

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
June 5, 2012

President Matt Schnackenberg called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Phong Nguyen, Pat Schaeffer, Rick Hoylman, Vanessa Bennett, Jan Abeita, and Suzet Petersen. A quorum was determined.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the May 1, 2012 meeting were approved as presented.

REPORT OF OFFICERS

Report of the President – M. Schnackenberg –

- There are two meetings tonight; the regular monthly meeting will be followed by the organizational meeting for next year. Those senators whose terms end this year will be excused after the regular meeting and next year's newly elected senators will be seated. The slate for next year's Senate Executive Committee will be voted on during the organizational meeting.
- Senex joined Academic Council to discuss the proposed academic plan for OIT. A previous draft of the plan, which failed to provide adequate background information on the proposal, had been returned to committee. The newest version of the plan includes the contextual information requested. Most of the discussion focused on interactions between the Klamath Falls and Wilsonville campuses. Matt was pleased with the Academic Council report.

Report of the Vice President – J. Long –

- Academic Council met on June 1st to review the Academic Planning Committee's (APC) recommended transformations.
- Four core themes were discussed:
 1. Wilsonville
 2. Distance Education
 3. Program Revitalization and Innovative Curriculum
 4. Applied Research
- Recommendations of the Academic Council revolved around:
 1. A stronger focus on unifying the different campus views. Currently, Klamath Falls, Distance Education, and Wilsonville are viewed as three separate entities; the focus should be on OIT as a whole, with different delivery mechanisms to support the themes.
 2. The relevance of the Wilsonville effort as a transformation, the appropriateness of including it as a core theme.
 3. Course delivery venues – Wilsonville and Distance Ed, versus academic directives – innovation in curriculum and applied research.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST – B. Burda –

- At Provosts' Council on June 7th, Brad will request approval to offer the Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering on the Wilsonville Campus in addition to the program in Klamath Falls.
- Mateo Aboy, Cristina Crespo and others worked with the Electrical Engineering and Computer Systems Departments at PSU to make sure that OIT is offering a curriculum that is unique, but that could also be a feeder into their Masters of Science in Electrical Engineering. There may be opportunities for students to take courses from both PSU and OIT resulting in dual Masters Degrees, from PSU in Electrical Engineering and from OIT in Renewable Energy.
- The intent of the Academic Plan is to enable the Wilsonville and Klamath Falls campuses to complement one another rather than compete with one another.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL DELEGATE – M. Schnackenberg – The Council met on May 24th.

- The revised *Academic Rank & Promotion Policy* submitted for consideration was approved.
- Matt provided the Welfare Committee's report on Applied Research.
- Matt reminded the Council that Faculty Senate had conducted a survey regarding replacing the college deans. The survey results indicated that faculty are in favor of conducting a national search for the dean positions when the time comes. President's Council said that a search might be conducted in the next year and that searches for the deans may be conducted separately and in different years.
- Matt reminded President's Council of the faculty's prioritization for allocating funds, that COLAs are of higher priority than re-establishing the previous level of Distance Ed (DE) compensation or other items.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT – C. Maples –

- President Maples will be in Salem on June 7th to give testimony regarding his position on university boards. He is concerned that there is not enough information about what university boards would be able to do or not do. It's unclear what the board responsibilities ultimately will be. If each university is going to have a university board, President Maples wants the board to be able to understand and work with the university, understand the university culture, understand the faculty and student cultures. Given that level of understanding, the board can work closely with students, faculty, and staff to set tuition. Currently, tuition is set by the Board of Higher Ed and ultimately, the Legislature.
- University boards must add value and must help the universities locally.
- If DE enrollment exceeds projections, the additional money generated will be set aside for next year, and will not be returned to the faculty.
- President Maples is fairly sure that faculty will receive COLAs in September or October, retroactive to July or September, depending on their appointment date.
- President Maples envisions the Wilsonville and Klamath Falls campuses growing as one university, minimizing redundancy and competition across campuses.
- Matt asked if there was any way to expedite fall faculty searches. Brad Burda responded that the searches that are not completed in a timely manner are the result of vacancies that occur throughout the academic year. President Maples stated that OIT's quarter begins a month later than the semester universities which also puts search committees behind.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

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

Welfare Committee – D. Peterson – At the May Senate meeting, the proposed *College Dean Evaluation Policy*, OIT-XX-XXX was returned to Committee for minor rewording. Following is the revised policy for Senate consideration.

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 college and with the goals of the institution as a whole. Additionally, regular reviews will help individual Deans refine their leadership skills and better understand their relationship with faculty and administration. Such a review shall include input from the faculty and staff in the Dean's respective college, written comments from the Provost, and written comments 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 is 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 every two years to insure compliance with stated college and university goals, to provide performance feedback for discussion, and to recognize exceptional contributions. The Dean evaluation will be completed by the Provost, with input from fulltime faculty members of the Dean's college, staff members who report directly to the Dean, and other constituents considered important by the Dean and/or the Provost.

Criteria

College Deans will be evaluated with reference to the Oregon Institute of Technology job description for Deans. The Provost, faculty, staff, and other important constituents will only evaluate those functions of a Dean's job performance with which they have knowledge and experience. Fulltime faculty and staff members will complete an evaluation survey approved by the Provost and Faculty Senate. No anonymous input will be considered as part of the evaluation process.

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 criteria listed below must be included in the performance evaluation. However, if the Dean being evaluated or the Provost would like to add additional functions for evaluation, functions may be added to the performance evaluation.

Evaluation by Faculty

Faculty will evaluate the Dean in the following functions described in the OIT Dean Position Description: (1) Ability to chair college faculty meetings, (2) Ability to manage the hiring process, (3) Ability to evaluate annual faculty workload, (4) Ability to evaluate faculty performance reviews and evaluation, (5) Ability to give and receive information, (6) Ability to resolve grievances. The functions listed will be covered on an evaluation survey given to faculty administered by the Provost's office.

Evaluation by Staff

Staff reporting to the Dean will evaluate the Dean in the following functions described in the OIT Dean Position Description: (1) Ability to give and receive information, (2) Ability to plan and execute operations and budgets. The functions listed will be covered on an evaluation survey given to staff administered by the Provost's office.

Evaluation by the Provost

The Provost will administer a Dean Evaluation Survey to faculty and staff within the Dean's College and write a narrative that evaluates the Dean within functions listed under Criteria and any additional function(s) the Provost and/or Dean deems relevant. The Provost will evaluate Deans in the following six essential functions described in the OIT Dean Position Description: (1) Ability to carry out the Dean function in the College, (2) Ability to serve as a senior manager, (3) Ability to chair College Academic Council and college faculty, (4) Ability to develop external partnerships, (5) Ability to support fund-raising, (6) Ability to conduct personal professional activities. The functions listed will be evaluated in the written narrative completed by the Provost.

Timeline

Spring Term	
Week 1	The Provost initiates Dean evaluation process.
Week 2	The Provost distributes evaluation surveys to college faculty and staff.
Week 5	Faculty and staff return surveys to the Provost's Office.
Week 6	The Provost solicits input from other constituents as appropriate.
Week 8	The Provost provides written evaluation to the Dean.
Week 9	The Provost and the Dean meet to discuss evaluation results.
Week 10	The evaluation process is 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 policy as presented. Following Dan's explanation of the changes, the policy was unanimously approved.

Academic Standards – J. Ballard – Jim has not heard from the General Education Advisory Council regarding their decision on the Math/Science/Social Science proposal. Jamie Zipay, a member of the Gen Ed Council, reported that the Council was seeking additional information, and had decided not to approve the request to drop the 36/45 credit requirement at this time. The request will be revisited next year.

Faculty Compensation – D. Thaemert – The Senate packets included a spreadsheet summarizing efforts by FCC to complete their charge of aiding departments to obtain additional comparators, if necessary, and the standing charge of developing salary floors for the programs or departments within the institution. Because the charge of recommending floors is tied to the second year of the biennium, the spreadsheet tabulation should be considered draft information ahead of next year's formal submittal of floors to the Faculty Senate by the Provost.

Compared to OIT comparator minimum salaries, most OIT department salaries are above our comparator minimums. However, additional analysis is continuing regarding how OIT salaries compare to the comparator floors. Next year, in addition to recommending floors, FCC might want to look at how Grant Funded faculty are accommodated.

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 will meet with a lobbying group in July regarding what is happening in the Legislature, and to possibly negotiate a new contract with the lobbyist.
- SB242 creates a Higher Education Coordinating Commission. AOF worked hard to get faculty representation on this committee and it now has four faculty members. The committee will look at changes to retirement and health insurance benefits.
- Simultaneously with the enactment of SB242, SB253 was passed. SB253 acts to protect the public interest. This bill states that even though OIT is no longer a state agency in the classic sense, all faculty, staff and administration are public employees, and as such, are accountable to the state.
- The Joint Special Committee on University Governance met and approved recommendations regarding institutional boards.
- The Superintendent of Public Instruction at the K-12 level has resigned at the Governor's request.
- The Governor has appointed a Chief Education Officer.
- OIT is proposing a 7.2% tuition increase to the State Board.

REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE – M. Clark – No report.

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

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE – S. Petersen – Ron McCutcheon reported that the Council met June 5th to welcome new members and to establish officers for next year. Ron will be the Senate Administrative Council delegate next year.

The newly elected senators from the Administrative ranks are Marla Edge and Bill Proebstel.

REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE – D. Helmricks – Daniel introduced Cheyenne Borja as the newly elected ASOIT President and Senate representative.

On May 29th ASOIT hosted their Student Activity Club Awards for the campus clubs.

ASOIT also hosted a retirement party for Jane Rider, Director of Campus Life.

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD – Sean StClair announced that the Civil Engineering Department has received the 2012 Walter LeFevre Award in the small program category from the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). The award was given in recognition of the department’s exemplary promotion of licensure, ethics, and professionalism in engineering education in a small program.

In a discussion regarding promotion portfolios, Ken Usher reported that faculty have suggested reducing the size of the departmental promotion committee from 5 members to 3 members, or eliminating the school-level or one of the advisory committees from the promotion process.

Tanya McVay reported additional discussions regarding the use of electronic portfolios. Ron McCutcheon said he anticipates that this would be in place by fall through SharePoint.

Matt thanked the departing senators.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hallie Neupert, Secretary

/db