

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**May 3, 2011**

President Matt Schnackenberg called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Jamie Zipay, Tony Richey, Daniel Helmricks and Tim Thompson. A quorum was determined.

**Approval of Minutes**

Matt Schnackenberg had a correction to the April minutes as follows:

Page 4, Report of the Provost, fourth paragraph, first sentence should read:

“Part of Senate Bill 242 is a compact with the state.”

The minutes of the April 5, 2011 meeting were then approved as corrected.

**REPORT OF OFFICERS**

**Report of the President** – M. Schnackenberg – President Maples sent out an email announcing that PREC has been formed. Matt and President Maples chose to establish a committee with 11 members, instead of 9 members as stated in the PREC policy, to better represent the faculty on campus.

Last fall Jim Long and Matt traveled to Eugene to meet with the leadership of the Faculty Senates from the other OUS schools. On May 13<sup>th</sup> they will again meet with the other Faculty Senate representatives to discuss common issues.

Nominations for next year’s OIT Faculty Senate representatives have been received and the ballots will go out on May 5, 2011.

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

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

- Implementation of new requirements from the Department of Education about applying for and seeking approval for offering online courses in other states has been postponed until 2014.
- The State Attorney General’s Office has conducted a faculty workload audit and the report was released today. OIT has been working on a response to that report. The report recommendations were:
  1. Ensure universities regularly review faculty workload and take action where efficiencies can be achieved without adverse impacts on instruction.
  2. Incorporate efficiency measures into a strategic plan.
  3. Develop OUS guidance on instructional and other workload expectations.
  4. Ensure universities set clear and specific instructional expectations for each department.
  5. Continue to gather and analyze information on all areas of faculty workload activities in all universities and departments.
  6. Incorporate these workload expectations into university performance evaluations.
  7. Ensure the universities provide any needed guidance and assistance to department heads so they can follow through on workload expectations.
  8. Adjust course offerings within and among the universities by consistently tracking unmet instructional needs and continue monitoring low enrollment courses to identify under-enrolled or unnecessary courses that can be eliminated.

**REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT’S COUNCIL DELEGATE** – M. Schnackenberg – No report.

## **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

**Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure** – T. Fogarty – There will be a Faculty Forum next fall to gather input on a non-tenure track for faculty.

**Welfare Committee** – M. Marker –

- The Committee is presenting the draft of the *College Dean Evaluation Policy* for the Senate's consideration. Motion was made and seconded to adopt the proposed policy as presented.

### **College Dean Evaluation Policy OIT-XX-XXX**

---

#### **Introduction**

A regular review of College Deans can help insure that there is a strong connection between the leadership of the Dean and the goals of individual departments within his or her school and with the goals of the institution as a whole. Additionally, regular reviews will help individual Dean's refine their leadership skills and better understand their relationship with faculty and administration. Such a review shall include input from the faculty in the Deans respective college, written comment from the Provost, and written comment from other constituents considered important by the Dean and/or the Provost. A written summary of the review will be provided to the Dean and he or she will be given the opportunity to respond. It will be the responsibility of the Provost's Office to initiate the review and insure that it is completed within the time frame prescribed under policy.

#### **Purpose and Participants**

Deans will be evaluated annually to insure synchronization of stated college and university goals, to provide performance feedback for discussion, and to recognize exceptional contributions. The annual Dean's evaluation will be completed by the Provost, fulltime faculty members of the Dean's college, and staff members who report directly to the Dean. The Provost will administer a Dean Evaluation Survey to faculty and write a narrative that evaluates the Dean within areas listed under Criteria and any additional area(s) the Provost and/or Dean deems relevant. Fulltime faculty and staff members will be asked to complete an evaluation survey approved by the Provost and Faculty Senate. With the exception of the evaluation survey, no anonymous input will be considered as part of the evaluation process.

#### **Criteria**

##### **Faculty Evaluation**

Faculty will be given the opportunity to evaluate the Dean in three areas: (1) College Leadership, (2) Organizational Ability, and (3) Faculty and Program Development. The areas listed below will be covered on an evaluation survey given to faculty and staff by the Provost's office.

1. College Leadership includes, but is not limited to, working effectively with faculty and department chairs, effectively advocating the needs of the college to university administration, acting as an effective role model for the college, and communicating in an effective and timely manner with faculty.
2. Organizational Ability includes, but is not limited to, maintaining effective communication with college faculty and staff, and effectively advocating for the college and the departments within the college.
3. Faculty and Program Development includes, but is not limited to, maintaining knowledge about all programs in the College, promoting a favorable environment for faculty development, supporting

and encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration, and encouraging long-range planning within the departments and programs within the college.

**Provost Evaluation**

The Provost will evaluate Deans in three areas: (1) College Leadership, (2) Organizational Ability, and (3) Resource Development.

1. College Leadership includes, but is not limited to, synchronizing college goals and outcomes, synchronizing department programs to college goals and outcomes, allocating college resources fairly, and providing fair and objective evaluation of Department Chairs.
2. Organizational Ability includes, but is not limited to, maintaining effective communication with college faculty and staff, and effectively advocating for the college and the departments within the college.
3. Resource Development for the college includes but is not limited to securing institutional level funding, assisting faculty in securing grants, gifts, and donations for their departments, and effectively representing the college to the Provost and the University President.

Given that the Dean’s position within the institution is dynamic and may include responsibilities not specified in the criteria above, it is essential to provide flexibility in the evaluation process. At a minimum, the three criteria listed above must be included in the performance evaluation. However, if the Dean being evaluated or the Provost would like to add additional areas for evaluation, additional areas may be added to the performance evaluation.

**Timeline**

Faculty and staff surveys will be distributed on Monday of week two during spring quarter. The completed surveys must be submitted to the Provost’s Office no later than Friday of week eight during spring quarter. The Provost’s narrative will be provided for the Dean to review five business days prior to meeting with the Provost to discuss the evaluation results. The annual evaluation process must be completed no later than the last week of spring quarter.

Recommended by:

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

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

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

During an extensive discussion of the proposed policy, the question was raised if faculty were qualified to evaluate the College Deans, suggesting that Department Chairs and the Provost should be the only ones to evaluate the deans. Several Senators objected given that many faculty members work closely with the deans in a variety of contexts.

Marla Miller stated that evaluation policies should build off a job description, which this policy does not do. Following further discussion, the proposed policy was sent back to the Welfare Committee to be re-written.

- The Welfare Committee is proposing the following resolution as a way to include library faculty on the committees, commissions and other faculty bodies that provide governance of the University.

**Resolution Supporting Inclusion of Library Faculty on Committees, Commissions, and Other Bodies that Provide Governance of the University by Faculty Members**

***Whereas:***

1. Opportunities for service on committees, commissions and other bodies that provide governance of the university by faculty members exist, all faculty members, whether teaching or library faculty, should have those opportunities.
2. On certain committees, membership by library faculty should be specifically identified because of library faculty member's relevance and expertise to the function of the committee in a manner similarly used to identify other specific members.
3. Leadership in campus governance is an identified promotion criteria and the inability to serve on certain campus committees, commissions and other bodies is a barrier to library faculty fulfillment of that criteria.
4. Committees, commissions, and other bodies for which library faculty are not eligible are identified on the attached Exhibit "A".

***Therefore Be It Resolved:***

1. Faculty Senate will request that standing committees, commissions, and other bodies under its control will request that the respective committee, commission, or other body Chair will evaluate the possibility of inclusion of library faculty in the list of possible candidates for membership. The Chair will send to Faculty Senate a written decision indicating if the committee will or will not accept library faculty with a reason for the decision. If the recommendation is for the inclusion of Library Faculty, Faculty Senate will insure that the wording of the appropriate policy is modified for inclusion of library faculty.
2. Library faculty will receive the *support* of Faculty Senate to seek membership on committees, commissions, and other bodies outside of the control of Faculty Senate through a process similar to that identified in Resolution 1.

Matt explained that the resolution was originally his suggestion. The process to revise Senate committee memberships to include library faculty is complex and requires changing the Senate charter. This resolution was drafted in an attempt to find some common ground across OIT committees and make progress on this charge. However, on further consideration, Matt thought that the resolution might be too specific. Instead of the above resolution, he proposed that the Senate consider supporting the following statement:

“Faculty Senate votes to support library faculty in seeking membership on OIT committees, commissions, and other bodies, both under Faculty Senate jurisdiction and otherwise, because of their roles as faculty and as representatives of the library.”

Provost Burda explained that next year the membership makeup of the OIT Standing Committees will be reviewed, providing an opportune time to revise committee memberships to include the library faculty.

Dawn Lowe Wincentsen, Portland representative and Portland Operations librarian, made the comment that when committee membership was comprised of faculty from one or both of the OIT colleges, library faculty were excluded because they didn't belong to either college. This statement would allow the inclusion of the library faculty even though they don't belong to a specific college.

Carrie Wittmer said that currently there was no way to request the removal of a non-participating committee member. She suggested that there be a supportive structure for the committee chairs that would allow them to request the removal of any non-participating committee member.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the statement supporting library faculty membership on OIT commissions and committees. Vote on this motion was 1 against, 3 abstentions and the rest aye. Motion passed.

- *Employment of Full-time Instructional Faculty, OIT-20-010 and Affirmative Action in Faculty Search, OIT-22-050*

Revised policies were presented to Senate for consideration at the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting and sent back to Committee with suggestions for revisions. The policies presented now outline the procedures more generally. Motion was made and seconded to approve the revised policies as presented.

#### **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. ~~When this authorization has been received, the following procedure is to be followed:~~

- ~~1. Upon approval, the Provost will notify the appropriate Department Chair of the approval to employ a new faculty member. or designee to appoint a search committee.~~
- ~~2. The Provost will notify the appropriate Department Chair to appoint a search committee. Normally, search committees will consist of three to five faculty members, including the chair. The Department Chair will send to the Provost the names of the members of the search committee.~~  
Membership will include one minority or female faculty member. If the department or unit is without such faculty, a minority or female faculty member from a related discipline or department will 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."
- ~~3. The search committee will prepare a recommended job description and list of qualifications sought. These include academic background, teaching and industrial experience required, description of special competencies, academic rank, tenure status, minimum starting salary, starting date, type of appointment and application deadline date. The advertising copy and job description will be sent to the Provost along with a recommended list of agencies and publications in which the notice is to be placed. The Provost submits the recommended copy, which must include the minimum salary and tenure status for the position to the Office of Human Resources for affirmative action review.~~

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.

4. ~~The Office of Human Resources reviews the recommended copy and advertising schedule to verify compliance with affirmative action goals.~~

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. The chair of the search committee should confer with the Department Chair and Provost to recommend academic rank and salary.

5. ~~All letters of application are to be received in the Office of Human Resources. Applicants will be sent a faculty application form. A log of applicants will be maintained and the completed applications forwarded to the Provost and to the appropriate search committee.~~

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.

6. ~~After reviewing the applications, the search committee returns those applications that are unsuitable to the Provost. The Provost's Office sends a letter to those applicants to let them know that they are not being considered. This is an ongoing process throughout the search.~~

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.

7. ~~When the search committee has selected finalists (normally no more than three) the committee chair completes the Affirmative Action form and submits it to the Office of Human Resources.~~

8. ~~The Office of Human Resources verifies compliance and returns the completed Affirmative Action form to the search committee chair.~~

9. ~~The search committee chair notifies the Department Chair and submits the application files for the finalists. The Provost will assist the Department Chair in checking references.~~

10. ~~Following the above procedures, the Department Chair will meet with the Provost. The Department Chair should come prepared to make recommendations as to any special terms of appointment. The Provost's Office will then seek authorization for funds for an on-campus interview with one or more of the recommended applicants.~~

11. ~~The Provost will contact the applicant for an on-campus interview and will explain the limitations of state reimbursement, if any, for the interview. The Provost will then notify the search committee of the date of arrival and duration of the applicant's visit.~~

**Employment of Full-time Instructional Faculty**  
**OIT-20-010**  
**Page 3**

---

~~12. It is the responsibility of the search committee to establish a schedule of interviews and classroom visitations where possible. The appropriate school Dean, the Provost, and the President must be included in the interview schedule. The chair of the search committee should confer with the Provost to recommend academic rank and salary.~~

~~13. 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 school 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 applicants 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 the Office of the Provost. A letter is prepared under the Provost's signature advising the unsuccessful applicants of their non-selection.

~~14. When a finalist is selected and has accepted the position, all applications in the in the hands of the search committee are to be sent to the office of the Provost. A letter is prepared under the Provost's signature telling the unsuccessful applicants that they were not selected.~~

~~15. If the applicant rejects the offer made by the President or his authorized delegate, the Provost Search Committee Chair will establish an interview date for the next ranked applicant with the consent of the Department Chair and the Provost.~~ The same procedure as above will be followed.

~~16. When the advertised position has been filled, the Provost will submit the name of the successful applicant to the Office of Human Resources.~~

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.

Recommended by:

Verified by President's Council – 1/85

Revised and Approved by President's Council (emergency approval) – 7/30/85

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Following an extensive discussion on the membership makeup of a faculty search committee, a motion was made to change the first sentence of the proposed second paragraph as follows:

It is encouraged that at least one member of the committee be of a protected class.

After further discussion, the vote was 7 against the change, 1 abstention, and the rest ayes. Motion to change the first sentence of the second paragraph was approved.

The proposed fourth paragraph reads as follows:

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. The chair of the search committee should confer with the Department Chair and Provost to recommend academic rank and salary.

Provost Burda stated that, regarding the last sentence in the proposed paragraph 4 above, salary is discussed, but that the academic rank is part of the employment advertisement. Motions was made and seconded to remove the last sentence of paragraph 4. Vote was unanimous to remove the last sentence.

Discussion progressed to the proposed first paragraph on page 2, which reads as follows:

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

Provost Burda said that the applications from the search committee are sent to the Human Resources (HR) Office, not the Provost, and that HR prepares and sends the letters to unsuccessful applicants. Motion was made and seconded to change the above paragraph to read as follows:

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.

The vote to make the change in the above paragraph was 1 abstention and the remaining ayes. Motion passed.

Discussion continued on the second paragraph of page 2 of the proposed draft concerning applicants. The proposed paragraph reads as follows:

If the applicant rejects the offer made by the President or his authorized delegate, the Search Committee Chair will establish an interview date for the next ranked applicant with the consent of the Department Chair and the Provost. The same procedure as above will be followed.

Motion was made and seconded to remove the second paragraph of page 2 as stated above. Vote was unanimous to delete the second paragraph.

Further discussion on the proposed policies pointed out that the two policies, *Employment of Full - time Instructional Faculty, OIT-20-010* and *Affirmative Action in Faculty Search, OIT-22-050*, needed to contain the same wording. As a result of the motions and changes that have been made regarding the policies, Senate voted unanimously to table both policy changes and asked for separate copies of the original policies and the proposed re-written policies, rather than the combined drafts.

**Academic Standards** – J. Ballard – Jim suggested that in the coming year possible interactions between Academic Standards and the Campus Assessment Commission be discussed.

**Faculty Compensation** – J. Long – Jim reported that the Chair of the committee has stepped down due to other campus-related duties. The committee currently has the OUS- approved comparator list; however, the list does not contain a sufficient number of discipline-specific comparators to retrieve good data. The



committee will need to come up with some kind of process and criteria to identify additional schools with similar disciplines to obtain the necessary salary data.

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

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – None.

**NEW BUSINESS – Emeritus Faculty Selection** – Mark Clark, representative of the Emeritus Committee, presented letters of support nominating Kathy Sale for Faculty Emeritus status. Following consideration of the letters, the Senate voted to approve Kathy Sale for Faculty Emeritus status.

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

**REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE** – M. Clark – The next state IFS meeting will be on June 3<sup>rd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup>.

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

**REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE** – T. Richey – No report.

**REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE** – D. Helmricks – No report.

**OPEN FLOOR PERIOD** – No report.

**ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hallie Neupert, Secretary

/db