

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

### **April 2, 2013**

President Dan Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Marla Edge. A quorum was determined.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the March 5, 2013 meeting were approved as presented.

#### **REPORT OF OFFICERS**

##### **Report of the President** – D. Peterson –

- Individual Boards in the OUS structure: IFS and AOF will be providing updates on the structure changes.
- Lita Colligan sent an email to all faculty and administrators that highlighted some of the things that President Maples is doing related specifically to the individual boards and the structure. He wants to make sure that OIT is included in any discussion.
- Lita has requested time in the May Senate meeting to talk with senators about her perspective on some of the things going on with the government relations.
- Grant Kirby has suggested that Senate talk with Hilda Roselli, member of the Oregon Educational Investment Board (OEIB), about the boards and about restructuring of OUS.
- Senex and FCC have been looking at faculty salaries and compensation priorities. They have also discussed a proposal from Senex to FOAC in terms of potential salaries and/or compensation raises.
- Faculty Senate election nomination forms will be distributed the week of April 29<sup>th</sup>, with the election to be held the week of May 6<sup>th</sup>.

##### **Report of the Vice President** – J. Zipay – Academic Council met on March 12<sup>th</sup>.

- Discussion was held concerning stipends and release time. Chairs were asked for their input on these items. The overall consensus was for the model to put more of the control and some flexibility back in the departments as far as how they take stipends and release time that is now given to program directors and chairs. This model will be based more on enrollment, so departments would receive an allocation of ¼ release time and a \$3000 stipend for every 50 students. The departments would then decide how they want to utilize the allocation.
- Questions were raised concerning the Boeing operations with most concerns voiced about the General Ed studies. The question was asked if there was some way that the release time or stipend could be converted to professional development and travel.
- Provost Burda explained that release time and stipends would go into a departmental fund that will be allocated by decision of the Department Chair and the department.

**REPORT OF THE PROVOST** – B. Burda – There will be a draft of the Strategic Plan that will begin the review process across campus by the April 9<sup>th</sup> Faculty Administrator meeting. The draft will be distributed to different groups across campus - Administrative Council, Faculty Senate, ASOIT, OIT Provost Council, the Student Affairs Directors (SAD) Committee, the Finance and Administration Directors (FAD) Committee. The draft will be distributed with questions and due back around the middle of May. The goal is to have the Strategic Plan completed by the end of this academic year in June.

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

#### **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

**Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure** – T. Fogarty – The third charge given to the committee is as follows:

3. Currently the Indefinite Tenure Selection policy requires that faculty working toward tenure be reviewed by a committee of colleagues from their department during only the year the faculty member goes up for tenure (usually the 5<sup>th</sup> year). Consider implementing a third year departmental committee review for faculty working toward tenure. Such a review would help untenured faculty understand the perspectives of their peers about their progress toward tenure and would enable the faculty member to continue working successfully toward tenure or to take corrective action in order to meet the demands of tenure within the specific department.

In response to the above change, the Committee proposes the following draft of a *Pre-Tenure Review Policy*.

**Pre-Tenure Review**  
**OIT-000000**

---

The purpose of this review is to provide a formative assessment of a faculty member's progress towards meeting indefinite tenure requirements. The assessment is intended to be informational and not a guarantee of any specific outcome of an indefinite tenure review.

**Performance Categories**

The pre-tenure review shall focus on the following, as detailed in OAR 580-21-0135:

- Instruction
- Research accomplishments and other scholarly achievements or, where relevant, other creative and artistic achievements
- Professionally related public service through which the institution and its members render service to the public (i.e., individuals, agencies or units of business, industry, government), and institutional service including, but not limited to, contributions made toward departmental, school, or institutional governance, and service to students through student welfare activities such as individual student advising, advising with student organizations or groups, and similar activities

Individuals shall also demonstrate professional integrity and a willingness to cooperate with their colleagues in a civil and respectful manner for the best interests of the department and the institution and shall evidence potential for and commitment to continued professional growth and improvement.

**Evaluation Criteria**

The OIT Faculty Evaluation Policy (OIT-21-040) contains criteria for evaluating faculty in instruction, professional development, and institutional and professionally-related public service.

**Procedure**

All parties shall abide by the timeline set forth in this policy. However, the provost may modify the timeline if s/he determines a reasonable need to do so.

- During the ninth week of spring term prior to the review, the provost shall provide each department chair with the names of departmental faculty eligible for pre-tenure review in the following year. The chair shall notify these faculty members of the upcoming review by the end of the tenth week of spring term. Each individual shall submit a portfolio to the chair by the end of the first week of the following fall term (see portfolio guidelines).
- By the end of the fifth week of fall term, the individual's department chair shall convene a meeting with all tenured members of the department. The chair will provide a written report to the individual summarizing the feedback from the meeting by the end of the sixth week.
- The chair will meet with the individual by the end of the tenth week of the fall term to discuss the assessment and help craft a future course of action.

Recommended by:  
Faculty Senate –  
President's Council –

Tiernan explained that, except for the first paragraph of this proposed new policy, wording was taken directly from the *Tenure Policy* in force.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed policy as presented. Following an extensive discussion of the proposed policy, the vote was 11 yes, 9 no and 2 abstentions.

After more discussion, Dan suggested that the proposed policy be tabled and that senators talk with their untenured faculty to obtain input from them. Tanya McVay suggested that the charge be rephrased for the Committee. The policy will be brought back to Senate at the next meeting.

#### **Welfare Committee – T. McVay –**

- *Performance Review of the Provost – This proposed new policy is based on the existing Evaluation Policy for the Deans.*

#### **Performance Review - Provost OIT-XX-XXX**

---

##### **Introduction and Purpose**

A biannual review of the Provost will be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the Provost in both academic and administrative responsibilities. The Provost plays a critical role in establishing and accomplishing the goals of the institution.

The principal objective for regular reviews is to help the Provost refine administrative skills, to provide performance feedback for discussion, and to recognize exceptional contributions.

##### **Participants**

Biannual review of the Provost will be conducted by the University President and will consist of input from faculty, staff and community.

##### **Process**

It is the responsibility of the Office of the President to initiate the review and ensure that it is completed within the time frame prescribed under policy.

The President will administer an evaluative questionnaire, jointly approved by the President and Faculty Senate, to tenured faculty. Evaluators will only assess those functions of a Provost's job performance with which they have knowledge and experience. Additionally, an open comment period will be given to all faculty, staff and community members. Minimally, this will be announced in TN daily and on the OIT website. No anonymous input will be considered for any part of the performance review.

The President will then write an evaluative narrative reviewing the Provost's performance. A written summary will be provided to the Provost and he or she will be given the opportunity to respond. The President will personally discuss the results of the performance review with the Provost. This discussion will include recommendations for performance improvement.

##### **Criteria**

The Provost will be evaluated with reference to the Oregon Institute of Technology job description for the Provost. Given that the Provost's position is dynamic and may include responsibilities not specified in the criteria below, it is essential that the evaluation process remain flexible. At a minimum, the criteria listed below must be included in the performance evaluation. However, if the President or the Provost would like to add additional functions for evaluation, functions may be added to the performance evaluation.

Tenured faculty will evaluate the Provost in the following functions described in the OIT Provost Position Description:

- Demonstrate collegiality and foster the collegial atmosphere and scholarly productivity of the institution;
- Provide leadership in maintaining the tradition of excellence in teaching and currency of subject matter, through an appropriate combination of teaching, professional service, and scholarship;
- Perform strategic planning effectively;
- Plan and execute operations and budgets;
- Recommend and advocate the budget for the academic activities of the institution and its programs, departments, and schools;

- Provide direction and support for the programs under his/her supervision;
- Manage the academic process;
- Promote faculty development through recruitment, evaluation, and in-service programs;
- Represent the institution and administer activities related to pertinent accreditation and external review of the institution and its programs;
- Act as final arbiter in all matters of conflict involving faculty, instruction, and curriculum;
- Promote diversity among the faculty;
- Ensure delivery of education by the institution throughout Oregon to meet various needs of diverse populations for programs and courses.

**Timeline:**

Spring Term	
Week 1	The President initiates the Provost Performance Review Process.
Week 2	The Office of the President distributes evaluative questionnaire to college faculty and staff.
Week 5	Faculty and staff return questionnaires to the Office of the President.
Week 6, 7	The President solicits input from other constituents as appropriate.
Week 8	The President provides written evaluation to the Provost.
Week 9	The President and the Provost meet to discuss evaluation results.
Week 10	Evaluation process completed.

Recommended by:

Faculty Senate – XX/XX/XX  
 President’s Council – XX/XX/XX

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed *Performance Review – Provost Policy* as presented. During discussion of the proposed policy, questions were raised about whether or not to allow anonymous input to be considered for any part of the performance review.

Matt Schnackenberg suggested stronger language for the second bullet under the “Criteria” heading.

- ~~Provide leadership in maintaining~~ **Defend** the tradition of excellence in teaching and currency of subject matter, through an appropriate combination of teaching, professional service, and scholarship;

Following further discussion, the proposed policy was sent back to Committee.

- *Faculty Grievance Procedure* is undergoing legal review.
- *Affirmative Action in Faculty Search, OIT-22-050*  
*Employment of Full-time Instructional Faculty, OIT-20-010*  
 Charge given to the Committee was to make sure that the wording of the two policies was the same. Work to align the two policies had begun in May 2011, but the process was never completed. Below are the proposed drafts of the policies that were approved by Senate at the May 31, 2011 Senate meeting.

**Affirmative Action in Faculty Search  
 OIT-22-050**

The Oregon Institute of Technology holds that the presence and sharing of diverse backgrounds and experiences results in a stronger and more complete educational and work experience, enriching all members of the campus community. Higher education is incomplete without real understanding and appreciation of the human differences that make individuals and groups unique. The OIT administration strongly recognizes and believes that a diverse academic environment fosters mutual understanding, interpersonal and individual respect, cultural awareness, harmony, and creativity, while providing necessary role models for all students.

The university expressly prohibits discrimination based on race, color, gender, marital status, national origin, age, disability, religion, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or any other consideration not directly and substantively related to effective performance and in compliance with all relevant federal, state and local laws and regulations. This commitment includes taking affirmative action in the recruitment and employment of faculty.

Search committees for hiring new faculty members will be constituted in keeping with Policy OIT-20-010 and shall include at least one member of a protected class. It is encouraged that at least one member of the committee be a woman or a minority. If the department or unit is without such faculty, a minority or female faculty member from a related discipline or department will may be invited to serve on the committee. The Human Resources/Affirmative Action Director will appoint an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity (AA/EO) representative who will advocate for the inclusion of qualified minority and female candidates in the finalist pool and certify eligibility for this consideration with Human Resources. This representative is charged with assuring that the search process proceeds without potentially discriminatory candidate evaluation and interviewing. While applicants with inferior job qualifications should never be selected only to satisfy affirmative action goals, protected class applicants who meet all job qualifications shall be carefully considered with awareness of the value of diversity to the university and in consideration of any under-representations that currently exist in the faculty ranks.

The search committee chair will notify the AA/EO representative or the Human Resources/Affirmative Action Director of reasons for non-selection of all candidates, or any actions of the search committee that may call into question the integrity of the search. Human Resources/Affirmative Action Director will review the selection process with the AA/EO representative and/or the search committee chair. Should questions arise concerning the non-selection of protected class candidates, additional justification may be required.

#### **Employment of Full-time Instructional Faculty OIT-20-010**

---

It is the policy of OIT to recruit and hire fully qualified instructional faculty to fill teaching positions. Authorization to employ a new faculty member must be given by the President to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Upon approval, the Provost will notify the appropriate Department Chair or designee to appoint a search committee.

It is encouraged that at least one member of the committee be of a protected class a woman or a minority. If the department or unit is without such faculty, a minority or female faculty member from a related discipline or department will may be invited to serve on the committee. The Human Resources/Affirmative Action Director will appoint an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity representative and will assist in developing committee composition as requested. Refer to Policy OIT-22-050, "Affirmative Action in Faculty Search."

The search will proceed in keeping with the current OIT Search Procedure which will be provided to all search committee members. The Human Resources Office will provide assistance in the development of interview and reference checking questions and will secure consents for reference checks from those candidates identified by the search committee.

It is the responsibility of the search committee to establish a schedule of interviews and classroom visitations where possible. The Department Chair, Dean, the Provost, and the President shall be included in the interview schedule.

Student input is expected to be part of the search process whenever possible. Student input may come from candidate class presentations, select group meetings, or other means decided upon by the search committee.

It is the responsibility of the President or his/her designated representative, to make an offer to the applicant. It is to be noted that the members of the search committee, the Department Chair and the appropriate Dean are not authorized to commit state funds for interview expenses or to make a job offer to the applicant being interviewed. Applicants who are offered positions and who have accepted employment will be informed of the factors used in determining salary levels that are higher than the minimum. A statement of the above factors will be included as part of an employment offer and as part of a new employee personnel file.

When a finalist is selected and has accepted the position, all applications in the hands of the search committee are to be sent to Human Resources. A letter is prepared by the Office of Human Resources advising the unsuccessful applicants of their non-selection.

All search documentation will be forwarded to the Human Resources Office at the close of the search, including search committee member notes and affirmative action records.

After this year’s Welfare Committee reviewed the policy drafts that were approved by Senate in May 2011, they suggested the following changes to the drafts (possible changes are bolded, underlined and highlighted).

**Affirmative Action in Faculty Search** (change to paragraph 3 of the approved policy draft)

**OIT-22-050**

Search committees for hiring new faculty members will be appointed by the appropriate Department Chair or designee upon notification from the Provost. Membership will include one minority or female faculty member. **It is encouraged that at least one additional member of the committee be of a protected class.** If the department or unit is without such faculty, a minority or female faculty member from a related discipline or department **will may** be invited to serve on the committee.

**Employment of Full-time Instructional Faculty** (change to paragraph 3 of the approved policy draft)

**OIT-20-010**

**Membership will include one minority or female faculty member. It is encouraged that at least one additional member of the committee be of a protected class.** If the department or unit is without such faculty, a minority or female faculty member from a related discipline or department **will may** be invited to serve on the committee. The Human Resources/Affirmative Action Director will appoint an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity representative and will assist in developing committee composition as requested. Refer to Policy OIT-22-050, “Affirmative Action in Faculty Search.”

Motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed changes to the draft policies as presented. Following extensive discussion, concerns voiced about search committee membership, and redundancy of the two policies, Dan Peterson decided that Senex needs to review the two documents and then advise the Welfare Council on how to proceed.

**Academic Standards** – J. Ballard – No report

**Faculty Compensation** – D. Thaemert – FCC has reviewed the most recent CUPA data; based on this data and the *Faculty Compensation Policy*, the Committee has made recommendations for floors, established by discipline represented by department.

**Discipline Floors**

In accordance with the analytical methods and procedures described in previous Faculty Senate meetings, FCC recommends the following floors for each faculty discipline and rank:

College	CIP-4	Program	Comparator Limited Floor Average of Equivalent Salary (1 FTE, 9 mo)		
			Assistant	Associate	Professor
ETM	14.08	Civil Engineering	60,857	73,029	87,634
ETM	15.12	Computer Systems Engr Tech	59,500	71,400	85,680
ETM	15.03	Electrical Engr & Renew Energy	57,617	69,140	82,968
ETM	14.38	Geomatics	60,857	73,029	87,634
ETM	52.02	Management	60,857	73,029	87,634
ETM	15.08	Manuf & Mechanical Engr Tech	59,100	70,920	85,104
HAS	51.10	Clinical Laboratory Science	49,435	59,323	71,187
HAS	09.99	Communication	41,833	50,200	60,240
HAS	51.06	Dental Hygiene	46,210	55,452	66,542
HAS	24 (42)	Humanities and Social Sciences	46,386	55,663	66,795
HAS	27.01	Mathematics	46,797	56,156	67,387
HAS	51.09	Medical Imaging Technology	44,898	53,877	64,653
HAS	30 (avg)	Natural Science	48,031	57,638	69,165
HAS	51.08	Paramedic Education Program	41,833	50,200	60,240
HAS	51.08	Respiratory Care	41,833	50,200	60,240
	(avg)	Library	41,833	50,200	60,240
<b>OIT</b>		<b>comparator institutional floor</b>	<b>41,833</b>	<b>50,200</b>	<b>60,240</b>

Review of current average OIT salaries by discipline and rank indicate that most disciplines and ranks within the HAS college are at least at their OIT floor (based on 87.5% of comparator average), while the majority of disciplines and ranks within the ETM college fall **below** their floor. The majority of faculty disciplines and ranks still fall below their comparator averages, which are the target values by policy.

The floor values, based on comparator data, indicate that salaries across the board have not kept pace with a 2% COLA or the western regional CPI, but are a reflection of current market conditions. FCC has prepared a model for Senate Executive and FOAC use to review different scenarios of COLA increases, equity increases to address floor shortages over the period of years or biennia, and equity increases to address comparator average shortages over the period of years or biennia.

Generally, across the board, OIT salaries are below the comparator average. For a number of disciplines, OIT's current salary averages are below the floor. FCC has been meeting with Senex and providing some models that Senex can consider in discussions with FOAC regarding salary discussions.

**REPORTS OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES** – No reports.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – No reports.

**REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE** – L. Ovgard – Marian Achleithner, Vice President for ASOIT was present and reported on the following.

- ASOIT elections will be conducted this term in May.
- Blood drive will be held on April 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup>.
- Interest has been shown in starting a 24-hour study area, potentially in the library area. There will be an open forum for student input on Tuesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>.

**NEW BUSINESS** -- No report.

**REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE** – T. Thompson – AOF will meet on April 27<sup>th</sup>.

- On March 15<sup>th</sup>, Tim, representing AOF, provided written and oral testimony on HB 2149, the House version relating to individual institutional boards. AOF advocates faculty, staff and student representation on the institutional boards.
- On March 27<sup>th</sup> AOF provided more testimony related to SB 270, the Senate's version of HB 2149, and met with legislators. Chair Dembrow is now going to work on amending SB 270 and shared several points relevant to AOF concerns.
  - \* There should be language in a bill adding two faculty to the Higher Ed Coordinating Commission (HECC).
  - \* Dembrow has gotten Senator Hass to agree to drop the "model" language that states that the OHSU model be used for the makeup of the institutional boards.
  - \* AOF is pushing for an implementation date of no sooner than July 2014 for institutional boards.
- SB 822 represents changes to PERS. This would limit the amount of COLAs paid to retired state workers who retired under PERS.

**REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE** – F. Shi – IFS met at Western Oregon University on March 15 & 16.

- ❖ Western Oregon University Introduction-Mark Weiss, WOU President
  - Over 6,000 students enrolled, 85% out state students, but over 50% of incoming students are Oregonians.
  - WOU is focused on being able to educate Oregonians towards the 40/40/20 goals.
  - Tuition promising at WOU
    - The tuition rate for a WOU student entering Western will remain the same for 4 years.
    - They have seniors graduating with the lowest tuition rate in the state of Oregon, but they now have a tuition structure that concerns them that they may be pricing themselves out of the market.
    - Affordability is a very real issue. When you graduate with \$25,000-30,000 of debt and are looking for a job to pay back that debt, it is very challenging.

- WOU has 300 international students, about 100 from China, about 100 from the Middle East, mostly Saudi Arabia, and another 100 from 10 other countries including Japan, Korea, Germany and other places. They looked for international students to add diversity to campus and also these students pay 3x the going rate of the in-state students, which helps pay for what the state does not pay and helps to temper some of the tuition increases for the in-state students.
- There is a “building lottery” in Salem. Universities can put in their construction projects. WOU put in their new College of Education building for this. WOU is at the bottom end of the cutoff. The OUS submitted about \$300 million of bonding projects. The governor’s budget included \$212 million of bonding monies for both OUS system and community colleges. Salem asked OUS to reevaluate all the projects and that was resubmitted. WOU’s project was above the line, but towards the bottom of the list. One of the big schools had the largest item.
- ❖ E-campus
  - We need to examine the literature/research on learning outcomes related to e-learning and hybrid teaching/learning models since our institutions are jumping on using the technology.
  - The PSU Provost (Sona Andrews) came up with “Rethink PSU” to use \$3 million and put out an RFP for faculty for ideas for online classes or MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) or alternative visions of education. These ideas are in the final stages of review.
  - OSU is looking at MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses).
  - What are issues around diversity and e-campus? We assume students have complete computer literacy and have access to technology, but this is not necessarily the case.
  - How does an e-campus deal with access to a university at more remote geographic locations?
  - The more financially viable a campus is the more they are left alone to govern themselves.
  - E-campus can help bring in dollars.
  - There were concerns expressed about degrees obtained totally online.
  - E-campus represent a lot of revenue for institutions.
  - At the board level there is appreciation for those efforts. This is another place where faculty perspective is important. It is not just cheaper, however – there is still a lot of effort, often more, in terms of communicating and administering those courses. By having these, however, are we eroding support for the smaller campuses? Not all students are suited to this kind of instruction.
- ❖ Bill SB 270-Institutional Boards
  - Institutional governing boards – EOU is opposed to the idea. WOU president Weiss was not sure of the view on the WOU campus, but gave us his view. In the summer he testified at the joint legislative committee addressing this topic. Weiss has no problem with the state board of higher education had recommended: the delegation of a lot of responsibilities and authorities to local boards, still within the framework of the OUS system there would be a coordination of central services, programs and allocation of funding in a way that sustains each of the institutions. The concern now is a “food fight”.
  - Weiss has spoken to small school presidents in Washington State to see how governing boards are working there. It is unproductive to have universities competing with each other for funding. We have about 12-15 board members. Multiple that by 7 with turnover every year and now there are a lot of people that have to have a lot of devotion to the institutions with a steep learning curve – that costs money at each institution to sustain boards. The local boards may make sense, but Weiss did not feel it made sense at Western and did not want to use student tuition to maintain boards and board committees. Weiss did not have a problem with those institutions that wanted it (PSU, UO).
  - Effort on institutional board composition with faculty and student involvements
    - A letter from IFS was delivered to **Senate Committee on Education and Workforce Development** stating that IFS believes representation of both students and faculty on any future institutional boards is vital to the future of our institutions, and for the future of higher education in Oregon.
- ❖ Compensation
  - OSU faculty are unhappy with their salary. Compared with their peer universities, OSU’s salary is low. Based on average salary analysis of their tenure-track assistant professors, tenured associate professors and professors, OSU decided to spend 3 million dollars to raise the base salary of associate professors and professors. They call this "Compression adjustment".

**REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE** – J. Zipay – No report.

**REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE** – R. McCutcheon – No report.



***OPEN FLOOR PERIOD*** – C. J. Riley was present and voiced his concern with some recent terminations on campus. He was concerned about the university’s vision and how it was being carried out in terms of staffing. He questioned the rational of a national search for a Facilities Services Director when searches for faculty and the Deans have been postponed for financial reasons. Tim Thompson suggested that the Faculty Forum, previously on the network, be reestablished as a way for faculty to voice their concerns. Because this particular position is under the control of MaryAnn Zemke, Vice President for Finance and Administration, senators and faculty should contact her with their concerns. Dan said that he would talk with President Maples about these concerns.

***ADJOURNMENT*** – The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wangping Sun, Secretary

/db