**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

**March 2, 2010**

President Debbie McCollam called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except AOF representative Tim Thompson. A quorum was determined.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the February 2, 2010 meeting were approved as presented.

Mark Clark made the motion that the agenda order be changed for tonight’s meeting so that the New Business items be presented and discussed at this time rather than later in the meeting. Motion was seconded, there was no discussion and vote was unanimous to discuss the New Business now.

***NEW BUSINESS*** –

* Mission Statement -- Beth Murphy presented a draft of the proposed revised Mission Statement and asked for feedback from the senators. She said that the committee would be meeting next week to word-smith a final draft. The proposed draft contains many core themes, each supported by a number of performance indicators. We are now required to have technical requirements to support the Mission Statement. Whatever is included in the Mission Statement must be assessed and evaluated. The statement was explained as pertaining to what we do now; a Vision Statement is for the future. During an in depth discussion of the proposed Mission Statement, senators voiced questions and concerns for Beth to take back to the committee.
* Sustainability Language in the Mission Statement – Carrie Wittmer presented the proposed sustainability language being considered for inclusion in the Mission Statement. Because OIT already practices or participates in a number of sustainability actions, it seems reasonable to include a sustainability piece in the revised Mission Statement. Sustainability Committee members talked with 106 faculty members about including sustainability language in the Mission Statement. 86 faculty signed a petition in support of the language being included; the other faculty were either neutral or didn’t think the language should be included. Beth Murphy asked, “Is the OIT community ready to make sustainability a core theme of this Mission Statement?” If sustainability is stated as a core theme, university level objectives and performance indicators will be required. Following a lengthy discussion of this issue, faculty were uncertain of the ramifications of including the language or not including it; what impact it might or might not have on the budget. Deb McCollam said that Senex would discuss this issue with President Maples to get some answers.

 In a straw vote of the senators, 17 voted to add sustainability to the core themes of the Mission Statement and 7 senators abstained. 13 Senators wanted an ISLO (Institutional Student Learning Outcome) in sustainability, 1 senator was against this, and 10 senators abstained.

***REPORT OF OFFICERS***

***Report of the President*** – D. McCollam – Senex is working on revising and clarifying the PREC policy. Based on the recommendations from the Ad Hoc PREC Committee and President Maples’ vision, a name change to Budget Reduction Advisory Council, BRAC, will be suggested. Senex is open to alternative name suggestions.

Senex will be working with the FCC Committee and President Maples concerning faculty salaries and the possible purchase of the property in Wilsonville. Funds not connected to salary money have been earmarked for the property purchase.

***Report of the Vice President*** – J. Long – Academic Council met Feb. 9th.

* Program Director job description is being worked on.
* Effects of cost cutting measures were discussed.

 \* Labs are looking ratty.

 \* Salary issues are causing morale problems across campus.

 \* Searches are failing because of low salary offerings.

 \* Departments are feeling understaffed.

 \* Because reductions will remain through this biennium and the next, the question

 was asked, “What should be the priority, staff or salary?” The spoken majority felt

 that the administration needs to find the funds to handle both staff and salary issues.

 Where would additional funds come from?

 \* Mission Statement was discussed.

Suggestion was made that Program Directors have input in the job description being revised. Jim will take this idea back to Academic Council.

***REPORT OF THE PROVOST*** – B. Burda – No report.

***REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT’S COUNCIL DELEGATE*** – D. McCollam – No report.

***REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES***

***Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure*** – Working on some policies that, hopefully, will be submitted for the next Senate meeting.

* Correct wording in OIT-20-040 promotion timeline.
* Committee recommendation to change the *Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review* portfolio guidelines to include documentation for previous (failed) attempts at promotion.
* Committee recommendations to update the OIT-20-041 *Rank and Promotion Policy for Library Faculty.*
* Committee is compiling data on how peer institutions meet their staffing needs, including the possibility of decoupling tenure and promotion.

***Welfare Committee*** – K. Usher – Committee continues to work on various charges.

* Student Evaluations: Last fall the following question was added to the evaluations. “If these course evaluations (important for feedback to your instructor and to his/her Department Chair) were available to complete online at OIT, but NOT on paper, during class time, how likely would you be to complete them online?” Based on the fairly even distribution of the responses, ranging from “definitely not” to “definitely yes,” the Welfare Committee recommends that we not switch to online evaluations at this time. However, the committee does feel that the issue should be revisited in a couple of years.
* In an attempt to get the results of the evaluations back sooner, Welfare voiced the idea that the forms be submitted to the IDEA Center in two batches. The first batch would be submitted near the start of exam week, the second batch would be submitted later for those faculty who return their Faculty Information Forms (FIF) late. Motion was made and seconded that a recommendation be made to the Provost that if the completed FIF forms weren’t in by the middle of exam week, those faculty members would not be evaluated that term. Vote on the motion was 5 abstentions and the rest aye. Motion passed.
* Department Chairs and the Provost receive group summary reports of IDEA Center data. Welfare is asking if the reports should be more widely available to faculty. Ken will present this to the Department Chairs through Academic Council.
* In response to the charge to create an Executive Evaluation process and policy for our Provost and school Deans, the committee is currently collecting information from the Chancellor’s Office and elsewhere concerning a procedure to provide feedback on administrative performance.
* Committee’s review of the current *Department Chair Selection and Evaluation Policy,* OIT-21-030 found that the current policy provides for reasonable evaluation of Chairs’ administrative duties. However, the committee did suggest the possible creation of a supplemental page for inclusion with the Chairs’ APE, which would help the evaluation of administrative duties actually happen. On a vote of 21 aye and 2 abstentions, Senate agreed with the supplemental page to be completed by the Chair and School Dean.

***Academic Standards –*** Jim Ballard – Marla Edge is talking with other OUS Registrars about the +/- grading system. The Provost is working on the curriculum maps.

***Faculty Compensation*** – S. Schultz – The comparator list has been returned by Ruth Keele, OUS, with suggested revisions. The FCC will meet on March 10th to consider adopting the changes.

* The FCC will start working on the additional charge of adding an adjunct compensation piece to the *Faculty Compensation Policy,* OIT-20-015.

***REPORTS OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES*** *–* None.

***UNFINISHED BUSINESS*** – *Awarding Honorary Degrees Policy – OIT-20-010*

This policy was approved last year and forwarded to President Maples. He reviewed the policy and returned it to Senate with the recommendation to add one word as follows: #2 under Procedure, add the word “begin,” change is highlighted and bolded:

**OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

**Awarding Honorary Degrees**

**OIT-27-010**

Oregon Institute of Technology will recommend to the State Board of Higher Education the awarding of an Honorary Doctorate of Technology degree using the following criteria and procedure:

**Criteria**

Candidates for honorary degrees are selected based on their integrity, distinguished achievements, and outstanding contributions to OIT, community, state or/and society in their lifetime. This will include service so noteworthy, because of longevity and significance to those served, that it has been seldom matched by others.

No honorary degree shall be granted to any individuals who are currently employed by the Oregon State of Higher Education.

**Procedure**

1. A six member Honorary Awards Committee is jointly appointed by the president of OIT and the president of the Faculty Senate. Committee membership must include at least two faculty members from each school, and two administrators.
2. Each year, the first week of October, the Honorary Awards Committee, HAC, will **begin** to solicit applications from the OIT community as well as from the State of Oregon from individuals who have met the above criteria. The application shall include all supporting documentation.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the word addition as recommended by President Maples. Vote was unanimous to make this change; motion carried.

***REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE*** – T. Thompson – AOF will meet in Portland on Saturday.

***REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE*** – M. Clark – IFS will meet next weekend in Portland.

***REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE*** – J. Long – FOAC met on February 20 and will meet again next Tuesday, March 9th.

* Discussed current state of the budget; there is an expectation of salary negotiations with the classified salaries and unions. This will ripple across to the unclassified with the hope of getting back the salary decrease taken for this year.
* 2009-2010 biennia: revenue and lottery forecasts are down. The expectation is that the shortfall will be absorbed by the fund balance.
* 2011-2013 biennia: projected state revenue shortfall is $1.5 - $2 billion. The impact to OUS is estimated to be a 13% cut.

 \*State is against the debt ceiling for state-backed bonds.

 \*Deferred maintenance continues to grow.

 \*Expecting to see a decrease in enrollment as high school graduation begins to flatten.

 \*Low financial aid for students impacts enrollment

* Wilsonville project is moving forward.

***REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE*** – J. Wiseman – Council met February 9th. Council members aren’t sure just what they are supposed to be doing. Council is trying to become more pro-active on campus.

***REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE*** – S. Salmonson – ASOIT is starting to plan for next term and the upcoming elections. Budgets have been completed for clubs and programs.

***OPEN FLOOR PERIOD*** – No discussion.

***ADJOURNMENT*** – The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Schnackenberg, Secretary
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