President Dan Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Sean StClair and Luke Ovgard. A quorum was determined.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 5, 2013 meeting were presented for approval. Terri Torres reported that in her report from the Distance Education Advisory Committee under *New Business,* the first sentence of Bullet #3 should read as follows:

- Another possibility is to hire a Program Director of DE.

The February minutes were then approved as amended.

REPORT OF OFFICERS

Report of the President – D. Peterson –

- Dan introduced Kristi Redd and Dick Siemens from the Oregon Tech Foundation Board of Directors. The OIT Foundation was established in 1969, to support the educational, cultural, charitable, and service activities of Oregon Institute of Technology. The Foundation raises funds and gathers other forms of support for the endowment, scholarships, and capital projects. The Foundation Board is made up of alumni, community members and friends of Oregon Tech.

- The issue of individual university boards is still being debated in the Legislature. President Maples says that there is a push by the presidents of the small schools to insure that similar opportunities are granted to all schools in the Oregon University System, including the smaller schools.

- Dan has been asked by faculty what are OIT's intentions with regard to the existing capital projects. OIT is within its debt limit and there is a slow down regarding new capital projects.

- There were questions raised at the February Senate meeting concerning past discussions about instructor lines and where that discussion went. A decision was made in the May 2011 Senate meeting that in the fall of 2011 a faculty forum would be held to gather information from faculty regarding non-tenure track positions. Sometime during the summer of 2011 a decision was made to not pursue this discussion further so there was no faculty forum held on this subject. As a result of conversations with the Provost and with Academic Council, Dan feels that this subject will need to be re-addressed and will probably be a charge to the RPT Committee for the 2013-14 academic year.

- Senex is working with David Thaemert and the Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) looking more closely at faculty compensation to prioritize faculty salaries.

Report of the Vice President – J. Zipay – Academic Council met on February 12th.

- Chairs Academic Planning Themes has three focus groups that they received reports from.
    - *New Program Development – Mark Neupert defined some of the requirements and goals for new programs, mission relevance, quality, return on investment & utilization of existing resources. A recommendation was for a possible charge to the RPT Committee next year to consider the inclusion of new program development for the leadership category of the *Promotion Policy.*
    - *Working on the idea of Program Incubator Teams to start encouraging new program development.

- Delivery of Educational Offerings presented by Christina Crespo who defined some goals. The focus is to be on Distance Education.
- Research: Current research was identified along with some that OIT might branch into more. Applied Research was discussed along with some of the constraints such as teaching load, the risk on faculty when they take on applied research, release time, cultural change with the research and where does funding for the research come from.
- A proposal has been made to define academic release time and stipends. The model being presented is headcount driven and is by degree types.

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

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL DELEGATE – D. Peterson – No report.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure – T. Fogarty – A Committee charge was to develop electronic portfolio guidelines. The existing guidelines were modified as follows: (changes are highlighted)

<div align="center">

e-Portfolio Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review
(to be attached to OIT 20-030, OIT 20-035, and OIT 20-040)

</div>

General Guidelines

The **e-**portfolio is a professional document that supports your application for tenure, promotion or post-tenure review. It is the candidate's responsibility to justify the case for tenure, promotion or post-tenure review. The **e-**portfolio shall include

- A guide to contents
- Materials clearly dated and labeled
- Only materials from the probationary years for tenure, the previous five years for promotion, or the previous six years for post-tenure review, except in curriculum vita**e**

The e-portfolio template is located on the HR tab of MyOIT under Faculty Promotion and Tenure. Upload materials to the appropriate folders in each section. Use standard file formats and a logical file naming convention. Use a one-inch, ringed binder for Sections I and II, and a two-inch, ringed binder for Section III. The candidate's name shall appear on the spine of both binders.

Required Sections

Section I – Personal Assessment: a reflective narrative that introduces the **e-**portfolio and provides a context for the candidate's achievements in relation to the criteria for promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review. In this narrative, candidates may describe their teaching philosophy, professional vision, and accomplishments in relation to instruction, professional development, institutional service, and professionally-related public service. Candidates may also discuss the interrelationships and the setting of priorities among these areas.

Section II - Standardized Assessment shall include

- Curriculum vita**e**, including faculty rank and years of experience
- Copies of Annual Performance Evaluation forms
- Student numerical evaluation summary printouts
- Student load statistics for all classes taught
- Documentation of any credit granted toward time in rank and/or tenure as part of the initial appointment

Section III – Supporting Documentation

This section shall include relevant documents referenced in previous sections, clearly organized, labeled and dated. **Do not overuse page protectors.**

Motion was made and seconded to approve the e-portfolio guidelines as presented, to begin Fall 2013 for the faculty up for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review at that time. Following discussion, the vote was all ayes to accept the e-portfolio guidelines as presented. Motion passed.

Welfare Committee – T. McVay – The Committee has been working on the *Performance Review for Provost Policy* and the *Grievance Procedure for Faculty.* Copies of each were distributed to senators for their review and will be brought before the Senate in April for approval.

Because the proposed draft of the *Grievance Procedure for Faculty* contains reference to a mediator, but there is no provision as to who would be eligible to serve in that position and what would be the binding results from the mediation, Provost Burda suggested that the draft of the *Grievance Procedure for Faculty* be reviewed by legal counsel before Senate action is taken. Dan advised Tanya to have the draft reviewed by legal counsel and then bring back for Senate consideration. Brad said that he would take the draft to legal counsel for review.

- The key policy is still on hold.

Three new charges given to the Welfare Committee are:
- Revision of the *Faculty Search Policy* – work in progress
- *Tobacco Free Environment Policy* – all OIT locations to be tobacco free by Fall 2013
- *Background Check Policy* – on hold pending revisions from HR

Academic Standards – J. Ballard –
At the request of the Registrar's Office, Academic Standards is presenting the following statements for Senate consideration.
- **No Grade Assigned (Z) Grade**
  The 'No Grade Assigned' grade is a grade assigned by the Registrar's Office when no grade is reported by the instructor. A 'Z' grade should be changed by the instructor as soon as possible. If a 'Z' is not removed by the completion of the following term, the 'Z' reverts to a grade of 'F'.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the Z Grade statement as presented. Jim explained that under the current procedure, if an instructor doesn't change the Z grade, the Registrar does not have the authority to do so. Thus, in some cases, the Z grade has remained on the student's record for months or years. This statement will allow the Registrar to change the Z to an F after one term, if the instructor doesn't change the grade. Following discussion, the vote on this statement was two abstentions and the rest ayes. The motion passed to adopt this statement.
- **In Progress (IP) Grade**
  The 'In Progress' grade is used for classes with coursework that continues past the end of the term in which the student is registered. Examples include externship, co-op, clinical and project classes. The 'IP' grade may be retained over multiple terms. 'IP' grades that are not changed during the allotted time revert to a grade of 'F' for undergraduate and graduate courses.

  'IP' grades given at the undergraduate level will be retained for a maximum of four terms. The 'IP' grade for a specific graduate level course is maintained by the Registrar's Office for a maximum of five years. Each year the student should file a progress report with the Graduate Council signed by the student and the student advisor. After five years, the student can appeal to the Graduate Council to request a grade change beyond this 5-year limit. The Graduate Council has the authority to approve or deny the student's petition.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the In Progress (IP) Grade as presented. Following discussion, motion passed with one abstention and the rest ayes.

Faculty Compensation – D. Thaemert – FCC has just received the current year CUPA data to support the analysis process discussed at the February Senate meeting. The Committee is expediting their analysis of this data, with the intent of closing the loop with Senex before the end of March and making a more detailed report to the Senate in April.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES – No reports.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – Terri Torres – Based on input from faculty, the Distance Education Advisory Committee is now working to develop job descriptions for Departmental Program Directors and developing the instructor track.

NEW BUSINESS -- No report.

REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE – T. Thompson – AOF met on February 16th.
- AOF met with Representative Dembrow who is on the House Higher Education Committee. Discussion was held concerning Senate Bill 270, which relates to the establishment of institutional boards for public universities in the Oregon University System. He told AOF that this bill originated, in part, from the Legislature in an attempt to move some of the power from university presidents to boards. AOF would like to see faculty and student representation on the boards.
- Senate Bill 664 modifies calculation of final average salary for members of Oregon Public Service Retirement Plan hired after July 1, 2013.
- Senate Bill 662 allows employer to pay less than 6% of an employee pick-up.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP) will hold a regional Oregon meeting in April.

REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE – F. Shi – No report.

REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE – J. Zipay
- FOAC recently met and will begin working on budget recommendations for fiscal year 2013-14. The budgets will be based on strategic plans, but FOAC will make recommendations.
- Mary Ann Zemke met with ASOIT to discuss a tuition recommendation.
  * ASOIT has proposed a baseline tuition increase to students of 6%.
- Regarding the current fiscal year 2012-13 budget
  * General fund & tuition revenue: General Fund has increased from the budget by $157,000; tuition has increased $414,000 for a net increase of $571,000.
  * Expenses: Personal services was $1,460,000 ahead of original budget proposal; SS and capital funds, including some of the debt service, are -$1,517,000
  * The 2012-13 year started with a $5.8 million fund balance and current projection is to end the fiscal year with a $3.2 million fund balance.
- Revenues generated by Distance Ed are $3.9 million with a cost of $2.2 million that results in a contribution of $1.7 million.
- Discussion of Wilsonville and the proposed sale of property to Clackamas, that doesn't seem to be going to happen.
- Geothermal Power Plant was discussed. Currently about $1.5 million remains from energy trust, about $3.5 million to complete results in a $2 million shortfall.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE – R. McCutcheon – Administrative Council met on February 12.
- Proposed policies reviewed were *Background Checks in Employment* and *Tobacco-Free OIT*. The Council endorsed the *Tobacco-Free Policy* and suggested revisions to the *Background Check Policy.*

- The February Spirit Week activity was a success across campus.
- Planning continues for the Administrative Summer Institute. Dr. Maples has allocated $2000 to Administrative Council to help with costs for the Institute and Council activity.
- The Council is soliciting nominations and applications for Administrative Emeritus consideration and voting will be held in April.

REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE – L. Ovgard – Dan Peterson presented information in Luke's absence.
- ASOIT has completed all the budget approvals for the Campus Clubs and programs. They were able to reduce all budgets by approximately $6000, which means that students will not be forced to pay additional fees to finance Clubs or Programs this year.
- All ASOIT officers have agreed to take voluntary pay cuts and will be paid minimum wage of $8.95/hour. This will help save on costs and allow for as much money as possible to go back to activities that directly benefit the Student Body.

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD – Jim Ballard asked Provost Burda what was going to happen with the geothermal power plant. Brad said that question needed to be referred to Mary Ann Zemke.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wangping Sun, Secretary

/db