**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

**April 6, 2010**

President Debbie McCollam called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Mark Clark, Jeff Wiseman and Tim Thompson. A quorum was determined.

**Approval of Minutes**

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

***REPORT OF OFFICERS***

***Report of the President*** – D. McCollam –

* Senex continues to work on the revision of the PREC policy.
* Salary continues to be a concern and Senex has met with Provost Burda to discuss plans for next year. Administration is making it a priority to get at least some of the 3.8% salary reduction back.
* Questions were asked about using the fund balance for salaries. The use of the fund balance is restricted to one-time expenditures, not recurring expenditures.
* The Wilsonville project is continuing with some of the Portland campuses touring the facility. Currently the combined Portland campuses have an approximate headcount of 400; the Wilsonville proposal is to accommodate 600-1000. Potential growth programs to increase this headcount are CLS, Renewable Energy and possibly Optics.
* Purchase of the InFocus building is contingent on the passage of Measure 69 in May. This will enable OIT to use G-bonds to purchase and remodel the building as necessary. Currently these bonds can only be used for new construction.
* Deb will be the representative to the Distance Education Board for Academic Standards and Faculty Senate. This board will be discussing options for the types of DE courses to be offered.

***Report of the Vice President*** – J. Long – No report.

***REPORT OF THE PROVOST*** – B. Burda –

* OIT has a non-binding, signed letter of intent to purchase the InFocus Building, Wilsonville. The purchase is dependent on the passage of Measure 69.
* Peer Comparator List – Faculty Compensation Committee has finished working on the list, Senex has signed off on the list, and Brad is waiting for a copy of the approved list to forward to the State.

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

***REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES***

***Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure*** – T. Fogarty –

* *Academic Rank and Promotion for Instructional Faculty, OIT-20-040*; proposed change, Page 6, #1, (change in strikeout and bold):

 1. By the end of the first week of ~~winter~~ **fall** term, the provost shall inform department chairs of faculty eligible for promotion based on time in rank. By the end of the second week of ~~winter~~ **fall** term, each department chair shall inform faculty in writing when they have met minimum eligibility requirements for promotion. The faculty member shall apply for promotion by submitting a portfolio to the Promotion Review Committee.

 Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed change to the policy as presented. Following discussion, vote was unanimous to approve the change as presented.

* *Academic Rank and Promotion for Library Faculty, OIT-20-041;* current policy dates back to the late 1990s. In an attempt to update the policy and modeled it after the faculty policy, the policy has been totally rewritten and the new policy is presented for consideration. Some of the major differences are:

 \* Tenure is not required for promotion of library faculty.

 \* Library faculty will be evaluated in four areas: teaching, research, service and professional development.

 \* No school committee since library is not part of any particular school.

 \* Review committee will contain two members from outside the library.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the rewritten policy for the library faculty as presented. Following discussion and clarification, the new policy was unanimously approved.

* Portfolio Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review: In an effort to track previous promotion attempts, additional wording proposed for the Required Sections, Section I – Personal Assessment, and Section II – Standardized Assessment, (new wording is highlighted):

 **Required Sections**

**Section I – Personal Assessment**: a reflective narrative that introduces the 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. If appropriate, candidates should describe how they have addressed recommendations from previous Annual Performance Evaluations (APE’s) and/or previous promotion attempts (for promotion portfolio only).

 **Section II - Standardized Assessment** shall include

* Curriculum vitae, 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
* If appropriate, include documentation of previous promotion attempts at the current promotion level (for promotion portfolio only).

 Motion was made and seconded to accept the additional wording to the Portfolio Guidelines as presented. Following an extensive discussion, the vote on this motion was one abstention and the rest voted “no.” The motion did not pass; additional wording was struck from the guidelines.

* RPT Committee is still gathering and analyzing data from comparator institutions concerning the link between tenure and promotion, and how they meet their staffing needs.

***Welfare Committee*** – K. Usher – No report.

***Academic Standards –*** Jim Ballard –

* Concerning the issue of +/- grading, Registrar Marla Edge has checked with the registrars of the other OUS institutions and all the other universities in the OUS system utilize + or – grades. All the universities grade A through D-, except U of O which grades A+ through D-. A few C-s can reduce a student’s cumulative GPA below 2.0. Students who receive a C- cannot move to the next course if a grade C or better is required. There are questions about what is passing if a student has a + or -. A C- is often not accepted as passing by receiving transfer schools. U of O is having some discussion about doing away with +/- grading as some feel that it has contributed to grade inflation. The Committee is still in need of feedback from faculty and students on the + or – grading.
* The Committee is waiting for response from the Provost’s Office about the curriculum maps.

***Faculty Compensation*** – S. Schultz – Committee has received the revised comparator list back from OUS, revisions approved. There are actually two comparator lists, one for OIT and one for OUS. The OIT list consists of 10 ETM comparators, 9 HAS comparators and 3 ETM & HAS comparators. The list for OUS consists of 7 ETM comparators, 7 HAS comparators and 2 ETM & HAS comparators.

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

***UNFINISHED BUSINESS*** – None.

***NEW BUSINESS*** – Deb McCollam has received comments from several faculty that cell phones in the classroom continue to be a problem. Students continue to text even though the class syllabus states that cell phones are not allowed or must be turned off. The senators felt that it was very disrespectful to use cell phones in classes; however, faculty need to control their own classes.

***REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE*** – T. Thompson – No report.

***REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE*** – G. Kirby –

* Much of the discussion at the last IFS meeting concerned the potential restructuring of OUS. There is much concern that U of O will drive the system and that the small schools might not have much of a voice. People thought it would be a good idea if the schools had the ability to have differential tuition. Concerns were voiced about possible competition if all universities were fighting for extra dollars. IFS felt that the small schools and their faculty have been cut out of the restructuring discussion; decisions are being made at the management level without a faculty voice.
* George Pernsteiner stated that he felt that OUS should pull out of the state system thus making the universities a separate public institution that would not be controlled by the state budget.
* Much talk that if U of O pulls out they will soak up all the bond capability in the state.
* Continued discussion of the Applied Baccalaureate.

***REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE*** – J. Long – Looking towards the end of the year reporting and trying to come up with a unified model for reporting that FOAC can base recommendations on.

***REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE*** – J. Wiseman – No report.

***REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE*** – S. Salmonson –

* Blood drive coming soon.
* Super Club signup will be next week.
* Election packets for next year’s officers are going out next week.
* Working with the Traffic Commission concerning the release of names.
* Presentation of “Invisible Children” will be held on April 17th. This is the story of Jacob, a child who escaped after being abducted and forced to become a child soldier.

***OPEN FLOOR PERIOD*** – Deb reminded senators of the upcoming Faculty Senate elections. Nomination forms will be sent out later this month. There will be two positions in each of the schools, three At-Large positions and two positions in Portland.

***ADJOURNMENT*** – The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Schnackenberg, Secretary
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