in particular. It may be that associate professors are not receiving the support they need to advance. The college also discontinued post-tenure developmental reviews in 2001, and it is possible that without these review processes in place faculty are too uncertain of success to put their cases forward. Moreover, when developmental reviews were discontinued, a policy was put in place for associate professors to meet with the Dean to discuss professional development and build a basis for a case for promotion. Dr. Bierzychudek remarked that she did not think these meetings have been happening with the regularity they should.

With respect to post-tenure promotion, CPT found that a generic set of criteria

currently apply to tenure and further promotion, with service commitments receiving no more weight in the latter case than in the former, even though they often leave associate professors with less time for scholarship. CPT also discussed the possibility that the tendency not to seek further promotion was self-perpetuating; when associate professors do not hear about their peers being promoted, they conclude that it is a difficult hurdle to clear.

Dr. Bierzychudek stated that CPT would like to know more about why this is occurring and asked colleagues for responses via e-mail (to [promotion@lclark.edu](mailto:promotion@lclark.edu)) or a letter (anonymous, if desired) to the committee. Have you delayed coming up for promotion? Are you willing to say why? What concerns do you have about current practices? Do you have ideas to address those concerns? Dr. Bierzychudek said that the committee would like to address the matter this semester and thus requested feedback by one week from the meeting date. CPT still has cases to review this semester, and the discussion will be easier to complete if feedback is received promptly.

There were no questions for Dr. Bierzychudek, but faculty acknowledged that this is a concern.

- b. Budget Advisory Committee (Cliff Bekar, chair) – Dr. Bekar opened his report by stating that he would focus on two issues: first, the cost of E&D, and second, the question of fixed vs. percentage raises. This year's budget saw an unexpected increase in faculty salaries, which led groups to begin digging into the causes of that. The single largest increase from the projected to the working budget was an 8.8% increase in faculty compensation, where 2% was considered appropriate.

To address the cost of E&D, Dr. Bekar presented graphs showing that the cost of non-tenure-track salaries has increased steadily over the past nine years. Over that time the staffing of E&D was between 30 and 45 percent tenure-track faculty. The cost of E&D amounts to 25 percent of all adjunct pay at the College and 10 percent of all non-tenure-track pay. Dr. Bekar stressed that the BAC is not taking a position, just presenting results.

- Dr. Kurt Fosso asked about the difference between 06-07 and 08-09, when there was good participation by the faculty but adjunct pay still represented a high cost. Dr. Bekar replied that moving parts, such as the size of a given class, produce variance.
- Associate Dean Jane Hunter added that variations in pay depended on the type of position an adjunct holds, whether it is a per-course position or a percentage of FTE. Salaries differ, and there is a tradeoff when we want faculty here and involved in student life. Dr. Bekar also noted that accounting on this is not standardized.
- Dr. Lyell Asher said that he wondered what to gather from this. Students have

to go somewhere, and the college hires adjuncts at a bargain rate. Doesn't a lot depend on how many sections are being taught? Dr. Bekar answered that he was definitely not commenting on per person costs, and faculty can decide for themselves if this is a large or small cost. The college simply had difficulty reaching its margin last year, and BAC has been looking at the difference between projected and working budgets.

- Dr. Martin Hart-Landsberg noted that when adjunct instructors teach higher-capacity courses rather than core courses, it results in lower costs overall. This could make a big difference.
- Dr. Sarah Warren asked about the discrepancy between the projected vs. actual budget: was the projected budget under-projected? Dr. Bekar said that the 8.8 percent increase in faculty compensation was by far the largest discrepancy in levels of spending.

With respect to fixed vs. percentage raises, Dr. Bekar explained that the issue at stake is whether percentage raises fall short in properly incentivizing the middle cohort of faculty, a question first raised to the BAC by Associate Dean Hunter in her year as Interim Dean. Dr. Bekar remarked that he first tried to argue that percentage raises make more sense, but has ultimately come to agree with Associate Dean Hunter that fixed raises would be more equitable. When raises are granted on a percentage basis, the raise pool is skewed toward high top-end salaries, which have larger increases than lower salaries. This can lead to serious discrepancies in pay over a faculty member's career.

In the faculty handbook, Dr. Bekar stressed, one stated objective is to recruit and retain top faculty and incentivize scholarship, service and teaching appropriately. In order to do this successfully, compression effects in the salary pool should be minimized. The current system of percentage raises results in four primary effects: 1) Higher incomes tend to be shifted to a later point in a faculty member's career, whereas a fixed raise would make those increases smoother; 2) Merit premiums turn into a significantly larger amount over a number of years, and it will be important to consider whether built-in increases are more desirable; 3) The sequence of raises makes a big difference in salaries over time as well, so that someone with early success would end up earning significantly more than someone with later success; 4) Market premiums and other outside factors, which determine a faculty member's salary when hired, alter earnings over time. Dr. Bekar stated that factors 3 and 4 in particular contribute to serious compression effects among cohorts, and that these effects are compounded over time. Colleagues hired in the last five years, who have not received raises every year, will be at a permanent disadvantage relative to other colleagues if we continue with a percentage raise system.

The BAC is not recommending that we change at this point, but the committee does believe that faculty should take this on and have a discussion. Dr. Bekar also stressed that the cost of transition might have its own set of cohort effects, with faculty in

midstream standing to lose out relative to those at the start or end of their careers.

Dr. Bekar responded to questions following his report.

- Dr. Hart-Landsberg asked how the timing of raises would be affected by changing to a fixed system. Dr. Bekar replied that adopting a system of fixed raises would not change level incomes at all; what would change are the discrepancies that result from differences in timing.
- Dr. Rishona Zimring asked about a possible connection to Dr. Bierzychudek's discussion of associate-level colleagues not pursuing promotion. She pointed out that by the time the college is done allocating monies to senior faculty with higher incomes, it is left with little to incentivize efforts toward promotion. Dr. Bierzychudek added that someone thinking about going up for promotion might under the current system decide to delay the process based on the relative strength or weakness of the raise pool.
- Dr. Oren Kosansky asked why the BAC is not making recommendations with respect to this issue. Is there something preventing the committee from doing so? Dr. Bekar responded that the model he presented here is very simple, and that he is not an expert in Human Resources or compensation. His report was not created in consultation with administrative or finance branches of the college. Compensation policies are more complex than his model here.
- Dr. Janis Lochner asked if our problems are unique to this college. Dr. Bekar replied that this was one of the first questions that the BAC asked, and that there is no good answer at this point. An informal search showed that raise policies are very mixed, with little or no resemblance between the public information and what actually goes on at institutions.
- Dr. Fosso noted the roulette quality of raises in how there is so much chance involved and some people just get unlucky. Dr. Bekar replied that this problem was part of what drove this process, as different cohorts are getting more upset. This is an interesting time to consider the raise policy, since the college is no longer going to commit in summer to a raise pool for faculty. In attempting to achieve stability, it would be helpful if we could make an effort to reconsider the entire package.
- Dr. Nora Beck asked if the committee had observed discrepancies between raise patterns of men and women at the college. Dr. Bekar said they had not. Associate Dean Hunter added that this issue had been raised in the PioLog two years ago, but that the discrepancy resulted because the Law and Graduate Schools had been counted together with CAS. The only discrepancy was among senior full professors; among assistants and associate professors, there was a tiny difference in favor of women.

- c. Library and Educational Technology (Peter Drake, chair) – Dr. Drake introduced Interim Library Director Mark Dahl, who discussed the status of library acquisitions for next fiscal year, including funds for information resources. The library's budget has been set at \$1.4 million, which is a 4 percent decrease of the current budget. Since the library requests an increase in funding every year, Mr. Dahl pointed out that the decrease essentially amounts to an 8.8 percent decrease in expected budget, and that this is a common theme in higher education at the moment. Comparatively, the library's budget is still close to that of UPS and above Whitman and Willamette. Reed has a far larger per-student budget.

With respect to the budget for acquisitions, the library expects to make cuts in all three of the biggest categories, namely serials (50 percent of budget), books (22 percent), and online content (18 percent). The library also needs to make decisions about journal subscriptions. Last year the budget was flat relative to the previous year, and some subscriptions still had to be cancelled; this year, the cuts will have to be deeper. Library staff will be looking at both individual and bundled subscriptions, though Mr. Dahl pointed out that bundles are more difficult to cancel, since they usually include top journals that would be prohibitively expensive to purchase a la carte. From mid-March to mid-April, library liaisons will be asking faculty for recommendations for cancellation. Mr. Dahl stressed that they greatly appreciate and depend on qualitative feedback from faculty in this process. He also pointed out that cancelled material would still be accessible via Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery Services.

A reduced book budget will be completed by mid-March. There will be across the board cuts as well as differences in how the library handles faculty requests based on collection usage patterns. Online sources, including multidisciplinary and discipline-specific databases, will also be closely examined to identify underused and overlapping resources. Again, Mr. Dahl stressed the need for faculty feedback in this process.

Mr. Dahl responded to several comments and questions following his report.

- Dr. Fosso described the situation with the library budget as appalling and wondered how we could justify such deep cuts in library funding while also talking about strategic planning and a great leap forward.
- Dr. Deborah Heath referred to the graph showing the relative size of the categories within the budget and asked whether Mr. Dahl had any input regarding those percentages, since the sciences rely heavily on online journals while other disciplines use different sources. Mr. Dahl replied that the sciences have increasingly smaller book budgets, while humanities tend to have a larger book budget.
- Dr. Susan Glosser asked how these cuts fit in with the overall budget picture and expressed her hope that the library is being hit more lightly than other areas of the budget, such as athletics, facilities, etc. Dean Jordan responded

that every division in the College took a major hit and that the Dean's office tried to make cuts as equitable as possible. She stated that they tried their best not to make cuts in areas that concern academics. Vice President for Business and Finance Carl Vance added that there may not be a vehicle to obtain that exact data, but that the budget has been published and that the BAC can report on the question of library budget cuts relative to other areas.

- Dr. Bierzychudek noted that access to materials in the future may not be as immediate as faculty are used to, but wondered if, given a projected heavier reliance on Summit, the library staff could communicate with other institutions to find out if they already own a given item. If three or more partner institutions already own something, then the library could consider not purchasing it. Mr. Dahl replied that the library already does this and will continue to do so.
- Dr. Kugler asked if it was possible that other institutions in the Summit consortium might become wary of a continued partnership if they are carrying the burden for us. Mr. Dahl replied that there has already been a great deal of discussion among Summit partners about bringing on institutions with limited book budgets, and that in the end the greater whole allows everyone to benefit. While Reed does spend a lot of money on books, Reed students still use the consortium a lot, just as Lewis & Clark students do.
- Dr. Glosser commented that it is quite different to have to wait for a book ordered through Summit than to have direct access in the stacks, saying that the former does not adequately substitute for the latter. Mr. Dahl agreed in response that the notion of having a core collection is still an important priority.

#### IV. Other Reports

- a. Faculty Development (Gary Reiness) – Dr. Reiness announced that a workshop would be taking place on May 8, two days after Commencement. This workshop is happening in conjunction with a workshop for E&D, but it is intended for all faculty. Michael Cholbi from Cal Poly Pomona will be leading the discussion on how to get good feedback from students and colleagues about teaching. Dr. Reiness said that the office of Faculty Development would be sending out an announcement soon.
- b. Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees (Jerusha Detweiler-Bedell and Susan Glosser) – Dr. Detweiler-Bedell began by announcing that there were two new Trustees who were parents of current students at the College, so the size of the Board has increased.

At the recent meeting that the Faculty Representatives attended, the Board discussed their concern with budget cuts and eliminated positions across the college, as well as with the decrease in Trustee giving, which went down from \$1.4 million to \$856,000 in 2011. However, CAS Alumni Giving is up 39 percent, thanks to the efforts of the

Alumni office.

The Trustees also discussed the Students First initiative, which was a campaign for endowed and expendable scholarships first announced two years ago. The original goal was to raise \$31 million, and as of now the campaign has raised \$5 million. The Board determined that this program is no longer sustainable in a campaign context and will no longer be a centerpiece of fundraising. Dr. Detweiler-Bedell reported that many trustees argued that the program should remain at the forefront of fundraising efforts, since many students cannot afford college without such help. The consensus was that the program was still important, but that it was not sustainable as a campaign.

The Board also heard a presentation from the CAS Dean, which focused on developing a program in entrepreneurship rather than “business.” There was strong support among Trustees for what Dean Jordan presented, and the Board considers the work of the task force a very high priority. Three students also enthusiastically described their experiences attending the recent Winterim workshop on entrepreneurship.

In addition, the Board received a report on buildings and grounds. The renovation of Fields Dining Room has been put on hold, since the proposed à la cart program is not financially feasible at present. Griswold Stadium will be getting new seating, Platt Hall will be renovated, and the Graduate School Campus will get a new parking lot, which will be built sustainably. Evans Hall will receive \$650,000 worth of improvements over the summer, including seven to eight smaller projects to be completed with feedback from faculty in the building.

The Board heard a report from an outside consultant looking at buildings and infrastructure. As compared to some top-ranked liberal arts colleges, Lewis & Clark has the highest density by far. The implication is not that we are overcrowded, but rather that there is a great deal of wear and tear on facilities. Compared to peer institutions, buildings at Lewis & Clark are significantly older. Furthermore, as enrollment continues an upward trajectory, building space remains flat, while for our aspirant institutions the increase has been parallel.

The report also showed that Lewis & Clark’s energy consumption is excellent.

The President also reported to the Board, highlighting Strategic Planning Initiatives, and the Trustees were interested in learning about that.

Dr. Detweiler-Bedell responded to questions following her report.

- Dr. Hart-Landsberg remarked that he found it discouraging that Trustee Giving has gone down. He observed that whenever college presidents have projected major campaigns in the past, each time those campaigns have disappeared; meanwhile, Board Giving goes down until there is some project that they want, after which there is great generosity. He asked if the Trustees saw their own decrease in giving as a problem and wondered whether the faculty could

engage the President to talk about this. Dr. Detweiler-Bedell replied that there was certainly no pride among the Trustees that giving has decreased, but that in a realistic context, the Trustees have become more conservative with their spending in a manner that is not necessarily different than at other institutions. She added that there was a lengthier executive discussion among the Board members that was closed to faculty, and that in this discussion they were going to address financial issues (giving, funding, etc.) very concretely.

- Dr. Kugler pointed out that the two new Board members have strong records of philanthropic giving and that the President has been working hard on this front. Dr. Detweiler-Bedell added that the new Trustees are also fundraisers themselves. Dean Jordan stated that the President identifies potential Board members, but that he does not have final say on who is appointed; only the Trustees themselves can decide that.
- Dr. Zimring noted that it was encouraging to hear that Board members are paying attention to the need to raise money, and that it would be great if Trustees were made aware of the current shortfall in the library budget. Dean Jordan responded that the library is a resource that would be looked at in the context of strategic planning.

Dr. Glosser then reported on the meeting of the Board's Academic Affairs committee, which she attended. The meeting featured presenters from all three schools, highlighted by professor-student teams - including one led by Dr. Peter Kennedy - who reported on collaborative research. Dr. Glosser observed that the Trustees are clearly interested in students and like to know that this kind of collaboration is going on, and that this is a nice way of letting Trustees know more about what faculty are doing.

Dr. Glosser also attended the meeting of the Finance Committee. She reported that the discussion started with talk about the target number for the incoming first-year class. The college is targeting a total student population of 2016, with an incoming class of 590. This represents maximum capacity. There will be a tuition increase of 4.8 percent, which is not the highest increase among our peer institutions. The discount rate remains a huge issue; at 46.9 percent this year, the rate has increased 50 percent in the past 10 years. Twenty-six percent of students were eligible for Pell grants last year, compared with 14 percent the previous year. The goal for this year is a discount rate of 42 percent, and a consulting firm has been hired to help project those numbers and target preferences. The percentage of scholarships that come from outside funding sources has been shrinking steadily, and the college is funding much of the difference.

## V. Dean's Report

Dean Jordan opened with a reminder that nominations for divisional representatives to committees had to be submitted by that Friday, March 9, at 4:30 P.M.

Provost Jane Atkinson introduced the new CIO, Adam Buchwald, who arrives at Lewis &



Clark from Boston, where he most recently served as Deputy CIO at Massachusetts College of Art & Design. He is a graduate of Whitman College. Provost Atkinson encouraged colleagues to take the opportunity to welcome him to campus.

Dean Jordan stated that she had nothing to add to the report on the most recent Board meeting.

She then discussed the issue of retention. Recently a consultant group from Dickinson College and USC visited campus and provided a debriefing to a new committee composed of groups from across campus. The focus of the consultants' study was the need to support all students while they are on campus. In the debriefing, the consultants identified some issues that the college must address. Dean Jordan noted that the committee is outstanding but that this process will take some time.

Dr. Fosso asked if the committee would be looking at the relation between retention and projected student debt. Dean Jordan replied that they would be looking at everything. Part of the analysis is the relation between recruitment and retention, and this agency will help us to get the "right" kind of student at Lewis & Clark, namely, the kind of student who really wants to be here. She noted that the consultant's report indicated that most retention problems on campus are not due to finances.

Dr. Bryan Sebok asked if there were any surprises in the debriefing with the consultant group. Dean Jordan replied that what shocked her most was the fact that not all groups of people on this campus feel welcome. We will need to address some problems that are very deep.

The dean then announced two new appointments. The new Director of Advising will be Dr. Jerry Harp, and the new Director of E&D will be Dr. Paul Powers.

She then turned to recent accolades on campus. Paul Allen, Naiomi Cameron, Yung-Pin Chang, and Peter Drake have received a collaborative grant of \$513,000 from the NSF-funded REU-RET site, the Willamette Research Consortium, to support research experiences for undergraduates and their teachers. The Willamette Research Consortium also includes Willamette, the University of Portland, and Linfield.

Mike Johansen will be Composer in Residence at the Jubilus Festival in Gainesville, FL.

Dr. Becko Copenhaver will deliver a lecture on "Anti-Intellectualism and the Academy in American Life" in the University of Alabama's Philosophy Today lecture series.

Dr. Kathy FitzGibbon received both a research grant of \$7,500 and a performance grant of \$4,700.

Dr. Kellar Autumn received a special creativity award from the National Science Foundation for his high-risk and high-benefit research. He will receive an additional \$300,000 over two years.

Provost Atkinson asked what was meant by high-risk. Dean Jordan explained that sometimes an idea is so innovative that if it does not work, a researcher might have nothing to show for it. Dr. Autumn is at the forefront of current research in the field.

VI. Old Business – None

VII. New Business

Discussion of Business Task Force Report

The dean, the present and future associate deans, and the general counsel (David Ellis) have been holding small group meetings with faculty about the Business Task Force report. Since about half of the meetings had taken place prior to the March meeting, Dr. Asher requested that a discussion of the report be placed on the agenda.

Dr. Asher opened the discussion by saying that he attended one of the meetings with five other colleagues and that although he understood the point of small groups, he felt representation was a problem in the small group format. He wanted to hear colleagues talk about the report, including faculty from Economics.

Dr. Bekar immediately responded that the report has nothing to do with the Economics department and that no one is asking them to offer courses.

Dr. Asher stated that as he understood it, the program would tap \$14 million from the endowment.

Dr. Detweiler-Bedell said that this was not true and that in fact the funding would come from new monies rather than the current endowment.

Dr. Curtis Johnson expressed his confusion about where the interest in a Business program is coming from, if not from the Economics department, since the faculty generally controls curriculum. Associate Dean Hunter replied that she had chaired the Business Task Force as charged by then-President Atkinson, and that members included Jim Grant, David Ellis and members of the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Bekar stated that the minutes of the small group meetings would be posted online, and that one point of discussion was that a “fortress” might be built around Economics to shield it from offering a business curriculum. He added that the faculty in the Economics department is very conflicted and not very positive on the initiative.

Dr. Fosso asked about the way forward from this point given the report, the small meetings, and this discussion. Dr. Goldsmith replied that a member of the faculty requested that this discussion be placed on the agenda, and so it was done. Dr. Fosso asked if the initiative would eventually come up for a vote. Associate Dean Hunter said that it had to take some concrete form before coming up for a vote. Dr. Fosso asked if a course proposal would come before the faculty.

Dr. Heath then said that the task force was initiated by the Trustees, some of whom have some concern about the information we share with students about how they make their way in the world. She noted that Associate Dean Hunter and the other members of the Task Force have done a good job of focusing on how some colleges like Lewis & Clark have steered this discussion beyond the confines of business per se and toward the general domain of entrepreneurship, possibly including social entrepreneurship. Dr. Heath pointed out that in the small group discussion she attended, Dean Jordan had made it clear that it is up to the faculty to steer this conversation; the Trustees want something to happen, and we need to decide how to define it. Dr. Heath explained that the Curriculum Committee was asked to review a course called “Managing Consumer Decisions,” which will be housed in the Economics department. It was first sent back to be revised, because the first proposal did not have enough content, but following revision the CC approved it as a one-time course. Dr. Heath reiterated that while any concern that we will be facing a revived Business department is misplaced, now it is up to the faculty to decide what to do.

Dr. Glosser suggested that both venues, the small group and plenum, would be important as this discussion progresses, and she requested that we continue the conversation as old business at the April meeting, particularly as more colleagues have the opportunity to attend small group meetings.

Dr. Alan Cole asked when the Board last initiated shifts in the college curriculum. He noted that this shift in curriculum is a serious question and that the faculty has a lot to discuss.

Dr. Kugler pointed out that the money figure presents a challenge to the Board: if they are interested in developing this initiative, they must be prepared to fund it. He said that he suspected students want and need this type of coursework and that the faculty should find out from them and provide responses.

Dr. Karen Gross remarked that she had heard a question in her small group session about whether this was a quid pro quo situation with the Trustees. At that point she had felt reassured that it was not, but following this discussion she was anxious again.

Dr. Asher stated that faculty share the Trustees’ concern that our students lead rich lives and do something after college that is rewarding, but that the concern here was that the Board did not consult faculty for ideas. If the Board wanted to talk about concrete things we could do to increase life skills, the faculty probably would have a lot of ideas.

At this point, Dr. Bierzychudek moved to adjourn, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 P.M.