The following is a list of questions, comments, and concerns that were raised by Marla Hacker (Dean, Academic Programs) and Becky Johnson (Vice-President, Cascades Campus) in the fact-checking stage of the TOL Program Review Reviewer Report. These are presented in the order of the report. The origin of each comment is identified. In an effort to note and record all perspectives, sub-bullets provide follow-up commentary from others.

- Page 2 – Marla Hacker expressed concerns about the choice of the word “stagnant” when referring to the TOL program.

- Page 2 - Marla Hacker noted that “All new programs start up with minimal staffing, since the state doesn’t provide startup funding so new programs start on a shoestring based upon a premise that students are available and interested in the major, and if we offer it, they will come. Naturally, this premise isn’t always correct... In the case of TOL, the premise has not been proven in the 10 years of offering it, we have lost money 9 years. Instead of adding more faculty (resources), perhaps we should discontinue and try something else?”
  - Michael Gassner – follow-up comment - All programs may indeed start up with minimal staffing but not necessarily similar funding. TOL runs quite lean financially where other programs are much more expensive. Some programs have been fortunate (or purposeful?) to find dollars for endowed chairs or similar startup funds.
  - Michael Gassner – follow-up comment - This statement, based on the self-study, is not correct. The graph and related text showing TOL’s in the black financial health was computed based on figures given to TOL by the Dean of Academics at Cascades and finance specialist at Cascades. In formulating the self-study there was disagreement between the Dean of Academics, the finance specialist, and others at Cascades about how the financial health of TOL (and other programs) is determined.
  - Michael Gassner – follow-up comment - I am not sure whether this is implying to close TOL?

- Page 2 – Becky Johnson’s response to the statement, “Certainly, it seems unsustainable to maintain a degree program with only two faculty” is, “This statement does not recognize the fact that we only teach at the upper level. The last sentence is clearly not true since we have other programs with only two faculty that have grown over this same time period, and some that have grown enough to warrant additional faculty members.”
  - Michael Gassner – follow-up comment - Becky’s first sentence is indeed factual. The statement does not recognize the fact that we only teach at the upper level. My opinion: What may not understood, or has been brought out in the reviewer report, is that TOL is a ‘discovery major’ as are other parks and recreation degree programs across the country. The review was a reminder that TOL is different than many other majors in that it is a discovery major. This has implications for its size on a campus with a small pool of students to "discover" the major. It also has implications for marketing. Becky indicates that substantial resources have been devoted to marketing TOL. This indeed
may be true. By thinking of TOL as a discovery major in conjunction with the reviewer report, marketing may be able to market TOL in different ways? My opinion: In other words, high school students and their parents do not generally recognize TOL type programs the way they do programs such as Business, Biology, or Psychology. The same is true of undergraduate students. These students often ‘discover’ TOL type programs while enrolled in another major and then switch. On any campus in the country TOL type programs are not the relatively big ones. TOL must be recognized and understood as a ‘discovery major’ and enrollment expectations of TOL should not the same as other mainstream programs. Other programs may have grown more because they are not discovery majors and are more widely recognized. The challenge is how to best market TOL. To maintain a degree program with 2 faculty is a challenge. Certainly in TOL the challenge is exacerbated by the extended nature of some of its off campus classes that require a faculty member to be off campus for a month of a term teaching if no adjunct can be found.

- Page 2 – In response to the statement, “A third faculty member would, in our estimation, not only add whatever expertise that hire might bring to the program, but might well, in fact, energize the current staff. Certainly, a new hire would suggest that, with growth, a fourth might follow. Incentive and passion, it seems to us, are the ingredients that need to be restored to the TOL program,” Marla Hacker feels that Kreg Lindberg and Michael Gassner are passionate about the TOL program and questions whether adding a new faculty member is really a way to add “incentive and passion.”

- Page 2 – Marla Hacker Concurs with the Reviewer Report statement that, “After ten years, the TOL program at the Cascades campus has come nowhere near to meeting enrollment figures that might be expected of an outdoor-based tourism degree in the outdoor-tourism-based cultural climate of Central Oregon.”

- Page 2 – Marla Hacker concurs with the Review Report statement that the team “recommends that the Tourism and Outdoor Leadership (TOL) program currently offered on the Cascades campus be integrated into the Recreation Resource Management (RRM) program currently offered on the Corvallis campus. The four options currently offered in the TOL program should be consolidated into two options, one focused on Sustainable Tourism and one focused on Adventure Leadership.” Marla clarifies that she believes, “the options should be determined based upon a broader analysis of what will attract students to Central Oregon and what employment for graduates is forecasted.”

- Page 6 - The Reviewer Report it states, “The current number of program options is overwhelming on a number of levels. The committee recommends focusing on two options that play on the strengths of the two existing faculty members – outdoor leadership and tourism. Emphasis should be placed on the upper division classes.” Marla Hacker states that, “I don’t think we should design curriculum based upon the current two faculty members. We should design based upon current resources and the current resources may be able to transfer to Corvallis.”
Michael Gassner – follow-up comment - The reviewers recognized the limited resources in terms of full time faculty in TOL and are recommending a way to strengthen the program, to solidify it.

Page 7 - The Reviewer Report states, “Kreg Lindberg (tenured) teaches six sections of courses across the year, including five different preparations.” Marla Hacker suggests that Kreg not co-teach NR 350 and turn his attention to TOL instead.

Kreg Lindberg responds: The list of courses I teach has evolved over the years, and may further evolve as a result of this review. At this point, I note that NR 350 is a required course in the TOL curriculum. In addition, I recommend that decisions about which courses I teach wait until more fundamental reviewer recommendations have been addressed; for example, the courses I teach may depend on the nature of integration between TOL and RRM.

Page 7 – The Report states, “Although faculty can buy out courses to provide time to do research, this comes at the expense of course offerings as bought out courses tend not to be offered.” Becky Johnson’s response is, “I don’t understand why adjuncts are not hired to teach the courses that are bought out, since that’s the purpose of the buy-out dollars. The reviewers are saying that this is an unacceptable trade-off, but there’s no reason that there has to be this trade-off.”

Response from Kreg Lindberg: “There are not qualified people in Central Oregon to teach the courses. For the first time in my 11 years at Cascades, I bought out courses this spring. Because there were no qualified adjuncts, the courses were not taught (this is why I had not previously bought out courses).”

Response from Becky Johnson: “It sounds like we need to help TOL find qualified adjuncts in Central Oregon. Hard to believe there aren’t people here, given the type of person that is attracted to Central Oregon. Perhaps this is another role for broadcasting courses from Corvallis, if there are people there that are qualified.”

Response from Michael Gassner: Adjuncts often times are not hired because they have been very difficult to get. The unacceptable tradeoff the reviewers imply (from TOL’s perspective) is that if an adjunct cannot be hired the students are hurt because 1) they have to find a substitute course if one is not hired, 2) if an adjunct is hired there is no guarantee they will be able to teach the next term or year, 3) the adjunct is a new face, 4) students perceive a patched together degree program and one that is not as valued if a full time hire was made. It is not difficult to find qualified folks without Masters degrees, but, finding folks for TOL with Masters degrees is exceedingly difficult. I have experienced this first hand many times in the past couple of years.

Page 8 - Marla expressed concern about the statements made on page 8 of the Reviewer Report regarding the recommendations that “…faculty have salaries, promotion and tenure privileges, university services, sabbatical leaves, leaves of absence, workload assignment, and financial support that are fair and equitable compared to those of other faculty in the institution, especially congruent with those in COF and FES.” And that “Promotion and tenure for faculty is a
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process administrated by FES. Therefore, the recommendation by the review committee is to align all processes concerning faculty with FES. Therefore, the method used to determine academic unit faculty workloads should be consistent with that applied to FES.” Marla states that, “Cascades believes that we have equitable, consistent processes in place. Salaries and raises proposed by Cascades are approved by COF. University policies are implemented across campuses. The Cascades financial model for the two campuses are different because revenue is different. There is a firewall between the 26,000FTE campus and the 450 FTE campus. How about faculty promotion and tenure be a process administrated by Cascades? Why isn’t this an option for decision?”

- Michael Gassner – follow-up comment - The reviewer report recommended strong ties with FES and the idea that methods used to determine academic unit faculty workloads should be consistent with that applied to FES. This is in line with their overall recommendations.

- Page 8 – Becky stated, “we have promotion possibilities for Instructors like Dr. Gassner, who in fact was just promoted to Senior Instructor last week. We also put senior instructors on the rolling extended contract that OSU allows.” Marla hacker states that she supports increasing contract lengths for promoted fixed term instructors, however this would be a university-level initiative.

- Michael Gassner - Although the program lead for TOL was just promoted to Senior Instructor, human resources at OSU-Cascades recently stated “A two-year contract doesn’t automatically come with this promotion”. There is a marked difference between perceived value of human resources if a 2 year contract is awarded verses a 5 year contract. The TOL program lead believes it was the reviewers’ intentions to point this out.

- Per the reviewer comments on diversity on page 8, Marla concurs and welcomes suggestions and ideas about how to do this.

- Michael Gassner – follow-up comment - Admittedly this is my opinion: I believe fundamental questions needs to be asked and grappled with: Why has Cascades lost the only two faculty of color it has had and what can we do to not let this happen?

- On page 9 the reviewers recommend, “The team wants to make clear that the compensation and expected duties of the Program Lead are in line with other institutions that use more traditional titles such as program coordinator. However, the review team would like to encourage more open communication to ensure an empathetic understanding of the realities faced by both Cascade administrators and Program Leads. As such we recommend that Program Leadership is assigned to tenured faculty, with time allocated for this responsibility.” Marla states that she is fine with Kreg Lindberg, who is tenured, assuming program lead for the time being. She also suggested the possibility of rotating the lead.

- Kreg Lindberg commented: There currently is only one tenured faculty member in TOL. As that person, I note that program lead responsibility at Cascades has a significant negative impact on normal career progression. This is implicitly recognized by the official discouragement of tenure-track faculty from serving in the
role. No Cascades faculty member has made the progression from associate to full professor while serving as program lead. I believe the impact of program lead on career progression, as well as on achievement of broader faculty career goals, must be addressed.

- Michael Gassner concurs with Kreg’s comments on this matter and notes: “for the record’ that program lead responsibilities are not adequately compensated for in terms of release time or finances. At the same time I am happy to continue as program lead but this role may evolve with the integration of TOL and RRM.”