FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
December 3, 2013

President Dan Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Pat Schaeffer. A quorum was determined.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the November 5, 2013 meeting were approved as presented.

REPORT OF OFFICERS
Report of the President – Dan Peterson
- Dan met with Wilsonville faculty November 22nd, and plans to meet with them again in winter and spring terms.
- SenEx met and discussed the report from the Academic Leadership and Structure (ALS) committee which will be presented during this meeting.
- Lita Colligan, Associate Vice President of Strategic Partnerships & Government Relations, discussed the community involvement survey on governance and gave an update on things she has been working on including legislative issues, higher education funding, and bonding to finance the Wilsonville campus.
  - Overall survey results:
    - 77% of respondents prefer an independent governing board
    - 13% prefer a consortium model
    - 10% prefer an affiliate model
  - On December 10th the TRU presidents will present preliminary findings to the State Board of Higher Education (SBHE).
  - Lita and others have spoken with Ben Cannon, whose new role will be director of HECC. Oregon Tech will be approaching HECC for mission and program approval for budget and capital construction project support. The current relationship with him will try to be preserved throughout the process.

Report of the Vice President – David Thaemert
- Academic Council (AC) met November 26th.
  - Cost and revenue information by departments and programs was given to department chairs for use as a management picture within the departments.
  - Discussion related to Distance Education (DE) and obtaining department approval to proceed with blended courses. A form was proposed for documenting department approval of blended DE courses, and AC recommended implementation of that form as early as winter term 2014. The form is to be used as a management tool for department chairs.
  - Feedback from department chairs regarding the ALS report was discussed.

Report of the Provost – Brad Burda
- Governance survey results by participant groups:

Group	Individual Board	Affiliate	Consortium
Foundation/Advisory Board Members	93%	6%	6%
Classified Staff	58%	13%	29%
Community Members	78%	15%	7%
Unclassified Staff	81%	14%	5%
Faculty	74%	12%	15%
Alumni	85%	3%	13%
Students	73%	8%	19%

- Summary of the approved proposals from the Engineering and Technology Industry Council (ETIC) to build academic programs:
  - o $40,000 for a new EET lab in Wilsonville
  - o $96,000 year 1 / $91,000 year 2 for faculty funding in laser optics. Scott Prahl will move to full-time status. Documents have been submitted to CPC to make this an EE program option.
  - o $110,000 year 1 / $85,000 year 2 to develop two flexible master's degrees in science and engineering, and package the courses to make them industry relevant. This will be the System Engineering and Technology Management option and will be available with any engineering degree.
  - o $215,000 for a Klamath Falls renewable energy gridwork proposal for integration of renewable energies along with a "smart grid with smart buildings".
  - o Approximately $63,000 to partner with PSU and OSU on power systems education.
  - o *Question:* Where will the master's degree in engineering be and who will lead?
    Answer: Mateo put the proposal together. The plan is being developed in Wilsonville but that does not mean it will remain only at Wilsonville.
  - o *Question:* Are ETIC funds cost share?
    Answer: Yes. In some cases we will have to match the ETIC funds.
- AC reviewed a cost revenue model at their last meeting, based on direct cost and direct revenue. A new person in the Chancellor's office has been asked to put together faculty efficiency reports for the TRU universities. His report looks at the total costs associated with providing academic programs, and fiscal viability must be demonstrated for the five year plan. Provost Burda will share the report with department chairs in the near future.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL DELEGATE – Dan Peterson
- No report.

At this time Senate President Dan Peterson proposed that the agenda be amended to allow for new business and the ALS report next. No opposition.

NEW BUSINESS:
- **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on ALS** – Mark Neupert
  - o Committee members present included Mark Neupert, Kelly Peterson, and Dan Peterson.
  - o Report background was presented.

- o Process questions:
  - ▪ *Question:* The document does not look at specific parts of the process such as what changes could occur, will they occur, and when. So currently, are we trying to decide what the academic structure is going to be and then later think about duties and responsibilities?
    Answer: That is a future process question and wasn't addressed by ALS.
  - ▪ *Question:* Can you tell us the type of work or research done for this report? For example, did you look at schools across the country?
    Answer: The committee reviewed literature on academic standards. In discussion with faculty, we found meager support for an associate provost model, geographic dean model, and division head model. Faculty like the dean model, but it is not working. Other schools are having this same conversation.
    Comment: Wilsonville faculty want deans for the Klamath Falls campus, and local academic leadership for their campus.
  - ▪ *Question:* In the report preface and charge, I don't see anything about the faculty. Will the role of faculty not be evaluated to further empower or disempower the faculty?
    Answer: No, faculty were not in the charge. We recognize that if changes are made to academic structure there will be changes in relationships between department chairs, deans, and faculty – and there will be repercussions.
  - ▪ *Question:* You listed raw data and comments in the back of the report. Where did that come from?
    Answer: The data isn't raw; it has been filtered. We used data collected from department meetings, identified main themes, and applied the protection rule to preserve anonymity of participants.
  - ▪ *Question:* What was the data exclusion criteria? Did you use all comments or some comments?
    Answer: Each committee member kept notes. We met several times to process the notes, listed key items, and compiled a list. We then took department meeting notes and applied the 5P rule to edit those notes and create the list in the report.
- o Document discussion:
  - ▪ ***Page 6, Section 2, Provost***
    Matt Search: The COM department understood this report to be a specific set of policies to be approved instead of broad recommendations. COM agrees that someone should own general education (see GE, page 7) but they are not convinced that the provost is the correct place to put GE. Why is GE with the provost?
    Mark Neupert: That comes from the conversation with the GERT force. GE needs to be the responsibility of one person. We think that should be the provost because the provost has the overarching view of each campus and the power to enforce and delegate.
    Claude Kansaku: We have a history of GE not being owned and today's processes are a possible reflection of that. Someone needs to own it but maybe it's not most appropriate with the provost's office.
    Kelly Peterson: This was a five year plan in our minds knowing that GE may change. We felt that for right now GE belongs with the provost.

Ken Usher: What if that document had read that the buck stops with the dean of HAS? As we operate now, GE is seen through HAS courses. I know we are looking to integrate that with more majors university-wide, but what would be the down side of doing that?

Mark Neupert: MGMT offers GE courses, and they are not an HAS school so we didn't want to exclude them from the reporting.

Jim Ballard: Claude's comment has convinced me that the correct place for GE is with the provost's office. The process may have been done wrong when the provost relieved people of GE, but I believe in the long run that it was the right decision. I think with our present process we are so conservative about changing things that even last year the provost had to step in for MGMT for a short time until we were able to make a long term decision about the hours required. We need to kick it to a place where some summary decisions can be made.

Tim Thompson: What is the purpose of this discussion in the Senate?

Dan Peterson: There are decision makers in this room that need to hear the voice of faculty as it relates to these particular issues. Recommendations have been presented; as a Faculty Senate we do not make decisions about them but rather talk about them. If there are some concerns that represent a large body of faculty then we need to voice those concerns. If we feel that we need to do something beyond that, I think that should be the end result.

Mark Neupert: What does the Senate think about trying to make some progress in empowering the provost in the budgeting process? Is that a good thing?

Various: Yes.

Cristina Crespo: In the report you proposed two alternatives in order to improve decision making in the budgeting process. Was there a reason the committee recommended the second alternative?

Mark Neupert: We thought closely on these two models. Going to an executive provost model would create a lot of issues -- especially in finance and administration. We got a lot of feedback saying that budgeting was the issue.

- *Page 7, Section 3, Associate Provost and Vice President of Research*

Ken Usher: Adding in the leadership of the graduate school seems like a good recommendation. I take it is more based on the current person occupying that position rather than how we should go forward structurally. In general, some aspects of this five years from now we might be ready to change and that may be based on changes in who we are as an institution and changes in the person in that position.

Mark Neupert: There is a vacuum of leadership over the graduate programs, so we need leadership. Someone had to get it. A vice president (VP) of research and graduate studies is a very common combination at that VP level. Certainly the person we've given it to has great qualities and has been participating in the development of graduate budgets and things like that.

Cristina Crespo: I agree that a VP for research and graduate studies are titles that go together in many occasions; however, isn't that typically the case for more research oriented universities where the graduate programs are more research oriented as opposed to the professional oriented programs that we have at Oregon Tech?

Mark Neupert: The question speaks to strategic vision for research and graduate studies at Oregon Tech and what directions we may want to be taking those. It seems like the best fit for us at this time, so we put it there.

Tim Thompson: In the future we could very well need a dean of a graduate school but right now what are you going to do? You don't want to create a dean position just for graduate school or research, so I agree it had to go somewhere; or we are going to be getting more deans? It's a good fit for the time being.

David Thaemert: I think this is also a good fit in terms of looking at where OREC sits and really evaluating the research and extension function of OREC. It makes a lot of sense to add that to that research portfolio.

- ***Page 8, Section 4, Dean***

Jim Fischer: I have a merit pay question. From what I gather the recommendation is that the dean would have more control over the merit pay and ultimately make the decisions. I remember being involved in merit and it seemed overwhelmingly that faculty did not want to have an administrator pushing that merit; they wanted it at more of a departmental level. Can you tell me a little more about merit pay?

Mark Neupert: Our thought is that if you want a strong dean you need to give them a way to reward faculty for performance and so forth. That's the main reason for the proposed change in merit. The last time we did this the money was given out per capita to departments. Department chairs came up with plans in consultation with their faculty for divvying up the merit pay money, took that to the dean for review, and the dean approved it. It worked pretty well. Certainly the dean could ask to reserve money out of that to reward people who have taken on extra duties such as developing a new program or building DE courses, etc. Strong deans rely on driving things forward -- as least according to all the literature I have read -- but really rely on their department chairs for support, action, and collaboration. I think any dean in their right mind would certainly involve the department chairs very closely in merit pay awards.

Dan Peterson: How do you feel about the idea of having powerful deans as opposed to weak deans or vice versa?

Feng Shi: I would like to reply with some ideas from our department. One option is to have no dean, a strong chair and strong provost. The other option is to have a strong dean with more power because we have a health science and engineering college and the two branches are so far away or separated. There would be one person to cover the two areas in order to narrow down and explore opportunities to develop the area.

Jamie Kennel: One of my concerns in this section is that it's a relatively easy decision to think about a strong dean versus a weak dean. It seems kind of obvious that people would prefer strong deans in most cases. What I'm missing in this section is a healthy discourse of the other organizational structures being properly evaluated independent of the dean structure. Is there a reason those aren't more thoroughly evaluated?

Mark Neupert: Time, interest, development…what would be your conditions for exclusion for other models? We looked at a variety of models including division heads, associate provosts in both areas, geographic deans – ETM in Wilsonville and HAS in Klamath – and so forth.

Jamie Kennel: I just didn't see in the report that you thoroughly reviewed those other items, so that's great to hear. I wish that was included as well.

Cristina Crespo: One comment from the EERE department meeting -- some people felt that the dean level was not needed and they would rather have empowered chairs and provost. Some people felt like a dean was beneficial, so there wasn't really a consensus there; however everyone did agree that if we are to have deans they need to be strong, not weak. The emphasis was that if we are going to have deans they should be involved in bringing in money. Everybody that provided input in the EERE department agreed that everybody should have a local leader that they could talk to. Faculty in Klamath Falls felt like two deans would actually work well for Klamath Falls and they were very open to have an alternative structure for Wilsonville -- and Wilsonville faculty agreed. They didn't feel that having two strong deans in Klamath Falls and an associate provost or equivalent in Wilsonville would be two opposing or conflicting things.

Chad Stillinger: We had a meeting today with the EERE department. There seemed to be a lot of concern due to our financial situation at the moment, especially with the new governance policies that are coming out. Someone mentioned that if we didn't have two deans then we could have our own board for the same price. There was another concern that having deans is like having another middle man. Their perspective was to get rid of the deans altogether -- so instead of having a strong dean, have stronger chairs and an associate provost type of model. I took an informal tally and about one-third of the EERE department said they would like deans; about two-thirds of the department said that they would rather do without deans. Those who didn't want deans seemed to echo Cristina's thoughts mentioned above – that they would be happy with deans if they could bring in their salary and generate revenue up to five times their salary. They also indicated that meeting face to face with the person we are working with would be fantastic.

Unknown: One other perspective from Health Sciences in Wilsonville: we've had a unique experience both in the EMS department and the CLS department. We've had a number of years reporting to a dean in Wilsonville, and there's been a number of different deans (that we've reported to as well as in the last couple of years) reporting to the associate provost without having a dean. There's a remarkably different level of support, engagement, and job satisfaction from all of the faculty involved when we've had local leadership in Wilsonville. I don't know of many other departments that have had both options and there is certainly some valid arguments on the table that are person dependent and not position dependent. In our experience, I think some other departments have worked with deans in Klamath Falls and the same people and have had a much different experience with them. From our faculty, both CLS and EMS, their strong opinion is just that local leadership and keeping things similar to what they are now is best. They don't see a lot of value in inserting another dean level in between the current department chair and the associate provost.

Dan Peterson: How do others feel about local leadership?

Tim Thompson: The finance question on FOAC – there was a discussion related to currently the chairs getting half of the deans' time. That's already a cost

incurred by the institution. If you wanted to go to a weaker dean model and strengthen the chairs, there doesn't seem to be any other way to do it but to give them more release time. In the end there is no money saved. The reason we are doing this is because we believe that what we have is not working. We want to do something different. Deans bringing in money – that's probably okay, but right now it seems like we've got enough administrative duties that need to be taken care of on campus. Maybe Brad doesn't think so, but I think that other people believe so. When you start to figure cost look at the cost of what deans might have, but also what the cost might be if we don't have them. Some other costs aren't really reflected in this document. I'm saying the choice to go to deans probably shouldn't be a financial decision.

Unknown from Wilsonville: If our experience is worth anything in that comment, we are performing -- the EMS and CLS departments – much better in a number of different aspects reporting locally than we were with a dean. I recognize that is only two departments out of all that are here.

Cristina Crespo: I sent a summary from Wilsonville faculty on how we feel about local leadership and why. The experience with my department and the ETM department in Wilsonville has been much different from the EMS and CLS in that we had a dean who actually traveled to our campus to see what was going on and kept what I consider to be reasonable communication lines, and was open, available, and engaged to the extent that he could be. Our numbers show that there was none to very little growth when we didn't have a local academic leader. I don't think it was because of the dean not wanting to be engaged enough or not being communicative enough, or not being strong enough, but we strongly believe that it is because he was local. There are many things that are critical to the success of the Wilsonville campus. There are many things that are geographically specific and only a local person can fully understand and engage in those things. We strongly feel, and the data supports, that with local leadership the growth has been much better in a number of ways: growth in enrollment, the amount of resources, number of degree programs, etc.

Sean St. Clair: I would argue that the reason they have seen such phenomenal growth isn't because they have someone local, it's because they have Mateo. If Mateo was sitting in a chair here in Klamath Falls and still charged to do what he did in Wilsonville I think all of those things still would have happened because he is a phenomenal person.

Cristina Crespo: I see that there are two things to have an effective academic leader. One is the person and the other is the position. Obviously if Mateo was incompetent it wouldn't matter where he was located and there wouldn't be any progress made. I disagree that if Mateo was located in Klamath Falls and appointed to be the academic leader of Wilsonville that we would have seen the same growth. We might if he moved to Klamath Falls now because he has been in Wilsonville for a while so he has a lot of local connections and he has a lot of understanding of the local landscape; but that understanding will be obsolete within a year or two. I don't think that Mateo sitting in Wilsonville will be able to affect the same progress as in Klamath Falls. We have had other operational leaders in the past -- exceptional ones including Lita Colligan – and she was unable to make the amount of progress that was made afterwards. My opinion is

not that she wasn't good enough but rather that she was not an academic leader so she wasn't able to advocate resources or put together initiatives for programs and things like that. She was lacking that authority which I think is critical. You can draw many conclusions. One conclusion that seems like somebody else is drawing is that there was no growth without a local leader even though there were good operational leaders; and the other is there was a local leader and there was a lot of growth. You can give two explanations: 1) Mateo is some kind of supernatural human being with superhero powers, or 2) he is local. I think he's just a normal guy since he is local. He understands the situation and he is able to provide local responsiveness. I think that is a more reasonable explanation for the success.

Tanya McVay: I think it is very important that we maintain unity in our academic directions regardless of the geographic locations. I think having a dean that would direct all of the programs under his or her leadership regardless of geographic location would be an important thing. Right now it feels that Klamath Falls, and maybe it's just the feeling in some departments, but it feels like Klamath Falls and Wilsonville are drifting further and further apart. I don't think that is a healthy situation. I think it will progress if we don't take some steps to create some kind of unity.

Cristina Crespo: I think that's actually backwards. I think that we have experienced a very good sense of unity since we got local academic leadership in Wilsonville. You may notice that there is a friction between the campuses right now because before the Wilsonville campus it was just so disconnected that nobody in Klamath Falls knew what was going on. Since we've gotten local academic leadership I think that we have started to work together a lot better and that there's a broader understanding of what goes on at the different campuses; so we've experienced just the opposite. If by having local academic leadership everybody can bring to the table, then we can use the diversity of missions to fulfill a common purpose, as opposed to just trying to create the uniform structure. We share the common goal of unity but we don't think a uniform structure would bring unity. If anything it will bring more friction because they will try to impose a structure that may not work for the Wilsonville campus. You will create a negative feeling toward whoever is trying to impose that. Unity is not really forged by forced relations but rather by collaboration. It is served from aligned interests and how we can serve them in different ways. To provide a specific example for something that only a local person can do: when we were about to move to Wilsonville there were a couple of programs where it was important for them, physically, to remain located on the west side because we were drawing students -- working professionals -- from west side companies. That was about 150 students and if we had lost those students we would have started the year in Wilsonville with 400-something students which would have been below the target of keeping the same enrollment levels. Nobody in Klamath Falls was the one brokering the deal for us to get the location at the Willow Creek center -- it was the local leader and having that decision made locally we will have started Wilsonville with lower enrollment than predicted as opposed to higher enrollment than predicted. That is just one example out of many.

- *Page 11, Section 5, Department Chair*
  Cristina Crespo: You recommended a five year term for department chairs. I didn't see any specific comments from faculty listed in the back. Is that something you got a lot of general consensus from or just a few voices that said that needed to be increased to five years, and why?
  Mark Neupert: The language in that section is softer than a recommendation in that we said it may be five years. To get back to Jamie's earlier question, it was very clear in talking with department chairs that they wanted to keep elected chairs and not move to a department head model, a line position, a permanent status, hiring and negotiating, etc. There are certainly university models where the chair is incredibly strong over things like salary and so forth. It was clear that the Oregon Tech faculty we talked to didn't want to go down that path. We didn't quantify numbers of remarks and have that perfectly reflected in the number of bullet points in that area but we did get cases from both sides of the argument. Currently we have a three year chair. There was a fair amount of discussion amongst departments about three years being a rather short tenure for a chair to get up to speed, develop programs, etc. We recommended that it be considered rather than use strong language. We followed it with a discussion about how at some universities the length of appointment and the appointment process itself is negotiated between the deans and the departments. Some departments may be fine as a status quo department – elect a chair, and have them pass through on a regular basis. Other departments may be targeted for strong long term leadership needs. In that case, a dean may want a five year chair to tackle certain objectives that fit with the strategic plan of the university – instead of getting three years into a chair and then switching chairs. We tried to spark a conversation and have flexibility from department to department on how each wants to handle things. The passage was intended to present options and have the Oregon Tech community talk about them.
  Kelly Peterson: That was one of the things that we specifically said would be a charge for this group to look at that if there is an interest.
- *Page 12, Section 6, Distance Education*
  Erika Veth: Our department talked about it and everyone was pleased with what you wrote, except for two minor things: 1) everyone was emphatic that we don't do financial aid advising; and 2) they requested some clarification on page 12. It says that the director should continue reporting to the provost and strong deans should have some managerial influence, so that's somewhat confusing.
  Mark Neupert: We talked a lot about the level of a DE leader. Should it be a peer level to a chair, and thus be on academic council and work with chairs, and thus report to a dean? But then you are reporting to two deans and that creates a problem about who evaluates you. The idea is that is we have some kind of elevation to the DE leader position so they can work as peers with the deans but work with chairs as well.
  Feng Shi: Do you have some background about how distance education works with the other departments in terms of leadership? How do other models work at other schools?

Kelly Peterson: There really is not a standard. Some schools consider DE a separate campus; other times its owned by the departments; so there's really no model. It also depends on if you are a state institution controlled at the state level.

Ken Usher: I'm not really arguing about having a director of DE answering to the provost versus the difficulty of a DE leader answering to two deans. We have a president for reporting and you want a dean who's in a joint position -- for instance, reports to two department chairs. It's not that difficult to do unless the two department chairs or two deans don't get along.

Mark Neupert: Very often they don't get tenured in both departments. They pick a department to be tenured in and that's their main reporting line.

Kelly Peterson: One of the things we talked about is that they have an academic role but they also have an administrative role too which makes them in some ways like a department chair; but in some ways you throw in the administrative piece so then ultimately they do have to work with budgets and reporting to the provost makes sense.

Mark Neupert: They have a variety of workers under them – not just faculty, but contract workers and staff as well.

Cristina Crespo: This comment stems from the comment Maureen made during the ALS group's visit to Wilsonville. She was thinking of online and this document. She has presented it more like a campus where it's a venue for different programs from different departments to be offered. She thought it would be great to have a leader for campus that could work with department chairs in developing a strategy for the online campus and say these are the programs that make sense to launch or not; and have that same leader engage with those departments and be an advocate to get resources to do those launches and things like that. Otherwise for the department chairs it becomes very difficult. You want to launch online programs, but it becomes a prioritization conflict between that and all the other stuff in that particular campus so having somebody that will take a leadership role into setting a strategy for the online campus and what will the department chairs advocate for resources, for whatever they decide makes sense to launch and things like that I think will be beneficial.

Matt Search: We had a similar discussion in the COM department. Basically as long as it comes down to exploring who works with the department chairs and not dictates to the department chairs we have a good deal of support for what is going on. It's not clear to us exactly how that is going to work.

Mark Neupert: In terms of setting strategies and agendas, and what to do with DE in the future at Oregon Tech, again, that's above our committee. The concern in all areas is that we do a quality job with DE. That became our focus – was there a recommendation we could make to strengthen our trust in the fact that we are delivering a quality product in DE that satisfies both the DE leadership and the content department leadership. Thus, we proposed the two key system where if someone needs to be hired to ensure quality control on both sides, that both sides have to agree to that appointment. We didn't try to tackle grand strategies.

Kelly Peterson: What he is talking about there is probably where the dash line for the deans would come in – if they have a department who is wanting the content

and you have this great instructor that DE wants and there is kind of a philosophy difference that is probably where the deans would have to come in and say what is the strategy, and what is important.

- *Page 13, Section 7, Accountability; page 14, Section 8, Considerations on College Structure; and page 14, Section 9, Position Descriptions*
  No questions or comments.

o Discussion regarding how to proceed and timeline involved.
o *Unknown from Wilsonville:* It seems from what you've said that discussion on this is going to determine the timing of when we do a search for a dean. That seems like a pre-determined solution. Is there room for not hiring a dean, or is this the theater of contribution versus contributing to a real substantial change?
o *Brad Burda:* Tonight is the first time I've heard, in any of the conversations regarding this document where I've sought input, talk about eliminating the dean positions, making chairs stronger, and having a single provost. If we need more time to make sure we do this right before we start a search for a dean, then we will take more time.
➢ Motion that the Senate only speak to the part about hiring a dean, and that we have the two dean system with deans able to have budgets and more authority than the deans have had in the past. Details to be worked out. Motion died.
o *Dan Peterson:* Timeline. How urgent is this to us?
o *Terri Torres:* From what I understood about this document, there are policies that need to be revised so there's going to be a lot more discussion. I feel like if we just drag our feet on this we will be another whole year or two behind.
o *Brad Burda:* Let me ask another question related to timeline. So we start a search for a dean. How do I set the job description? We haven't changed any policies that actually give them any change in authority or responsibility from what they currently have. So my question is – I hire a dean based on the job description that won't happen when they get here?
o *Terri Torres:* So what are you suggesting? What will it take? A year to get those policies up and then we go another whole year?
o *Dan Peterson:* Not necessarily. We could go through those policies as quickly as we can, but I don't know whether it's possible to do it in a quarter. The discussion I've had with Mark is that if we could move quickly as Faculty Senate the search could go on while we're making the policy changes so that when the person arrives the policies are in place.
➢ Motion and second that the Senate support the recommendations of the ALS committee and forward the recommendations with comments to the provost for consideration. Discussion regarding sending document ahead when not everyone is in agreement as to its points.
  - Amendment to include comments from Wilsonville.
  - Reformation of the motion: Motion and second that the Faculty Senate support the recommendations of the ALS committee and forwards the recommendations, including the addendum from Wilsonville, to the provost for consideration. Motion carried. Two opposed. One abstention.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES
- **Rank Promotion and Tenure:** table report until next meeting.
- **Welfare:** table report until next meeting.
- **Academic Standards:**

- o Discussion regarding changes in OHECC report on Credit for Prior Learning Standards. This document has to be forwarded to the state on December 5th.
- ➢ Motion and second to approve the document with the changes recommended by the Academic Standards committee. Motion carried. One abstention.

Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Standards

Introduction:

House Bill 4059, passed by the 2012 Oregon Legislature, directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) to work with the State Board of Education, State Board of Higher Education, community college districts, independent not-for-profit institutions of higher education and the for-profit private career colleges to carry out specific goals for expanding and improving access to Credit for Prior Learning (CPL). CPL is defined as credit obtained through evidence-based assessment of learning that occurs outside of traditional college-level coursework. One of the goals for the bill was to "increase the number of students who receive academic credit for prior learning...., while ensuring that credit is awarded only for high quality course-level competencies." The CPL Advisory Committee, under the auspices of the Commission, identified a set of implementation strategies in response to legislative goals outlined in the bill. One of strategies was to develop policies and state standards in collaboration with the higher education institutions to ensure colleges and universities develop and maintain high quality CPL opportunities for students.

The HECC directs Oregon postsecondary institutions that award CPL to adopt a set of standards. The decision to award CPL is determined by the institution. The institution's decision must be transparent to students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. These standards shall build on the recognition and acknowledgement that credit awarded for prior learning is granted only for evidence of learning and not solely on the basis of experience. Foundational to these standards is faculty involvement and use of their expertise to assess credit awarded to students. Credit may be awarded through these types of assessments:

Credit by Assessment @ Postsecondary Level:
- Portfolio
- Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment
- Credit-By-Exam (CLEP, DANTES, etc.)
- American Council on Education (ACE) Credit Recommendation (Military Service)
- Industry Certifications

Credit by Agreement from Secondary Level:
- International Baccalaureate
- Advanced Placement Exams

The HECC has identified eight standards that must be addressed by all Oregon postsecondary institutions. These areas include:
- Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning
- Standard 2: Evidence-Based Assessment
- Standard 3: Tuition and Fee Structure
- Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription
- Standard 5: Data Collection and Reporting
- Standard 6: Faculty and Staff Development
- Standard 7: Transparency/Access
- Standard 8: Oversight & Review

Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning
1.1 For those areas in which CPL is awarded, Oregon's postsecondary institutions shall develop institutional policies and procedures for awarding credit in response to the CPL Standards. The procedures must ensure

Commented [KK1]: Discussion on whether to use CPL or PLA (prior learning assessment). Current thinking is that these standards deal with giving credit for prior learning and not allowing prior learning to stand for a pre-requisite. Thus, keeping the "credit" is important.

credit is awarded only for high quality college-level competencies. The policies and procedures must be transparent to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders.

1.2 Academic credit will be awarded and transcripted only for those courses offered by the institution and directly applicable to curriculum requirements at the college/university of enrollment and to the student's declared certificate or degree program as outlined in college publications [see Standard 4]

Commented [KK2]: Discussion on whether this was too strict. Would it preclude some CLEP or ACE credits that do not match exactly with courses offered by OIT? Decision was that Standard 4 indicates that we can identify how we accept these credits.

Resources:

Tennessee's Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Policy and Practice for Tennessee Public Colleges and Universities: http://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/Recommendations%20for%20Standards%20in%20PLA%20-%20Final%20Version%201-1.pdf

Oregon's Statewide International Baccalaureate Alignment Policy for the 2013-14 Academic Year: http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/partner/k12/IBCourseCredit2013_14_Final.pdf

Oregon's Advanced Placement Course Credit for the 2013-14 Academic Year: http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/partner/k12/APCourseCredit2013_14_Final.pdf

Standard 2: Evidence-Based Assessment

2.1 Institutions shall provide a guided process to assist students with organizing their documents for evaluation.

2.2 All credit must be based on sufficient evidence provided by the student and/or the institution. All evidence must be reviewed by the institution to document the credit awarded. The student must articulate and document the connection between what they have learned in another setting and the theoretical foundation, knowledge, and skills as defined by the course-specific learning outcomes of the credit to be awarded.

2.3 Evidence required by the institution must be based on nationally recognized CPL assessment methods. Multiple assessment processes/tools may be used to determine the credit awarded, including, but not limited to, institutionally developed tests or final examinations, performance-based assessments, demonstrations, presentations, portfolios, and industry certifications.

2.4 Credit awarded shall be evaluated by appropriately qualified faculty to determine the credit to be awarded.

Resources:

Tennessee's Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Policy and Practice for Tennessee Public Colleges and Universities: http://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/Recommendations%20for%20Standards%20in%20PLA%20-%20Final%20Version%201-1.pdf

Marylhurst University Prior Learning Assessment: http://www.marylhurst.edu/academics/prior-learning-assessment/

Standard 3: Tuition and Fee Structure

Oregon's postsecondary institutions shall develop a tuition and fee structure for CPL that is transparent and accessible to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. Institutions should consider the following factors to identify direct and indirect costs related to assessing and awarding credit when determining the tuition and fee structure:

- Costs for student services to guide the student and to support the assessment process;

- Costs associated with faculty workload for the evaluation of CPL;

- Costs associated with recognizing and supporting faculty and staff who are involved in the assessment process including any costs related to training and staff development;

- Costs related to transcripting credit;

- Costs for developing portfolio infrastructure and conducting portfolio assessments; and

- Other costs associated with developing and assessing CPL such as challenge exams, review of ACE Credit Recommendations, etc.

Resources:

"Fees charged for assessment should be based on the services performed in the process and not determined by the amount of credit awarded." (CAEL Ten Standards for Assessing Learning)

The **Washington** State Board for Community and Technical Colleges Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning state the following:
- "The fees for assessment will be based on actual costs… . The fees will be based on the amount of credit requested, not the amount of credit awarded.
- Fees should be published and consistently applied.
- Fees should be consistent to the extent possible across the system"

Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription

4.1   Oregon's postsecondary institutions that award CPL shall work with partnering institutions to promote transferability of CPL.

4.2   Institutions shall determine the acceptability of transfer credit granted for CPL from other institutions.

4.3   Institutions must determine the applicability of CPL toward a course leading to a degree, certificate or elective credit. All CPL credits must be clearly indicated as such on the official transcript.

4.4   All documentation and files regarding prior learning assessment and/or credit will be maintained as part of the student's official institutional academic record.

4.5   All academic credit that is awarded must be transcripted to comply with state and federal regulations and accreditation policies and standards (taking special note of NWCCU Standard 2.C.7). Notations on the transcript shall clearly identify the type of CPL awarded. Types of CPL include:

Credit by Assessment @ Postsecondary Level:
- Portfolio
- Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment
- Credit – By-Exam (CLEP, DANTES, etc.)
- ACE Credit Recommendation (Military Service)
- Industry Certifications

Credit by Agreement @ Secondary Level:
- International Baccalaureate
- Advanced Placement Exams

Commented [KK3]: Discussion on not knowing where CPL credits come from and their nature.

Commented [KK4]: Evaluations? Tests? Or all raw data? Needs clarification.

Commented [KK5]: Marla: Concern with archiving these records and their format. Deal with in institution policy.

- CAEL Assessment Standards
http://www.cael.org/pla.htm#Follow the Ten Standards for Assessing Learning
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Standards:

> 2.C.7   Credit for prior experiential learning, if granted, is:
> a) guided by approved policies and procedures;
>
> b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students;
>
> c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree;
>
> d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution's regular curricular offerings; and
>
> e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately qualified teaching faculty.
>
> Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students' transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution's review process.
>
> 2.C.8   The final judgment in accepting transfer credit is the responsibility of the receiving institution. Transfer credit is accepted according to procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality, relevance to the students' programs, and integrity of the receiving institution's degrees. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that the credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic quality, and level to credit it offers. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements between the institutions.

Standard 5: Data Collection & Reporting

Institutions shall collect and report data on the types of CPL awarded. Data to be collected include the number of credits granted for and the number of students who receive credit through CPL.

Data can be documented via the following:
- Portfolio
- Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment
- Military Credit (ACE Credit Recommendation Service)
- International Baccalaureate
- Advanced Placement Exam
- Credit granted for other Prior Learning

Resources:

Data Classifications:	Definition
Portfolio	Credit granted for the preparation and defense of a collection of evidence by a student to demonstrate and validate college-level credit for learning acquired outside of the classroom.
Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment	Credit granted through the assessment of course student learning offered by the institution.
	Credit granted for tests of learning – including DSST / DANTES, CLEP, Excelsior, NYU Foreign Language, etc.,

Military Credit (ACE Credit Recommendation Service)	Credit granted through evaluation of ACE published credit recommendations for formal instructional programs offered by non-collegiate agencies, both civilian employers and the military. Or credit awarded through the evaluation of military experiential learning.
International Baccalaureate	Credit granted for International Baccalaureate
Advanced Placement Exams	Credit awarded through the evaluation of Advanced Placement Exam scores
Other Credit for Prior Learning	Credit granted for other prior learning experiences not listed in other classifications. For example, credit granted for professional licensure or industry certifications proving applied knowledge and skills in an industry-identified area.

Although Dual Credit may play an important role in degree completion, it should not be confused with CPL.

Standard 6:   Faculty and Staff Development

Institutions shall develop a policy and strategic plan for faculty and staff development for assessing CPL. The plan should insure that there is institution-wide agreement on assessment tools, personnel qualifications, and appropriate resources.

Resources:

All personnel involved in the assessment of learning should pursue and receive adequate training and continuing professional development for the functions they perform. (CAEL Ten Standards for Assessing Learning).

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Standards:

2.C.7   Credit for prior experiential learning, if granted, is: a) guided by approved policies and procedures; b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students; c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree; d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution's regular curricular offerings; and e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately qualified teaching faculty. Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students' transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution's review process.

Standard 7:   Oversight and Review

Institutions granting CPL shall organize a cross-functional (student services, instruction, registrar, etc.) CPL advisory team. The team shall be responsible for conducting ongoing evaluations of institutional CPL policies, standards, procedures, and practices. The HECC shall review the effectiveness of each university's CPL process through periodic audits, ensuring that the university is awarding CPL appropriately.

Resources:

Tennessee Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations for "the Periodic review of PLA policies". These recommendations can be found on page 13 of the 2012 Recommended Standards Report:

http://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/Recommendations%20for%20Standards%20in%20PLA%20-%20Final%20Version%201-1.pdf

Standard 8: Transparency/Access

8.1 Institutional CPL policies and expectations shall be clearly communicated to students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. Information must be available electronically at all institutions and be searchable using the term "Credit for Prior Learning" or "CPL". Information about the following shall be included:

- Institutional CPL contacts

- Tuition and Fee Structure(s)

- Available CPL opportunities

- Requirements for evidence

8.2 Processes must be in place for a student to request CPL for courses offered by the institution.

Resources:

Tennessee Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations for "Maintaining Transparency and Consistency" These recommendations can be found on pages 13-14 of the 2012 Recommended Standards Report:

http://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/Recommendations%20for%20Standards%20in%20PLA%20-%20Final%20Version%201-1.pdf

Glossary of Terms

Advanced Placement (AP) Exams: A series of tests developed by the College Board initially for AP High School courses. This is also a type of early postsecondary educational opportunity.

American Council on Education (ACE) Guidelines: Published credit recommendations for formal instructional programs and examinations offered by non-collegiate agencies (including civilian employers, the military, professional associations, and other workplace related-training).

Council for Adult Experiential Learning (CAEL): National nonprofit organization that works at all levels within the higher education, public, and private sectors. Responsible for the development of 10 standards related to Credit for Prior Learning.

College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Exams: Tests of college material offered by the College Board.

CPL Leadership Team: Institutional cross-functional team that is responsible for overseeing all CPL activities such as developing and conducting ongoing evaluations of institutional CPL policies, standards, procedures, and practices. Membership may be comprised of student services, instruction, registrars, etc.

Credit for Prior Learning (CPL): Credit obtained through evidence-based assessment of learning that occurs outside of traditional college-level coursework. Per HB 4059, "prior learning" is defined as the knowledge and skills gained through work and life experience, through military training and experience and through formal and informal education and training from institutions of higher education in the United States and in other nations.

Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES) Subject Standardized Tests (DSSTs): DSSTs are examinations administered by Prometric. While originally being restricted to active and retired military personnel, these tests are now available to civilians.

Dual Credit: The awarding of secondary and postsecondary credit simultaneously for a course offered in a high school during regular school hours, as determined by local school board and community college/university board policy.

Evidence-Based Assessment: The process of documenting student knowledge, skills and abilities to demonstrate achievement of identified course outcomes.

International Baccalaureate Programs (IB): An internationally accepted qualification for entry into institutes of higher education, much like the AP program. Designed for students ages 16 to 19, it is a two-year curriculum that leads up to a final examination. To receive a diploma, students must achieve a minimum score and have completed satisfactory participation in the creativity, action, service requirement.

Portfolio: Credit granted for the preparation and defense of a collection of evidence by a student to demonstrate and validate college-level credit for learning acquired outside of the classroom.

- **Faculty Compensation:** no report.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES
- No reports.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
- None.

REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE – Christian Vukasovich
- Meeting with Ben Cannon on December 17th to talk specifically about faculty interests in regards to governance.
- There was opposition to faculty and staff having votes on the boards. The Governor gave us votes anyway. If there's a change in governor that could change for us.
- TRU governance questions currently without answers:
  - In the time period after the governing boards -- what will happen to the OAR regarding rank, grievances, etc.?
  - What will happen to the faculty/staff tuition policy?
- Shared services: cost estimate as a whole is between $1.9M and $3.2M. Possibility of it being $6M-$7M if you add in all of the individual costs including legal issues, software licensing services, etc.
- PERS: SB861 and where people stand on it. PERS board testimony during the special session is being fast-tracked to the Oregon Supreme Court. Hearings in February or March and a decision in six months to one year. This will happen during the 2015 legislative session, and has big implications regarding PERS liability. Depending on the wording of the decision, we may be back where we started.
- News regarding other campuses – see Christian for details.

REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE – Feng Shi
- The nearest IFS meeting was held in Portland State University (PSU) at Portland, Oregon on November 22nd and 23rd. The agenda included three major parts:
  - Portland State University Introduction -- Wim Wiewel, President – Portland State University
    - has 29,000 students, 2/3 students are transfer, many students are the first college students in their families, 3,000 residential students on campus, 3,500 full time employees, 50 buildings on 50 acres.
    - Challenges PSU are facing to:
      - rise in student debt
      - reductions in state funding
      - shortage of available jobs after graduation

- online learning
- growing national and international recognition, particularly for their programs focused on sustainability
- Another area of focus - life and health sciences, partly from the partnerships with OHSU and additional individual collaborations between faculties at both institutions.
- The third area of focus - "cradle to career" continuum: PSU is part of an educational pipeline and must help work with the future K-12 teachers and other educators. PSU is one of six "STRIVE" ("cradle to career") sites. There was a competition earlier this year from OEIB to fund programs like this. STRIVE agrees on key indicators along the way.
- 4-year degree guarantee – freshman, 45 credit a year, maintain good academic standing, if no right classes for students to graduate within 4 years. Students are free to take classes to graduate.
- Departments need clear curriculum maps.
- SB 270 passage and PSU own board:
  - More targeted attention to PSU
  - difference between a governing body and an advisory board
  - procure more local support
  - region feeling of local institution and not one tied to the state
- shared services and a budget rebalancing effort at PSU - state cuts and increases in PEBB insurance
- They are also developing a more robust program review
- HECC and individual boards – no reach out from HECC yet, make sense to think about the higher education enterprise as one large enterprise.

- ❖ "Rethink PSU" - Sona Andrews, PSU Provost
  - 3 millions - ideas for awards for innovative ways to work with the curriculum that would have impact at a larger institutional level.
  - 162 concepts were posted and over 1/3 of faculty and staff participated in one of the proposals
  - How do we as an institution provide greater access to more students?
  - U.S. public higher education faces increasing challenges, including: changing models of educational delivery, declining state funding, alternative credentialing, demographic shifts in student populations, questions concerning the relevancy of the curriculum, increased cost, and increasing legislative scrutiny. Portland State is not immune to these challenges. We should proactively work on how we might *re*THINK PSU to address these challenges.
  - Focus Areas:
    - STEM: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics programs at PSU are poised to make a significant impact by leveraging technology to make dramatic changes in student learning. These proposals will also move parts of the science curriculum online.
    - Accelerating a School or College Forward: A cluster of proposals which would significantly enhance the School of Business Administration's ability to meet student demand through development of online programs.
    - Selected Masters Programs/Certificates Online: Proposals in this focus area will ensure that Portland State continues to educate Oregon's largest number of graduate students by offering an innovative portfolio of programs.
    - Scaffolding for Offering Undergraduate Degrees Online: PSU will offer fully online degree completion programs in General and Liberal Studies and create a platform from which other online degree programs could be constructed. In 2012 nearly 20% of PSU students graduated with a degree in General or Liberal Studies.
    - Credentials for Prior Learning/Competency Based Education: Among the many innovative responses to the Provost's Challenge are a cluster of proposals that would significantly enhance the use of credit for prior learning and reduction of time to degree supported by an institution-wide electronic portfolio platform.

- ➢ Many projects will benefit from collaboration with other institutions
- ➢ It is something that impacts all our institutions
- ➢ Nationally state authorization for distance education and reciprocity agreements
- ➢ National agreements is currently on the WICHE committee
- ➢ WICHE – Western Interstate Commission of Higher Education
- ➢ Looking to partner with other institutions: not every student has to take each of their courses at PSU.
- ➢ Collectively students can bring their strengths together across institutions for particular disciplines.
- ❖ **"Issues of Equity and Quality in Higher Ed" - Samuel Henry, Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB)**
  - ➢ There are five areas of equity concern:
    - ▪ 1) broad and vigorous efforts for access including stronger accountability for better results for student of color and rural communities;
    - ▪ 2) formal adaptation of OEIB Equity Lens;
    - ▪ 3) A strategic plan for addressing talent pool for state's second language speakers;
    - ▪ 4) A more active higher education and social support for equity issues in all of education including higher education and rural education;
    - ▪ 5) More interaction with pre-K and community colleges towards student success.
  - ➢ OEIB is the "what" and groups like HECC are the "how".
  - ➢ Henry hopes for IFS to help with picture of what post-secondary education should look like in the state of Oregon
  - ➢ IFS needs to have access to OEIB on a regular basis to be able to partner on these initiatives
- ❖ **Academic Strategies - Karen Marrongelle, Oregon University System Interim Vice Chancellor**
  - ➢ What is happening with OUS and the chancellor's office?
    - ▪ shared services: offer mostly business and financial services
    - ▪ retirement benefits, collective bargaining and health benefits through 2015
    - ▪ possible future model: some campuses providing service to the other campuses
    - ▪ 20 employees will continue to work under shared services enterprise and this group will hire a director
    - ▪ SB 270: no harm shall come to the smaller institutions that will not have individual institutional boards
    - ▪ Chancellor's office: statewide effort is being transferred to HECC
    - ▪ Chancellor's office will reduce staff 75%
  - ➢ Individual/alignment/consortium: Who will make this decision in the end? The State Board of Higher Education and the Oregon state legislature
- ❖ **Senator Michael Dembrow**
  - ➢ Dembrow has moved from the House to the Senate, given up the position in House Education committee, kept the senate point contact of governance committee.
  - ➢ Confirmed appointments to the university boards this week
  - ➢ Faculty and staff members will be able to vote
  - ➢ Joint Committee on University Governance met on November 21 (Thursday)
  - ➢ Mitigate the impact on the smaller schools if the larger schools pull out and still maintain economies of scale
  - ➢ Dembrow also had a meeting with the presidents of the regionals. If OSU, UO, and PSU pulled out of shared services with respect to PEBB and risk management it will cost them about $10 million a year. If the legislature produces another $10 million and put it into the system everyone would be whole, but that is not likely. There are some shared services the legislature may not

allow the larger universities to pull out of. Some administrative services are being done now through the chancellor's office and presumably will not need to be routed this way in the future.

➢ The assumption that the universities have to be rated individually is a false assumption and the governor will likely not allow them to be. The only way to solve our health care cost problems is by creating the largest pool possible. The university administrations wanted to pull out of PEBB with the assumption this would save money. However, this means the cost for those who remain will go up and that money will still come from the university budget, so will anything actually be gained by that?

➢ The other major question they are wrestling with is the governance of the TRUs (technical and regional universities). Do they have individual boards, remain as part of the consortium, do they attach to the larger universities as branch campuses? Originally the TRUs had until June 2015 to make this decision, but now we collectively realize we need to figure this out so there is more certainty. The regional presidents want to make this decision sooner and see legislation passed in January that would change the change to June 2014. Of critical importance is the long-term financial viability for whatever the end-result of the governance structure is. The governor's inclination is the branch campus approach if the TRUs cannot be viable on its own. Being attached to larger universities would provide some cushion for the TRUs.

➢ Part of why the regional presidents may be bringing in the community is because of the strong resistance to being a branch campus. The concern is that over time certain services would transfer from the branch campus to the main campus. There would need to be safeguards in space to make sure that kind of attrition at the branch in favor of the main campus would not happen.

➢ Dembrow thinks OIT could have our own board because our business model works well and we are state wide institution.

➢ UO, OSU and PSU presidents are not exciting about the branch campus idea because they have to absorb the debts of the smaller universities

➢ Faculties in those larger universities have not discussed the concept yet

▪ *Question:* Has there been any discussion about what could happen with IFS as a result of some of the changes in the state?

Answer: Yes. There is a lot of discussion about that. IFS would like to be existing after the change, and we are trying to work actively with HECC to build a relationship with them.

REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE – David Thaemert

▪ No report.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE – Tony Richey

• No report.

REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE – Michael Benedict

• Kelly Peterson asked ASOIT to collect data on student library usage.

• ASOIT has been speaking with students regarding governance issues.

• Blackout for hunger Friday, December 6th at the basketball games.

• ASOIT does not feel that faculty get enough appreciation from the students. They've talked with students and were asked to extend their gratitude to all faculty members.

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD

• IFS run off ballots are due Friday, December 6th at 5:00 p.m.

- A faculty member in Wilsonville expressed concerns to Slobodan Petrovic regarding academic rank and promotion. The concerns point to potential flaws in the policy and policy interpretation specifically regarding the criteria of leadership and the criteria for promotion to full professor.
  - One of the critical statements is that leadership can be demonstrated most commonly in the government of the department or in other campus-wide activities.
  - The flaws can be found in the following areas:
    - There seems to be perceived inequality in the opportunities for faculty in all cases other than Klamath Falls; faculty in Wilsonville and other satellite locations may have limited opportunities for recognition and participation in activities recognized by the leadership criteria and interpretation of this criteria by the committees. There are no specific guidelines as to what these other activities are, and there seems to be two rules of interpretation by the committees.
    - Another problem is regarding the intervals for which the history of contribution is made and specifically regarding the recognition or grandfathering of the prior achievements and the credit given to certain faculty. With respect to leadership or service, there should be guidelines that are included in the annual performance evaluations and that has not been the case. In addition, there seems to be perceived bias by the faculty in Wilsonville regarding the composition of the committees because at the moment, the composition is such that there is no personal knowledge in most cases of the individual's capabilities, performance, and accomplishments by the committee members. There also seems to be perceived inconsistencies between the different committees.
    - Slobodan Petrovic believes that this warrants discussion and changes to the policy so that the policy can be equally fair to faculty from all locations.
    - Dan Peterson indicated that Senate committees will discuss this issue further.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robyn Cole, Secretary

/dw