

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
June 4, 2013

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the May 7, 2013 meeting were approved as presented.

REPORT OF OFFICERS

Report of the President – D. Peterson –

- Senate Executive continues to look at compensation issues
 - * Budgeting process is advancing.
 - * Goal is to finish budget discussions by the end of Spring term.
 - * Senex's proposal to FOAC was \$1,033,168.
- Oregon Tech Strategic Plan
 - * Senex was asked to look at the plan and has done so in a variety of ways.
- SB270: Higher Education Governance
 - * Still some uncertainty.
 - * Possibility that smaller schools could be given the opportunity to create their own boards.
 - * Concerns remain as to the makeup of the boards, and whether or not all members will be voting members.
- President Maples has expressed an interest in having his performance evaluated by faculty.

Report of the Vice President – J. Zipay – Academic Council met on June 4th.

- Finalized report from the Strategy Focus Groups
 - * Delivery of Educational Offerings through multiple venues
 - Have questions that need to be answered to help proceed with the next steps.
 - What role is Distance Ed (DE) going to have on this campus, particularly in the upcoming 20-25 Strategy Plan?
 - Questions about the amount of growth.
 - Are there going to be changes in structure and leadership?
 - * Revitalizations and Innovations in Curriculum
 - Program Incubation Team (PIT) piloted for next year.
 - Need to work on collaborations with other programs, particularly with regard to dual-major offerings.
 - Concerns about more Gen Ed course offerings at the 300 and 400 levels.
 - * Facilitate Research to Support the Educational Mission
 - Look at the cultural change on OIT if the university is going to value research.
 - How will OIT, as an institution, value research in promotions?
 - Making the faculty aware that OIT is considering research.
- Stipends and Release Guidelines
 - * Need to use the appropriate codes for dual-major courses to have the correct head count.
 - * Departments need to turn in stipend recommendations by the end of June to be included in the appointment contracts for faculty.
- Presentation on Industry-Supported Senior Projects – Intent is to provide another venue for departments to find senior projects through some industry partners.
 - * Three levels of industry involvement with Senior Projects.
 - Specific project Industry / Department / Students
 - Internship through company

- Company sponsored (through Office of Strategic Partners (OSP)?) working on definitions of roles
 - Companies will mentor students
 - Donations will be solicited; range will be \$2500 to an amount to be negotiated depending on the project's scope. [\$1800 – project; \$200 – department; \$500 – OSP]
 - Students
 - Required to set up initial contacts, meetings and design reviews.
 - Managing project timelines and budgets.
 - Faculty
 - Will approve the project as a valid one.
 - Will approve any project budget expenses.
- Discussion of Leadership of HAS College
 - * Currently no plan for interim dean
 - * College is setting up a management by committee approach; Leann Maupin has been selected as lead on this plan, to begin July 1, 2013. By not searching and replacing Dean Powers when he retires, funding is available for two faculty positions. Duties and responsibilities previously assigned to Dr. Powers will now be handled by Provost Burda, Leann Maupin and the HAS Department Chairs. Provost Burda will handle student grievances.

Tim Thompson asked Provost Burda why OIT was not conducting a search for Dean Powers' replacement. Brad responded that OIT was filling two faculty positions with the savings from the dean's position for the coming year. Brad explained that he has again formed another governance committee to look at the academic structure of OIT. Although this had been done previously, Brad feels that it's time to look again because of the following reasons:

- * Currently there is the dean position vacancy;
- * With the Wilsonville campus, OIT has a different operation than previously. There are now two campus arrangements with ongoing structural changes.

The ad hoc governance committee's charge has two parts:

- in light of current physical and/or policy, define what effective academic support should be;
- to make recommendations for either improvements in the current structure, or a different structure that more effectively and efficiently provides academic support. The analysis will include a vertical line of responsibilities and authorities at the department level, middle management, and chief academic officer.

Timeline for the committee is to have a report to the provost no later than the end of Fall Term 2013.

The decision not to search for the dean replacement at this time was made solely by Provost Burda, based on the climate of the campus, remarks about burnout, overload and the workload, in general, of faculty. He felt it was important to take a year to look at the structure, and, at the same time, fund two new faculty positions.

- The OIT Marketing Group is looking for summer volunteers to help with local marketing events downtown during the Third Thursdays. Contact the Marketing Department if interested.

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

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL DELEGATE – D. Peterson – President's Council met and the following policies or procedures were approved: Policy on Credit Hour, IP and Z Grade verbiage change, Policy related to E-Portfolios for Tenure and Promotion, and Policy for Tobacco Free Environment.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure – T. Fogarty – No report.

Welfare Committee – T. McVay –

- Faculty Grievance Policy is still under review by Legal.
- Provost Evaluation Policy is presented for Senate consideration.

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~~ Defend 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;

Comment [TM1]: Faculty Senate, 4-2013

- Act as final arbiter in all matters of conflict involving faculty, instruction, and curriculum;
- Promote diversity among the faculty;
- Ensure delivery of education throughout Oregon by the institution 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: _____

The Committee incorporated the Senate suggestions from the May meeting into the proposed policy, as shown above. Motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed policy as presented tonight. Vote was unanimous to approve the Provost Evaluation Policy as presented.

Academic Standards – J. Ballard – No report.

Faculty Compensation – D. Thiemert – No report.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES – No reports.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – No report.

NEW BUSINESS – No report.

REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE – T. Thompson – AOF met Saturday, June 1st.

- Legislative bills related to institutional boards were discussed. AOF heard that the regional presidents were now seeking to open a discussion about institutional boards for the regional schools. For the most part, student associations still seem to be generally opposed to the issue of boards. Senator Hass, in testimony before his own committee, clearly stated that the boards would have two primary tools that they don’t have now:
 - They will have the authority to hire and fire the president, to be confirmed with the governor.
 - The boards will have the authority to re-issue bonds upon review of the Treasurer.
 AOF gave testimony to the legislature trying to ensure that faculty have a seat on the boards. Current amendments to the senate bill appear that the board could contain one voting student, and one faculty, maybe voting, maybe not.
- The Higher Education Coordinating Committee (HECC) will be the supreme board of higher education in the state.

- Governor has contacted the majority and minority leaders of both chambers to discuss some further changes to the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for possible increases in revenue.

REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE – The nearest IFS meeting was held in Eastern Oregon University (EOU) at La Grande, Oregon on May 10 and 11. The agenda included the following:

❖ **Review on the status of the emerging governance structures - Melody Rose, Interim Chancellor, Oregon University System**

- SB270 moved out of their policy committees of origin (All substantive matters are supposed to be resolved in their committees of origin).
- Both bills moved on to Ways and Means (there is a significant fiscal impact to them and must be reviewed before they go to the floor).
- The Oregon University System (OUS) is asked to provide fiscal analysis on the bills.
- Consulted with OSU, PSU, and UO to do their own analysis of what an institutional board would cost them.
- OUS did their own independent analysis.
- They still need to analyze the financial impact to the other institutions.
- The campuses had differences of opinion in what a board would cost between them and between them and OUS.
- OUS provided Ways and Means with all the information.
- HB3120 – The bill that would clarify and expand the role of the HECC (Higher Education Coordinating Commission).
- It will use HECC as a coordinating body between OUS institutions and community colleges – program approval would move through the HECC.
- HECC is described as a coordinating effort – not one that controls everything.
- This bill requests that some budget be moved from OUS to HECC.
- The Governor remains very supportive of both bills.
- What is the faculty role on these bills? Melody was not sure where the bills landed in terms of faculty voting representation (for program approval, etc.) as there have been many versions of the bills. Current versions of the bills are available from the Oregon State Legislature site at <http://www.leg.state.or.us/mag/home.htm>.
- Representative Michael Dembrow is very supportive of faculty representation.
- Rose expressed the importance of faculty representation on Provost's Council and continuing to have a seat at the ASC (Administrative Support Council) table.
- The Vice Chancellor tends to be the only academic at that table. Most of the board, although enthusiastic about higher education, do not have a background in higher education.
- Grant Kirby had been the representative there, but we don't have a voice at that table right now. Melody encouraged us to figure out representation for this.
- IFS has talked about redoing the bylaws – even if OUS does not exist we would form a senate of faculty from Oregon public universities.
- Laura mentioned and sent Melody some information on Senator Warren's suggestion for establishing lower student loan interest rates: <http://business.time.com/2013/05/10/elizabeth-warren-students-should-get-the-same-rate-as-the-bankers/>; http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/08/elizabeth-warren-student-loans_n_3240407.html
- Oregon has lower student loan default rates than the rest of the nation, but student loan debt is still a problem in Oregon. OUS working on debt and affordability issues.
- OUS identified seven existing set of shared services. They have gone in-depth to one of these areas (human resources). This process took four months. They are now doing the full analysis of how it works and how it would look under a different legal consideration. OUS does not have the internal resources to do the whole analysis until after the legislative session is done.
- The transition of the new structure will take time. During that time, OUS will continue to support the campuses in the way they always have during this time.

❖ **Introduction of EOU - Bob Davies, President, Eastern Oregon University**

- EOU provides value for students who would otherwise not have this option.
- There are a lot of small high schools that on occasion have the entire population of their graduating class come to EOU for college; if it wasn't for Eastern they would likely go to Washington or Boise State and not come back.
- EOU has about 4,000 students. A few years ago it was down to 2,500.
- EOU now is looking at programs they need to reduce or eliminate, which is difficult to do during a time the institution is growing, but necessary to continue the EOU mission to serve students in this area.
- They also are looking at online delivery of instruction.
- The "Eastern Promise" is a program and a strategy of how they look at college readiness and how they work with communities, families, and social structures starting with students in 5th grade to develop a mind-set to go to college.
- A dual credit class is a class a high school student takes for which the high school student gets both high school and college credit.
- EOU is watching SB270 very closely. It may make a difference in future philanthropy. The concern is that the universities have the same access to the HECC, capital projects, mission approval, etc. EOU does not want to see an institutional board that is advantaged or disadvantaged. The concept of shared services concerns EOU.
- HB3120 – This bill would develop a Department of Post-Secondary Education. Developing a new bureaucracy is money that could be used to educate students. This is putting structure before strategy.
- The philosophy of the distance programs is that it is the same as any classroom – the modality happens to be in a distance mechanism. EOU has nine full majors and 18 minors online. Most of the online students are from all over Oregon. There are 16 physical locations where students can meet with advisors face to face. A lot of students take both online and on-campus classes
- Teachers cannot operate with the online classes being the "overload" classes: sometimes there are more students in the online classes than on-campus classes. They are looking at the wage scales so they don't have to depend on the "overload" classes to fiscally survive. They are experimenting with a farm business online program that is a hybrid in-person in Hermiston.

❖ **ASEOU- Evan Bryan, Vice-President for Political Affairs**

- The student group that went to Salem a few weeks ago expressed opposition to SB270 to create institutional boards and the damage it would do to coordination between campuses. They spoke with Senator Peter Courtney and Senator Mark Haas. Oregon Student Association is currently advocating for a 0% tuition freeze. At EOU they are looking at a 5% tuition increase (or see more drastic cuts). Students said they would be willing to pay more and not see certain departments cut.
- EOU tries to have students on every committee, no matter how small. This has been pretty successful in getting students involved.
- **Online Education Discussion – Jeff Dense and Shari Carpenter**
- The group discussed issues around online education at all our institutions.
- At PSU the distance students are charged a fee for hybrid and online courses. Originally, the money was intended to facilitate online learning for students and faculty development. Recently, Provost Andrews initiated a onetime RFP (ReThink PSU) that used the \$3 million collected from the fee. Online and hybrid offerings at PSU are increasing and fee is still being collected.
- How do we ensure that the distance student fees go to the intended place? PSU faculty do not get similar compensation or support for online programs. Developing online classes requires an additional workload. Another related issue is that the university will own the copyright on these classes that faculty have developed. Compensation and workload are issues, particularly with requirements to make all the online content ADA compliant (requires closed captioning, transcripts, additional aspects). Many faculty need additional instructional design support to construct these classes to these standards. The online fee should be used to benefit the online students. It would be fairer to wrap these fees into tuition, particularly since about 80% of classes (even the in-person classes) have some online component.

- How can we collaborate to share online instruction knowledge, technology, and more? How can our education departments work together in the state? We should not be competing with each other. Financially it would benefit all Oregon public universities to explore collaborations in this area.
 - It would be interesting to further discuss how the funding and other structures are set up at all the universities.
 - What is happening with Western Governor's (<http://www.wgu.edu>) ?
 - We also discussed the evaluation of the quality and content of online classes and coordination of curriculum as a whole. EOU is looking for an instrument to evaluate online courses. How do you ensure quality in the development of an online teaching evaluation rubric? The Cal State Chico rubric has been suggested and utilized nationally and can be changed specifically for different institutions. Chico's Rubric for Online Instruction is available at <http://www.csuchico.edu/roi/> .
 - UO is proposing a committee on instructional technology and is looking at nationwide trends and success for instructional technology.
- ❖ **Collective board composition of regional and technical universities**
- How are regional and technical universities represented on governing boards following the break-out into individual governing boards?
 - Explore ideas for how we could better collaborate to minimize competition between us for online courses.
- ❖ **IFS position statement was sent to Representative Kotek, Buckley, Nathanson and Richardson, Senators Courtney, Devlin and Johnson (Statement follows)**

Dear Speaker of the House Kotek,

As the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS), we are the elected voice of faculty in public university education in Oregon, representing eight unique and diverse university campuses: Eastern Oregon University; Oregon Health & Science University; Oregon Institute of Technology; Oregon State University; Portland State University; Southern Oregon University; University of Oregon, and Western Oregon University.

SB270 proposes to establish institutional boards for University of Oregon and Portland State University. We oppose the recent Amendment to SB 270 (Section 6(2)(c)) that specifies faculty members shall be non-voting members of the governing board.

The IFS believes that representation with full voting privileges for 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. Faculty and students are important stakeholders in conversations and decisions regarding our universities, stakeholders who have dedicated years to the good of higher education.

By virtue of their positions, faculty and students offer unique perspectives and knowledge of potential impacts of board decisions on the workings of their universities. While we understand concerns of potential conflict of interest, we also understand that this is an inherent issue on any board. All members of a board will be expected to recuse themselves from certain decisions, and to defer to General Counsel when conflicts are less clear. We would not expect any less of our faculty and students.

We believe that the expertise and experience of faculty and students are essential to the success of any new governance structure for our universities. This representation is consistent with the history of the faculty and student representation on the current Oregon State Board of Higher Education. As the elected voice of public university education in Oregon, the IFS urges members of the Joint Ways and Means Committee to consider the inclusion of faculty and students with voting privileges on any future university institutional boards.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, Oregon University System

REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE – J. Zipay – FOAC met recently and is working on their end-of-the-year budget recommendations.

- Any increases in tuition and fees be applied to instructional support.
- Increases or decreases in revenue be clearly defined in the budgeting process.
- Capital projects such as Wilsonville and the Geothermal Power Plant: When these were first proposed the thinking was that they would be more cost neutral. Both now have debt service.
 - * Recommendation is that no new debt should require use of student funding.
 - * Future sales, such as from the Harmony sale, be used to pay down some of the debt service, particularly that on the Wilsonville project.
 - * Don't use student funding for a capital-type seed money.
- Resource allocation – like to see more of a model to encourage departmental and program initiatives and the resources behind those.
- See financial analysis of operational changes. Development of some enrollment management and marketing plans. Also include personnel changes.
- FOAC is recommending the Senate proposal introduced at the May Senate meeting for faculty compensation, and support for the Administrative Council proposal.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE – R. McCutcheon – Council met in May.

- Sam King was awarded Administrative Emeritus.
- Karen Blevins will be the new Payroll Manager.
- Results of the Administrative Council elections are as follows:
 - Dan Ziriaux, Bill Goloski and Tony Richey will join the council; Suzie Peterson will serve as chair; Genevieve Predmore and Abbie Allen will continue the second year of their terms.
- Administrative Council representatives to the Faculty Senate will be Erika Veth and Bill Proebstel.

REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE – Michael Benedict was present to represent ASOIT.

- Elections were held in May and Michael Benedict was elected president of ASOIT.
- ASOIT statement on Z letter grade:

It is the opinion of ASOIT that having a Z grade transition to an F the following term would not be in the interest of the general student body.

Being our understanding that a Z grade being given only when a faculty has not entered a grade, we feel it would only punish the students to implement this policy. Instead of an F grade, we believe it would be better to have the Z grade transition to a W or Incomplete when no grade has been posted in the allotted time.

In the circumstances where a student does not receive a posting due to not showing up for class, we believe that an F grade be posted for the student.

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD – Sean StClair asked what was being done with the compensation data that the Faculty Compensation Committee had provided. Dan Peterson responded that the data was not being ignored. However, Senex still needs information from FOAC and the administration to move forward.

Faculty discussed the need for faculty advising training during the summer to assist students and newer faculty. Provost Burda, as a member of the SIM Team, asked faculty for some kind of a bulleted list of suggestions for improvement that he could take to the group.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wangping Sun, Secretary

/db