

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**November 5, 2013**

President Dan Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Matt Search, Tim Thompson, Feng Shi, and Sean St. Clair. A quorum was determined.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the October 1, 2013 meeting were approved with one revision:

- *(Found under Report of the Provost, Salary Increases, next to last paragraph)*  
New faculty are not eligible for the salary increase in their first year of contract. Faculty in the second year of contract at the Assistant Professor level are ~~not~~ eligible for salary increases for the 2013-14 year ~~but~~ and ~~are~~ eligible for the final 3% distribution in the 2014-15 year.

**REPORT OF OFFICERS**

*Report of the President* – Dan Peterson

- The Senate Executive committee has refined some of the senate charges and revised memberships. Most of the revisions in terms of membership were:
  - Richard Bailey was asked to serve on FCC since there wasn't a person from PAC on that committee.
  - Aaron Scher from the Wilsonville campus was added to the Welfare committee to represent Wilsonville's interests.
- The Academic Leadership and Structure committee met with departments and constituents. They are reviewing and categorizing information gathered to develop themes that will be important for considering changes to academic structure and leadership. The report is due November 15<sup>th</sup> and will be reviewed by various groups before being shared with faculty across campus. Mark Neupert will present the report at the December Faculty Senate meeting as well as collect thoughts from meeting attendees.
- The IFS nomination process for the position currently held by Grant Kirby is ongoing. It concludes November 6<sup>th</sup>. Faculty are encouraged to participate in order to have a good candidate slate. The IFS representative time commitment was reviewed.

*Report of the Vice President* – David Thaemert

- Academic Council met October 22<sup>nd</sup>.
  - The council reviewed items left at the end of academic year 2012-13 as well as strategic processes that began last year. In regards to the RPT charge, the council is looking more intently at the process of training and how that portion of the Vice President for Research is being implemented. Erik Jorgensen of the Wilsonville campus is primarily functioning as the grant writer/grant support for the research component and for the office of sponsored projects.
  - Discussion regarding curriculum revitalization, innovation and the program innovation team. There is funding set aside for research innovation and non-salary related components for program innovation.

- There are plans to hire a Distance Education director as the implementation person to work with GEAC.
- Ongoing components of the governance discussion include the survey going online and the need for faculty discussion and input.

#### **REPORT OF THE PROVOST – Brad Burda**

- President Maples was in attendance for discussion on governance.
  - The three other small universities have surveys out or completed. The Committee on University Governance (CUG), led by Matt Donegan, was charged with making a recommendation and deciding what kind of governance the TRU universities will be allowed to have going forward. The surveys were referred to collectively as measures of bias since there was probably not enough information on what an alignment model or consortium model would look like. The committee summarily, to a certain extent, dismissed the surveys November 4<sup>th</sup>.
  - Oregon Tech is in a good position with fine tuning a survey and trying to get more information out to the university on what an alignment or consortium model might look like specifically for us.
  - The AGB report was discussed at the CUG meeting. It focuses on the alignment and consortium models and mentions independent boards but doesn't focus on them in detail. It gives a few system examples on what alignment versus consortium would look like. The report will be posted online.
  - President Maples met with the chancellor of Montana Tech to discuss their governance process. A main point of interest was that under the previous president of University of Montana (UMT), and currently today, all promotion and tenure recommendations from Montana Tech go through UMT before going to the overall governing boards in Montana.
  - *Jim Ballard:* I worked at Montana State College of Engineering when Montana Tech made a conscious decision in administration not to align with the engineering school, and went with the non-engineering university because they were afraid of being closed due to being 90 miles from Montana State. There were issues from the start.  
*President Maples:* The report made to me was that they had emails from a couple of the deans at Montana State outlining the plans to close some programs and move others to Bozeman. From their perspective at the time, it was the lesser of two evils. They had enough political clout in the state and they were in a large enough city in Butte that they were able to come out with the least name change of any of the other universities. The structure that's in place has at times been problematic for them because there is only one reporting line. Whenever the president of UMT is sitting at a table with other people it is unclear if he is wearing a hat of that system – UMT and three or four satellite schools – or just the central campus of UMT. There is no chancellor equivalent for that Montana campus that is the chancellor equivalent for all the surrounding campuses and that leads to some level of confusion in various meetings in terms of what somebody is doing and how they are functioning in that system.
  - The three large universities will have their own governing boards in place beginning July of 2014. Those boards will be responsible for those universities. We are being asked to

figure out what an alignment looks like with a potential alignment partner where the board isn't in place and hasn't agreed to take on the risk associated with a smaller university.

- There will be a transition form of governance in a consortium style for the TRU universities beginning July 1, 2014 through at least June 30, 2015 by legislative edict. We cannot implement a new governance until July 2015. How can we have the lowest form of cost governance and the maximum amount of student success? It's going to be assumed that the lowest cost of this will be an alignment of some kind. Additional costs of governance will have to be justified in terms of additional student success. We have two months to put this together.

- *Ken Usher:* Specifically related to alignment and lowest cost it could easily be perceived that one of the reasons for that being a lowest cost option is that it almost implicitly builds in some shared services expectations that are still out there on the table for the other two options. You could decouple or have different shared services and not do that. Is there any way of bringing that across?

*President Maples:* We keep trying to decouple those on a regular basis and you are right about the implication of shared services and the diminished cost of shared services. The unstated part of this is that it is a cost picked up by the larger institution that is picking up the alignment. I plan to go to the table with things that I view are deal breakers in terms of alignment such as major name change; mission change associated with the university; change in our promotion tenure policy and the type of education that we do with an undergraduate focus here; and change in the athletics structure.

- *Ken Usher:* I understand that the mothership institution should have some say in control over program addition or deletion, but there is a degree of say or potential arbitrariness that it sounds like Montana Tech avoided by staying away from Montana State, and I would hope would also be a deal breaker.

*President Maples:* They have control over the existing ones but their ability to implement new ones has been hampered. You implement new programs, it costs money. That money is allocated by the main university because you are a budget of them. You have to make the case that you will bring in additional revenue – and now you are making it against, to a certain extent, faculty colleagues at another university who may have their own programs they want to do. When those programs have severe overlap, things can get fiercer.

- *Jim Ballard:* Regarding Montana State, the chair and a couple of professors in civil worked closely with that department and they said outright that as soon as they got the chance they would close civil. They let it be known publicly.

*President Maples:* You can do it in the name of efficiency but you are also getting rid of some competition. You also remove opportunity for people within the state. You remove opportunity for student success and compromise the ability to achieve 40-40-20 unless, hypothetically, you decide to move stuff to another place where you think growth will occur.

- *Jim Ballard:* In the first of your presentation you put quotes around what they will allow us to do – can you explain that a little more?

*President Maples:* The CUG chair, Matt Donegan, had a point in which he wanted to have everything out on the table. He talked at length about alignment and about the consortium models and said there was a lot of variability and that they all were pretty much the same. He never talked about a single board model in that discussion. I think it's pretty clear that not all four of the small universities will get their own board. I think the questions are a) is there a consortium model that works that allows something like that; b) is there an alignment model that works better for one or more of the four small universities; or c) is there a model that would allow a certain subset of the smaller universities to be consortium and then a smaller subset to do something different? I don't know the answer to that.

- *Jim Ballard:* If we don't align what will happen to us?

*President Maples:* It will not get carved off. It will be part and partial of the entire alignment.

- *Jim Ballard:* Even if we were aligned with Portland State?

*President Maples:* For instance, even if we were aligned with Portland State. Everything would be aligned. We are a total package. That's part of a deal breaker, by the way. We all go together.

- *Terri Torres:* I understand the dilemma you are having in trying to talk to these other institutions when they don't have a board yet, but are you still talking to all of them individually to see what an alignment might look like?

*President Maples:* I use Portland State specifically because I feel like they are off the table. From my perspective, Portland State is a regional institution. That leaves Oregon State and University of Oregon. The report we got back from the AFB representative leaned heavily on the Montana model. Bear in mind where that reporting line is for Montana Tech -- it's with UMT, not Montana State.

- *Terri Torres:* In Montana, were the faculty members that were already tenured grandfathered in?

*President Maples:* Absolutely. The ones who were going through tenure process were going through basically the same process -- they just happened to have an activist president at UMT for a period of time that occasionally took a few people off the list. That is part of the deal breaker for me. But that carries with it an understanding and appreciation of the unique mission of this university not just in the programmatic offerings but in the way our faculty teach, the way our faculty interact with students, the demands we put on faculty time and their own expertise. This is unlike any of the three large universities. It is really critical for them to understand us rather than assume that we become like them.

- *Tanya McVay:* When you talked about different interactions and skills that our faculty have, they also don't have any expectations of research. Would you anticipate that changing, would that become a new expectation for us?

*President Maples:* I think what would likely happen is that for some people there would probably be some accommodation. There may be a second type of faculty line that develops here but there is always going to be this core of no expectation in research. The other challenge -- and this is what Montana Tech ran into -- is in going through the larger

sort of research oriented university there is very little understanding of and appreciation for non-terminal degree holders; from their perspective terminal degrees are Ph.D.'s.

- *Jim Ballard:* Who in the end will make these decisions?

*President Maples:* Matt Donegan and the CUG will make a recommendation to the full Board of Higher Education which will then make a recommendation to the Higher Education Coordinating Committee, which is headed by Ben Cannon who is the Governor's education advisor now, and then make a recommendation to the Governor. The Governor will ultimately make the final decision on requests for some form of governance other than what will be the interim form of governments next year; hence my concern about that becoming the default mode.

- *Jim Ballard:* Will the legislature get to vote?

*President Maples:* I'm not sure we have to go through the legislature. The legislature can do some stuff about it one way or the other. There is a separate legislative committee that is looking at shared services and governance but it is focusing on shared services right now. Control of higher education has moved out of the legislative and into the executive branch in terms of appointing lots of boards and appointing a couple of interim groups, then having those groups deal with the apportionment of education dollars across the entire education spectrum in Oregon.

- *Terri Torres:* This next year when we have the consortium board, what will I see different? We've never had a board.

*President Maples:* I don't know what you will see different at this point. My goal is for you to see as little difference as humanly possible compared to what you are seeing now. My hope is that you will think about all of this and you will examine options, then give us some opinions and feedback. No matter what comes down the line – whether it's alignment or forced alignment with a particular university, whether it's a consortium or forced consortium, or whether it's an independent board -- this university will not only survive but will do well under any of those circumstances and will set the stage for us to be doing what we need to do 5-15 years down the line.

- *David Thaemert:* You mentioned that the CUG report will be posted. Any sense of when that will be done?

*President Maples:* Tomorrow, November 6<sup>th</sup>.

- *David Thaemert:* Is there a timeline for the survey?

*President Maples:* I want to try to do that hopefully in the next week or two. It may be we end up doing a pretty serious rewrite of the current survey that we have – get away from the particular structures of governance and get more into the processes and things that are important to us as a way of defining more clearly the deal breakers. It will be as soon as possible but certainly before Thanksgiving.

- *Dan Peterson:* One of the things about this process that has bothered me is that I have felt out of control. I have felt like I need to say something as a faculty member -- but does that have any meaning? I feel like as a faculty, and as Faculty Senate President, I am not sure what to do with our faculty in order to have our voice heard besides going to that survey and checking a box. I don't think that's the best thing for our faculty, but I think we need to do that. If that's all I have as a quantitative measure, it seems so insignificant for such a huge thing in all of our lives.

*President Maples:* As we focus in on what we feel would be the most important path forward for us, our students, for the educational value that we bring to Oregon, that it might be worthwhile to have a very short letter with 100 or more signatures on it – something that states that the faculty endorse these principles moving forward. That might carry a huge amount of weight when this is all said and done.

*Provost Burda:* That's a tough one to answer. Maybe it's time for us to talk about pros and cons -- maybe even based on borrowing some of the pros and cons from the AGB report, so we have a little better sense of what things look like in terms of tallies on both sides of the fence for the three models. He is right, we have in political issues in ancient history had resolutions from the Senate that were an endorsement of the faculty for a particular stance or direction that the faculty felt was important. There may be something in terms of deal breakers for faculty that we are not thinking about that maybe you can help us identify. The governance structure we have currently, in my opinion, seems to be working okay. What are the key parts of that governance structure that need to be carried forward if we are going to be an affiliate model?

*President Maples:* There are other deal breakers. In an alignment model does the Faculty Senate here exist or not? Or is it a subset of the Faculty Senate of the larger university?

- *Terri Torres:* I appreciate your deal breakers and it's not that I don't agree with them, I just am not convinced that we even have the power to have deal breakers.

*President Maples:* I am convinced we do. As I said, I am walking into this as though we are pick of the litter – because we are. I am convinced of it.

*Provost Burda:* I think we are being negligent in terms of representing this university if we don't go forward with the plan.

*President Maples:* I am conscious of being available versus desperate. We are not desperate. We are forced to be available but we are available at a price -- and that price is more philosophical than financial.

- *Dean Jones:* You keep talking about three options. I see five or six depending on the affiliates, right?

*President Maples:* Right.

*Dean Jones:* And that gets back to the deal breakers question, right?

*President Maples:* Right.

*Dean Jones:* To me that's bothersome. I'm fearful of some of the alignments.

*President Maples:* Yes, which is why I would take deal breakers to the table in any of the alignment discussions. You're right. That's in part what Matt Donegan, chair of the CUG, was getting at when he was saying there is as much variability in the alignment model as there is in the consortium model.

- *Jim Ballard:* Has anybody expressed an interest in aligning with us?

*President Maples:* I think there's been some interest expressed in the Governor's office by at least one president about having alignment and creating a system.

- *Tanya McVay:* Have you talked about putting everybody in one pot?

*President Maples:* Potentially.

- *Jim Ballard:* So the idea of all the small universities going together is gone?

*President Maples:* No. We have not abandoned that. We have some interesting options associated with that as well that we are looking at and exploring, and getting pretty

creative about. I did not want a consortium model that had a single board for all four of us so that we had a quarter of a board with three liberal arts regional colleges. A single board would see us trying to get our mission, message, pricing structure and educational values and everything else through that group.

- *Terri Torres:* Let's talk about fundraising. How much money are we able to bring in now with this all being up in the air?

*President Maples:* Fundraising is going slowly. We are hiring a development officer who is going to work in the Portland area. We are going to make connections with alumni and do more fundraising. It's not a simple matter of going out and asking for money. There is relationship development. We are going to be without a Vice President of Development for at least a year, probably two, maybe more. We are not going to spend that kind of money at that kind of level. We are going to have much more direct contact with potential donors and I will be more involved in some of those contacts with potential donors.

- *Robyn Cole:* You mentioned an increase in enrollment on campus. What about DE enrollment?

*President Maples:* That's the total headcount of the university. I will need to understand where those enrollment increases actually are. I do know that over 100 of the 400 are at Wilsonville. That's gone from roughly 525 before we moved in, to 630 when we moved in, to about 740 or more now.

- *Erika Veth:* We are up in DE enrollment.

*President Maples:* We are up in Boeing.

*Provost Burda:* We are up in Klamath Falls.

- *President Maples:* So we have a footprint that works, makes sense and that we can build from and we are in a unique position for that. We have some opportunity to continue to bring additional enrollment into all of these sectors. I am excited about the future for us.

## REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL DELEGATE -- Dan Peterson

- No report.

## REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

- **Rank Promotion and Tenure:** The committee is working on two charges.
  - The first charge was revised, and reads: *Review and revise the promotion and tenure policies to better recognize research within the categories of teaching, faculty development and service.* Randall Paul volunteered to work on wording revisions in the policy on tenure promotion for teaching faculty to reflect the charge. He will try to add wording to emphasize 'by research or research as it pertains to teaching or as it pertains to service'. Ken Usher asked if the revisions were related to the policy referred to in the previous minutes between associate and full professor. Jim Fischer's reply was that part of the charge is no longer being emphasized and the committee is looking at all ranks. The committee will move forward with other policies depending on what happens with this one.
  - The second charge reads: *Review and provide recommendations for change in the training of chairs and the evaluation of faculty during the rank promotion and tenure*

*process.* Department chair training was discussed with current and former department chairs and there is no formal training. The chairs are positive and want RPT to be proactive in the training. Ken Usher and Marla Miller were asked to visit with the league of chairs. Ken Usher submitted a proposal to the chairs that spoke of a possible one day workshop where all chairs would have planned activities such as looking at real case scenarios and discussing the various situations that can arise regarding promotion and tenure. Jim Fischer asked if there should be a policy on chair training, and if such a document currently exists. The response was no on both counts.

- **Welfare:** No report.
- **Academic Standards:** The HECC draft for credit for prior learning is under review.
- **Faculty Compensation:** Standing and new charges were reviewed, prioritized, and a potential timeline was set on how to address them. Discussion on revisiting some of the compensation recommendations and the scaling process that was used. Standing charges are being put on a lower priority level and they are addressing some of the conversation that occurred at the last meeting as the current priority.

#### **REPORT OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES:**

- No reports.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

- None.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- Update from Terri Torres on the GERT force. GERT met with all but one department, got faculty input, and is processing the information. They have been researching the history of GE and GE review at Oregon Tech. An ongoing faculty forum is planned for November 21<sup>st</sup> from 7-9 a.m. The force has divided work amongst five or six subcommittees to broaden the conversation, involve more stakeholders in the process, and to do some of the work beyond the scope of the force.
- Update from Terri Torres on DEAC. They talked about things that were reviewed last year such as an instructor position for fully online courses that would have possible levels in order to provide an opportunity for advancement, instructor retention, and reward. Discussed a program director and DE director, which will not be decided until governance restructuring takes place. They decided that an academic leader is needed to represent DE. Several questions were raised including:
  - Instructor positions - who pays the salaries? Erika Veth replied that DE would cover the salary.
  - Would the salary be based on the number of students in class? Erika replied no, they would be full time non-tenure track faculty positions and would be paid similarly to that.
  - Who would they report to in terms of promotion evaluation? Erika thought both DE and the department chairs. Provost Burda said the instructor track is something for RPT as to definition and reporting responsibilities of the position, and the program director needs to take part in that conversation.



- In terms of academic consistencies, would those instructors belong to the departments or would they be part of DE and not associated with academic departments? Terri stated that she thought they would be members of the departments. Erika added that they would attend regular department meetings but they wouldn't necessarily have to be local. The issue is in the decision process.

**REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE – Christian Vukasovich**

- No report.

**REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE – Feng Shi**

- No report.

**REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE – David Thaemert**

- The Academic Leadership and Structure committee met with FOAC in early October. They discussed executive and middle leadership options. Questions on this subject should be directed to Mark Neupert.

**REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE – Tony Richey**

- No report.

**REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE – Michael Benedict**

- No report.

**OPEN FLOOR PERIOD**

- Provost Burda opened a discussion regarding Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) forms. The Provost's signature is no longer required on the signature page for two reasons: 1) a separation is trying to be made between the department chairs and the deans regarding the final arbitrator in personnel issues; and 2) the absence of the Provost's signature will give weight to the deans' authority, and the deans' signatures would be the final authority on the APE form. A stamp has been made that basically says the original copy has been received and is on file in the Provost's office. For HAS faculty, the Provost would sign the APE as dean and then stamp it as Provost.
- A faculty member approached Dan Peterson and expressed concern regarding student safety and travel during the Thanksgiving holiday. Discussion regarding why classes are held until 1 pm on the day before Thanksgiving, and whether or not Oregon Tech has any control over it. Provost Burda stated that the academic calendar is set by the Chancellor's office, but he will find out and get back to the Senate.
- Claude Kansaku brought comments from his department regarding the recent email failure. The bottom line was that something like this should never be allowed to happen, and maybe funds for prevention should be a priority. Jim Ballard said that the ITSAC committee had new equipment on order and it would have been installed in two to three weeks. Provost Burda said we need to figure out what happened, take steps to ensure this does not happen in the future, and do a better job of planning and preventing. Tony Richey stated that each year he creates a new five year plan to prevent a failure of this type, but sees that there is no money available to carry out the plan.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robyn Cole, Secretary

/dw