

## Minutes

March 1, 2016 6:03 pm, Mt. McLoughlin Room, College Union

---

### Attendance/Quorum

---

President Robyn Cole called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm. All senators or alternates were present except Matt Beekman and Tiernan Fogarty; a quorum was determined. All representatives to the Faculty Senate were present except Shellie Wilson (Administrative Council), Leann Maupin (HAS Dean), and Hallie Neupert (ETM Interim Dean).

---

### Approval of Minutes

---

Minutes of the February 2 2016, meeting were approved.

---

### Reports of Officers

---

#### Report of the President – Robyn Cole

- The Faculty Elections Committee is pleased to announce that David Thaemert was elected as Faculty Senate President. His two-year term will begin June 2016. Robyn expressed her confidence that David will successfully represent faculty interests with respect to diverse interest for the next two years.
- She thanked the current FOAC Chair, David Thaemert for providing a memo to further consider the Soccer Faculty Proposal; refer to page 16 of the 03/01/16 packet.
- Updates to Faculty Senate can be found at the Senate webpage.
- The Elections Committee will notify faculty of any pending vacancies in all senate positions.
- SenEx has created a new RPT Committee charge: Develop non-tenure track (NTT) policy related to 2015-2016 Ad Hoc Committee recommendations.
- SenEx needs to host further discussion on improving digital communication, how items can be moved electronically on campus rather than “old school” paper methods, including ballots, better use of the Faculty Senate webpage, surveys, etc.
- Robyn thanked the Welfare committee and all faculty who provided input that highlighted issues of concern on our campuses.
- At the 2/23/16 Board of Trustees’ meeting, Faculty Senate was only allotted five minutes in which to report the following:
  - Faculty Senate president’s report (reading packet, page 19)
  - Resolution Regarding Proposed On-Campus Soccer Playing Field (reading packet, page 18)
  - Resolution Regarding Board of Trustees’ Review of the University President (reading packet, page 9).
- SenEx recently met with Slobodan Petrovic from Wilsonville to better understand both his and other Wilsonville faculty perspectives on current issues.
- SenEx met with Provost Burda and discussed campus updates in regards to:
  - Campus positions
  - Faculty compensation consultant
  - Most recent RPT charge.
- There was some discussion regarding the limited faculty input on the Faculty Senate President’s report to the Board. Pres. Cole stated that, due to short notice regarding the Faculty Senate President’s report at the Trustees’ meeting, she had no time to solicit faculty opinions on the report. Senators asked if a revised report could be submitted and wondered if a revised written report would even be reviewed by the Board.

- Faculty Senate minutes from 03/14/14 indicated that policy OIT 020-030 Indefinite Tenure Selection was amended 03/04/14, but not forwarded to President’s Council for final adoption. This policy and others will be presented late this year for President’s Council consideration.

### **Report of the Vice President – Terri Torres**

Regarding the Academic Master Plan: why do we need an academic master plan?

1. To address long-standing faculty frustration with regards to the following:
  - Position and equipment processes and timing
  - Securing resources to maintain and grow programs
  - Encourage transparent decision making
2. Provide a decision making framework with uniform assumptions and approaches
  - Increase certainty in the resource landscape
  - Optimize resource allocations.

Master plan topics addressed:

1. Dashboards (there will be multiple)
  - a) Highlight issues ahead of time (looking forward, visual and graphs that use all data)
  - b) Unify action around strategies (what is best?)
  - c) Help motivate decisions and action
  - d) Communication
  - e) Our dashboard should be unique to Oregon Tech, not borrowed from other universities
2. Workload – goal to maintain quality, provide access, protect faculty welfare
  - a) Overload target is 0; last year 6.7% of total credits were in overload (highest MIT)
  - b) Consider including professional development and service in workload
  - c) Online: 16% of total credits; develop a student credit hour taught limit; look at online being in-load
3. Department Chair Primer
  - Where to get data, how to use data
  - Who to ask for resources
  - Timelines/ deadlines
  - FOP/APE
  - Budgets
  - VP Torres suggested that leadership training, along with how to motivate the team, be included in the training.
4. Introduced the Planning Template – mainly for department chairs at this point

---

### **Reports of Standing Committees**

---

#### **Faculty Rank Promotion & Tenure (RPT) – Hugh Jarrard**

The committee has met twice since February. They looked at external review of the library faculty and considered whether there was enough time for external review. They are in the final stages of language edits, to bring their final recommendations on Promotion Policy for Library Faculty, OIT 20-041, to the April meeting.

Regarding the new NTTF charge, RPT plans to have meetings with both the Ad Hoc and Welfare committees to receive full background information and solicit more input on these processes.

#### **Faculty Welfare – Don McDonnell**

Referring to page 22 of the reading packet, there are a few changes:

- #3- President’s Executive Assistant through Vice President.
- #5- added the word “and”
- Page 23- Traffic committee moved

Regarding a question on white papers, the committee recommend this white paper be presented at convocation, be included in the faculty handbook, and be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

Motion to accept these changes was made by David Thaemert and it was seconded. There was some discussion to change the title, that additional pages have sub-headings, and that this be included in the Department Chair primer. Motion was approved unanimously, no abstentions, with the above amendments.

#### **Academic Standards – Chris Caster**

Chris referred to the reading packet, page 29. After covering this report, he moved that the report on Credit for Prior Learning, OIT 013-013, be approved. Motion was seconded. The Provost then gave a few scenarios to illustrate the 25% cap for Experiential Learning (prior work, licensing testing). He stated that the Department and the faculty have a choice to award credit or not. The motion was approved unanimously with no abstentions. Further committee deliberation on this topic is included in these minutes as Addendum #1.

Chris stated the committee will continue work on the policy for Online Learning.

#### **Faculty Compensation (FCC) – Joe Reid**

Five consultant companies responded to the RFQ for faculty compensation analysis. One company was given an offer this afternoon, March 1, 2016. As the offer was just issued this afternoon, nothing has been formalized yet. The consultant recommendation was made solely by faculty; no administration was involved with the choice. Requirements of the study include:

- A determination of the breadth and depth of faculty concerns at the front end.
- To ensure faculty involvement, surveys are to be obtained from the faculty.
- A substantive report will be provided at the end of the study.
- The timeline is that the study be completed by the end of this school year. It will include adjunct overload, library and tenure track.

Joe stated the consultant selection team will provide details to the committee. Faculty will be updated as the process moves forward.

---

#### **Reports of Special or Ad Hoc Committee**

---

##### **Ad Hoc Welfare – Tiernan Fogerty**

No report.

---

#### **Unfinished Business**

---

Referring to reading packet, page 33, (draft) Candidate Application for Faculty, Staff, and Student Board of Trustees Positions, OIT-01-002: The first draft of this policy does not specify any faculty input to this process. A trustee appointment is made by the Oregon Governor. Historically, IFS and Faculty Senate have been given the opportunity to provide input during candidate vetting. This draft is not Board policy but University policy. This appointment is not a faculty representative, but is a trustee of the university with faculty perspective. The position serves the governor not faculty, students nor the university.

Ken Usher recommended that the review committee (section 2) should include: 1) Administrative Council Chair, 2) ASOIT President, and 3) Faculty Senate President, or their respective designee. The policy draft, with Usher's amendment, was voted on and approved. No abstentions. The policy will go to the Board Secretary for revision and President's Council consideration.

---

#### **New Business**

---

None.

---

#### **Open Floor Period**

---

- Ken Usher followed up on the 2/2/16 meeting information. Regarding the recognition of minors at graduation, the Registrar is planning to list minors in print but no announcement will be made. Minors are also not listed on the diplomas.

- Slobodan Petrovic voiced concerns about faculty increasingly being expected to monitor students. Examples include calling students who are late in registering for the next term. He questioned why newly hired retention advisors were not completing this task.

---

**Report of the Provost – Brad Burda**

---

- No report.

---

**Report of the President's Council Delegate – Robyn Cole**

---

- No report.

---

**Report of the AOF Representative – Christian Vukasovich**

---

- No report.

---

**Report of the IFS Representative – Mehmet Vurkac / Ryan Madden**

---

Ryan Madden stated there will be an IFS report at the April meeting.

---

**Report of the FOAC Representative – Terri Torres**

---

- No report.

---

**Report of the Administrative Council Delegate – Tracie Houtz**

---

- The winners of Spirit Week will be announced and receive plaques next week.
- The next meeting will be election of the Council Chair, which is currently held by Bill Goloski.

---

**Report of the ASOIT Representative – Kristen Marsters**

---

- Kristen reported on tuition increases. Last year ASOIT was told, if they chose 5%, the following year it would only be 3%, so the increase will be 3%.
- Incidental Fee Committee (IFC) and College Union (CU) and Campus Life in their budgets received increases in two departments and a decrease in another.
  - The CU received an \$70,000 increase in a special fund for renovations on the auditorium
  - Campus Life received a \$30,000 increase for campus programs.
  - Athletics was reduced by \$11,000.
  - There have been many question regarding the new rules for clubs. The feedback from students is that they do not like the new restrictions.
  - On the IFC, the athletic funds have a base of \$30,000 for gym equipment.
- Elections are coming up for ASOIT. No speeches to be given by candidates. Students are asked to submit recommendations.

---

**Adjournment**

---

Motion and second to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Thaemert, Secretary  
/jp

Academic Standards Committee (ASC)  
3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting 1-26-16

In attendance was Chris Caster, Erika Veth, Karen Kunz, Linda Young, Veronica Koehn, Suzanne Hopper and desperately trying to connect by phone - Kris Rosenberg.

For the first half of the meeting, the ASC discussed the following six questions from Faculty Senate in regard to the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) policy revisions made last year. The ASC provided the following responses and appropriate changes were made to the final CPL policy draft:

1. Brad had asked if we shouldn't mention the 25% limit for credit for prior experiential learning and perhaps simply omit the verbiage. I thought perhaps we could change the verbiage from:

No more than 25 percent of the credits needed for a degree or certificate may be from credit for Prior Experiential Learning (for all forms of prior credit learning).

To: Only a certain percent of credits needed for a degree or certificate may be from credit for Prior Experiential Learning (see NWCCU standards).

I will be meeting with Wendy and Dean Maupin on Wednesday to discuss this issue further and will most likely have more to present to you at our meeting next week.

ASC response: because the 25% rule mentioned above was a standard from Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities' (NWCCU) standards published in 1988, is currently published as standard 2.C.7 and is endorsed by the Oregon Higher Education coordinating Commission (HECC) May 8, 2014, the ASC unanimously agreed this verbiage must be appropriately included in the CPL policy. Under section "II. Credit for Prior Experiential Learning" in the CPL policy, the ASC agreed to include the 25% rule verbiage just once after the introductory paragraph where sub-categories A through C are listed and the revisions were made in the final CPL policy draft.

2. There was a question as to why the International Baccalaureate (IB) could not be included under the heading of Advanced Placement. After some discussion among the Faculty Senate members, it was thought the IB is just fine under its own heading. At any rate, I said I would bring the issue to the committee.

ASC response: members found no credible reasoning to combine IB with Advanced Placement and agreed to leave both "as is" in the policy – no changes made to the revised CPL policy.

3. The issue of Minimum Grade Standard being as low as a "D" letter grade was brought up as possibly being too low of a standard for Oregon Tech. I know in the past, this has been more of a call for individual programs and program directors, but again, I said I would bring it to our committee.

ASC response: members agreed this should be more of a program (Director) decision than a CPL policy mandate. Also, because many community colleges do this, "D" letter grades come across as passing rather than not passing. Also discussed, was the fact that enrollment could be significantly impacted if this standard were to be raised at a time when enrollment is so crucial – no changes were made to the CPL policy.

4. Under Military Credit, there is the current statement, "Students may request evaluation of the military credit by furnishing an official AARTS or SMART transcript." I was informed there has been a change and it should read, "Students may request evaluation of the military credit by furnishing an official JST (Joint Services Transcript) or SMART transcript."

ASC response: members agreed not only to make this change, but to also qualify both the JST and SMART acronyms - revisions were made in the final CPL policy draft.

5. Nathan Mead contacted me from Seattle and was wondering if we could grant credit by portfolio for a single course or a course by course basis like Eastern Oregon University does. According to our policy, "This process is appropriate only for students who wish to demonstrate learning for more than one required course." (Page 5 - Credit by Portfolio). After presenting Nathan's question to Faculty Senate, the suggestion was made to change the sentence above to, "This process is appropriate only primarily for students who wish to demonstrate learning for more than one required course."

ASC response: ASC members agreed to make this change - revisions were made in the final CPL policy draft.

6. Of those Faculty Senate members who have experienced the portfolio process, there was the question as to why faculty evaluators will not receive a stipend? Discussion centered around the fact that giving credit by portfolio is no easy task and requires a significant amount of work.

ASC response: ASC members unanimously agreed stipend verbiage should be left out of the CPL policy as Oregon Tech administration could therefore provide or not provide stipends for portfolio evaluation or exam composition to faculty members involved - no changes were made to the revised CPL policy.

The second half of the meeting was devoted to the ASC second charge for this year, “continue work related to DE and develop policy as it relates to distance education.”

As the ASC accomplished in its first meeting this year, robust discussion was engaged for the specific issues and needs Online Learning must develop to keep pace with policies already being implemented for on-campus students. Members were quick to recognize how policy development must be considered carefully in order to provide equity to all stakeholders. Although no policy was penned, food for thought was plentiful and members clearly acknowledged the fact that much work must be accomplished in future meetings.

Chris Caster  
ASC Chair