

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
March 1, 2011

President Matt Schnackenberg called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Matt announced that Robin Schwartz had resigned due to time constraints; his alternate, Dan Peterson, will replace him for the rest of this year. All senators or alternates were present except Jenny Kellstrom and Daniel Helmricks. Phone problems prevented the Portland reps from conferencing into the meeting. A quorum was determined.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 1, 2011 meeting were approved as distributed.

REPORT OF OFFICERS

Report of the President – M. Schnackenberg – Matt reported on the proposed governance resolution.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Resolution 01 March 2011

Whereas, as observed in the Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate Resolution 14 January 2010, under the current higher education structure and funding model the State of Oregon is unable to meet the higher education needs of Oregon citizens today or to plan effectively to meet the needs of future Oregon students.

Whereas the Oregon University System Governance Proposal provides for greater fiscal flexibility and self-reliance.

Whereas the Proposal includes an increased emphasis on outcomes.

Whereas adoption of the Governance Proposal would result in substantial change to the Oregon University System, both fiscally and structurally.

Whereas individual institutional boards would grant the larger Oregon University System schools disproportionate lobbying power.

The Oregon Institute of Technology faculty resolve to endorse the Oregon University System Governance Proposal consistent with the following core principles.

- A. The implementation of the proposal must improve the education of all OUS students.
- B. The designation of required outcomes must provide for the unique strengths of each OUS school as well as the interdependent nature of the OUS system.
- C. Benefits provided to faculty and staff must remain comparable to current levels.
- D. OUS schools must not be allowed individual boards.
- E. Faculty must be involved in every step of the implementation.

The first paragraph of the proposed resolution is a summary of the Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate Resolution from January 14, 2010. Senex feels that the three main concerns in the proposed resolution are items B, C, and D.

- * B. The designation of required outcomes must provide for the unique strengths of each OUS school as well as the interdependent nature of the OUS system.
- * C. Benefits provided to faculty and staff must remain comparable to current levels.
- * D. OUS schools must not be allowed individual boards.

This resolution would provide discussion guidance for IFS reps Grant Kirby and Mark Clark. “D” might be the most controversial statement in the resolution; without it OUS schools could establish individual boards. Individual boards may benefit larger schools more, increasing their

access to the legislature. It could also potentially increase competition for resources, thus making it harder for the smaller schools to be involved. It would be to OIT's benefit to keep the current structure with the Board of Higher Education providing a unified voice for all OUS schools. Matt does not think that the other small institutions have addressed the proposal yet and said that he would contact them with OIT's resolution.

The motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution as it was presented. During the discussion of the resolution, Tim Thompson, AOF Representative, said that the Oregon Student Association (OSA) would now endorse the new governance proposal in exchange for each institution having a Tuition Committee made up of 50% students.

David Thaemert commented that while the core principles in the resolution were mostly positive, #D had a negative tone. He suggested rewording the sentence as follows:

“OUS schools must remain equally represented by one Board.”

Motion was made and seconded to accept the amended change to #D of the resolution as stated above. Vote was unanimous to approve the change.

Ron McCutcheon, Director of Human Resources, asked if the legislature allows individual boards, or if there are legislatively imposed changes in benefits, does the language of the resolution mean that the Senate's endorsement of the governance proposal is withdrawn? The Senate supported Matt's belief that the resolution is a statement of OIT's concerns. The vote was all ayes to adopt the amended resolution; Matt will forward it to the Board of High Education.

Report of the Vice President – J. Long – No report.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST – B. Burda –

- The mission part of the portfolio process for the Higher Education piece is drawing to a close. Instead of three matrices with outcomes and measures, the goal is to develop system-wide and institution-specific metrics associated with those matrices.
- The Department of Education has been directed to enforce a new regulation regarding the delivery of Distance Education (DE) courses interstate. A process is under way to identify approval procedures in different states that will allow out-of-state DE courses to be offered within each state. Oregon State University estimated the annual cost at \$300,000 to apply and/or seek approval in all 50 states. Concern was raised at the last Provosts' Council meeting that this might also apply to any programs offered out-of-state, for example, Boeing in Seattle, Washington. This new regulation originated with a House sub-committee that has been reviewing for-profit programs and trying to figure out how to make them more accountable in terms of outcomes for their graduates. It is virtually impossible to tell where a student is located when they are taking an online course. Barb DeKalb, Director of Distance Education, has said that OIT currently has DE students from 49 of the 50 states.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL DELEGATE – M. Schnackenberg – No report.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure – T. Fogarty –

- *Recommendation for promotion track for non-tenure-track faculty*
One of the charges given to the RPT Committee this year was to consider findings from last year and to recommend a model with multiple ranks for instructors that would suit the needs of OIT. After reviewing the information available, RPT is now asking the Senate for

direction on whether or not to start writing a policy to implement a secondary non-tenure-track set of ranks.

From proposed changes sent to the Academic Strategies Committee from the Provosts' Council, the committee has developed possible tracks as follows:

- Non-tenure-track set #1: Instructor, Senior Instructor 1, Senior Instructor 2, and/or
- Non-tenure-track set #2: Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Professor.

These would be one-year or longer renewable contracts, reviewed annually by the Department Chair, have a built-in 5-year review process that could automatically trigger a rank increase, pay increase, consideration for tenure-track (if requested), and possible contract extension longer than one year. The five-year review would be an intra-departmental review rather than committee review.

During the discussion of establishing additional non-tenure tracks, the concern was raised if introducing the new track(s) parallel to tenure-track professors would possibly dilute the tenure-track professor rank, therefore decreasing the amount of influence they might have with the administration. These tracks currently exist in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) which the University of Oregon has proposed changing. Recommendations from the Provosts' Council to the State Board should be coming soon.

Provost Burda said that multi-year contracts were not an option because they would have to be signed individually by the Chancellor. Currently, the only multi-year contracts are for members of coaching staffs.

Tiernan stated that all of the 16 OIT comparators have tracks similar to those proposed above. It is very common among the comparators to have non-tenure track, three-title rank systems. Many have one or the other or both systems.

To be sure that faculty on non-tenure tracks did not feel like "second-class citizens," it was suggested that the criteria for these tracks be more departmental rather than institutional because not everyone fits the same mold for professor. Developing non-tenure tracks would provide a way to hire, maintain, reward and keep valuable faculty who are not necessarily tenure-track full-professor individuals.

Following an extensive discussion, the Senate directed the RPT Committee to proceed with the creation of a policy for non-tenure track faculty, such as instructor/lecturer/senior lecturer.

Welfare Committee – M. Marker –

- Charge 1 was to develop an evaluation process and policy for the Provost and college Deans. The Welfare Committee is currently drafting the policy for this charge.
- Charge 2 was to research and make recommendations regarding the inclusion of library faculty in awards and committee appointments currently only available to teaching faculty. Mason handed out a matrix that outlined the campus committees library faculty are not eligible for and a justification for their inclusion. The committee is asking the Senate to review this document and provide comments and suggestions by March 11, 2011.
- Charge 4 was to revise for consistency the *Employment of Full-time Instructional Faculty Policy*, *OIT-20-010*, and *Employment – Affirmative Action in Faculty Search Policy*, *OIT-22-050*. Mason handed out revised copies of both policies and asked for the Senate's review and input by March 11, 2011. During the discussion of these revised policies, Matt Schnackenberg asked if it would be possible for the two policies to be combined into one policy. Tim Thompson asked if the Senate should even be revising the *Affirmative Action Policy* since it is an Administrative

Policy rather than an Academic Policy. Following further discussion, Ron McCutcheon said that he would work with the Committee to simplify and combine the two policies.

Academic Standards – J. Ballard – Academic Standards has not met since the February Senate meeting. However, Jim Ballard was informed by a faculty member that an instructor was teaching a blended/hybrid class with Blackboard and was putting tests and notes on Blackboard. As fewer students attended class, the class migrated until all students were attending online. Jim asked if this was a problem since online classes are supposed to be just as good as on campus classes. Marla Miller pointed out that the University has a rule that blended/hybrid classes must have a certain number of face-to-face contact hours. Provost Burda said that if over ½ of the course material is presented online, it's an online course and tuition is charged accordingly.

Faculty Compensation – J. Long – The Committee hasn't met this quarter, and is waiting for information regarding OIT's comparators. Provost Burda clarified OIT's comparator list for the Senate. Of the 16 schools on the OIT comparator list, 7 schools compare well with the College of ETM, 7 schools compare well with the College of HAS, and 2 schools compare well with both colleges.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES – No reports.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None.

NEW BUSINESS – None.

REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE – T. Thompson – AOF met with their lobbyists on Saturday, February 26th, to look at possible legislative action that might affect faculty.

- AOF is sending a letter of concerns regarding faculty benefits and salaries to the Senate sub-committee for Higher Education.
- There are currently about 27 amendments that are part of the governance bill.
- There is a major bill pending that will remove the 6% pickup by employers for employees. If you are in the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS), on paper, 6% of your overall salary is paid into the system and there is a match made of 6% by employers. Currently, that 6% goes to shore up the PERS pension program, and 6% goes to the Individual Account Program (IAP). For the Optional Retirement Program (ORP), the university contributes 6% towards your ORP. AOF has gone on record as being against the removal of the 6% pickup by employers, unless there is a return in compensation to replace the 6%. For people in the ORP, removal of the 6% pickup would mean a 6% reduction in gross salary.
- The American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees (AFSCME) represents employees in the State of Oregon. The state has proposed the removal of the 6% pickup to the union. It is possible that the 6% could be replaced through salary increases or by providing funds to supplement the rising cost of health care.
- In the event that the 6% pickup is removed, AOF would like feedback from faculty as to what kind of options they would like to see for replacement dollars.
- The Oregon University System currently includes ½ of unused sick leave in a PERS, Tier 1 employee's final salary calculation. There is a bill in the legislature to remove that provision.
- There is also a bill pending that will limit a state employee's retirement to 100% of their final salary.
- There is no indication on any campus that faculty will take any salary reductions.

REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE – M. Clark – There were a number of speakers and topics discussed at the February IFS meeting.

- Jim Francesconi, Vice President of the Oregon University System (OUS) Board, talked about a new, non-profit named Oregon Idea. They will lobby the legislature in support of higher

education in an attempt to mimic what K-12 has done in the past. It is receiving support and money from the business community.

- Sona Andrews, Vice Chair of Academic Strategies for OUS, talked about new definitions for faculty ranks. She confirmed that the new ranks are an expansion of the existing ranks, not a division.
- OUS is interested in faculty satisfaction, particularly career flexibility. They have asked for feedback on how to measure faculty satisfaction.
- Western Oregon University, University of Oregon, and Oregon State University are undergoing state audits on instructional efficiencies. These are performance audits and OUS is documenting problems with the audits.
- Chancellor Pernsteiner said that the budget doesn't look quite as bad as expected. He said if the OUS governance proposal does go through, PERS will remain the same.
- Grant Kirby was re-elected as IFS representative to the Provosts' Council.
- IFS will meet with the State Board on Friday, March 4th.

REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE – J. Long – FOAC met on February 8th and worked on differential tuition models.

- Some initial recommendations for tuition are:
 - * Re-evaluate WUE for high- and over-enrolled programs.
 - * Phase out part-time tuition breaks for out-of-state students over the next two years.
 - * Retain current reciprocity agreements.
- A new Tuition Committee will be comprised of 50% students. The establishment of the new committee will remove the tuition setting policy responsibility from FOAC.
- FOAC's primary focus will be on the financial oversight of OIT.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE – T. Richey – No report.

REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE – D. Helmricks – No report.

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD – No discussion.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hallie Neupert, Secretary

/db