

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
December 4, 2012

President Dan Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Pat Schaeffer, Teshome Jiru and Cheyenne Borja. A quorum was determined.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the November 6, 2012 meeting were presented for approval. Tim Thompson and Ron McCutcheon asked that the second paragraph of the AOF Report be changed to read:

“One proposal is that anyone hired into the OUS system after July 1, 2014, will receive 8% OUS contribution for retirement with a match up to 4% for a total of 16%, which is pretty standard around the country.”

Senate voted to make that change and then the minutes were approved as amended.

REPORT OF OFFICERS

Report of the President – D. Peterson – Dan announced that Feng Shi has been elected IFS representative. He will replace Mark Clark whose term expires the end of December.

- Regarding Legislative Concept 759, Dan presented for Senate consideration, the following draft letter to the Members of the Joint Special Committee on University Governance.

December 3, 2012

Dear Members of the Joint Special Committee on University Governance (HB 4061),

The Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate has taken an opportunity to analyze Legislative Concept 759 which “establishes institutional boards for certain public universities [and] vests institutional boards with certain rights, powers, and duties”. As a result of this review, we have the following questions and concerns related to the influence of the bill on Oregon Tech and OUS:

1. What will be the relationship between institutional boards and campus administration? What is the relationship of these boards with OUS and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education?
2. Does use of institutional boards create a layer of unnecessary administrative responsibility to manage the interactions between these boards and OUS?
3. How will members of institutional boards be selected? Will they be selected by the governor, board members, the university or other constituents?
4. What influence will institutional boards have on the tenure, promotion, and hiring policies of faculty at universities with and without individual boards?
5. Does the creation of institutional boards and their influence require collective bargaining?
6. The faculty senate also supports the questions and concerns of Oregon Tech President Chris Maples in a memo to your committee in September 2012, including:
 - a. What criteria qualify a university to have an institutional board?
 - b. How will this legislation ensure that all institutions comply with the same level of accountability in the process to gain approval for authority to form an institutional board?
 - c. What criteria matter most in establishment of an institutional board?

In summary, our major concerns with this legislation focus on the potential for diminished control over the day to day operations of our university. We require that Oregon Tech receives equitable treatment as part of the stipulations in the legislation. Further, we ask you to carefully consider Oregon Tech and other smaller OUS schools during your deliberations of Legislative Concept 759. If Oregon Tech faculty can be of assistance during your deliberations, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Dan Peterson
Faculty Senate President
Oregon Institute of Technology

During discussion of the letter, the following changes were proposed (changes are highlighted).

Dear Members of the Joint Special Committee on University Governance (HB 4061),

The Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate has taken an opportunity to analyze Legislative Concept 759 which “establishes institutional boards for certain public universities [and] vests institutional boards with certain rights, powers, and duties”. As a result of this review, we have the following questions and concerns related to the influence of the bill on Oregon Tech and OUS:

1. What will be the relationship between institutional boards and campus administration? What is the relationship of these boards with OUS and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education?
2. Does use of institutional boards create a layer of unnecessary administrative responsibility to manage the interactions between these boards and OUS?
3. **How will members of institutional boards be selected? Will they be selected by the governor, board members, the university or other constituents?**
4. What influence will institutional boards have on the tenure, promotion, and hiring policies of faculty at universities with and without individual boards?
5. Does the creation of institutional boards and their influence require collective bargaining?
6. **How will institutional boards affect approval of new programs?**
7. The faculty senate also supports the questions and concerns of Oregon Tech President Chris Maples in a memo to your committee in September 2012, including:
 - a. What criteria qualify a university to have an institutional board?
 - b. How will this legislation ensure that all institutions comply with the same level of accountability in the process to gain approval for authority to form an institutional board?
 - c. What criteria matter most in establishment of an institutional board?

In summary, our major concerns with this legislation focus on the potential for diminished control over the day to day operations of our university. We require that Oregon Tech receives equitable treatment as part of the stipulations in the legislation. Further, we ask you to carefully consider Oregon Tech and other smaller OUS schools during your deliberations of Legislative Concept 759. **Our interest is that all public institutions of higher education in OUS progress together, as opposed to competing against each other.** If Oregon Tech faculty can be of assistance during your deliberations, do not hesitate to contact us. **We look forward to your timely response regarding these important issues.**

Following further discussion, the vote was 1 abstention and the rest aye to approve the draft letter as amended.

- Questions were raised about the academic structure of Wilsonville and whether or not Wilsonville was following the existing policies regarding hiring and faculty reviews. Senators were assured that actions are consistent with established policies.

Dan announced an order change for the agenda due to another commitment for Tiernan Fogarty, Chair of the Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure Standing Committee.

Faculty Rank Promotion and Tenure – T. Fogarty –

- The committee was charged to review the *Tenure and Promotion Policy* and consider a reduction of the number of tenure and promotion committee members from 5 to 3. Following their review, the committee felt no change was necessary. After Senate discussion, the committee was asked to talk further with the departments which had originally requested the change to obtain more specific reasoning for this change request.
- The committee continues to investigate the use of electronic portfolios during the tenure and promotion process. Department chairs will be invited to the next meeting for their input.

Report of the Vice President – J. Zipay – Discussion at Academic Council concerned planning for academic growth with three core themes:

- * Delivery in multiple venues through Distance Ed
- * Balancing the mixture of programs
- * Facilitating excellence in applied research.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST – B. Burda –

- In an effort to encourage more rapid student progress through the system, earning excess credits, more than 180 credits, is being reviewed. The focus is on credits beyond those required by the university or the specific program.
- The Governor's budget for the next biennium has been released and includes a 6.6% increase to higher ed. This budget must still be approved by the legislature.

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

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Welfare Committee – T. McVay –

- The committee is obtaining input to draft the *Provost Evaluation Policy*.
- *Faculty Grievance Policy* is under review and information from other OUS schools is being obtained.
- Review of the *Key Policy* is on hold.
- Faculty survey is being developed concerning the possibility of changing to online IDEA Center evaluations.

Academic Standards – J. Ballard –

- Jim asked Larry Powers to update the Senate on the proposal to change the number of PE credits. Larry stated that President Maples had asked him and Mike Schell to implement a proposal for a mandatory physical education requirement to be considered by the faculty. A proposal was drafted and submitted to the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) and it is currently under review.
- The committee is reviewing the minimum GPA requirements for transfer students to see if the current 2.25 should be raised.

Faculty Compensation – D. Thaemert – The committee has just received the comparator data to begin their analysis.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES – No reports.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – No report.

NEW BUSINESS – No report.

REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE – T. Thompson – AOF met at Portland State University on December 1, 2012.

- Effective mid-year, OSU will spend \$2.5 million to increase salaries of associate and full professors.
- UO's newly formed union is currently involved in collective bargaining.

- Faculty at EOU are reopening negotiations to discuss a final increase of 2% for the current biennium, which will be in addition to previous raises this biennium.
- WOU, SOU and PSU are preparing for bargaining.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is forming a group of leaders from PSU, OSU and OU with one goal being to support OSU's unionization effort.
- Governor Kitzhaber proposes the creation of a new Department of Post-Secondary Education to oversee public universities and community colleges. OUS offices would have funding reduced as a result of the new department.

REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE – M. Clark / G. Kirby – IFS met in Portland on November 16th.

- The number of IFS representatives per campus was discussed. Future meetings will probably include reviews and possible updating of the IFS Charter and Bylaws.
- Credit for Prior Learning is under discussion, but has little support from faculty at most schools.
- Higher tuition for excess credits is being discussed by an OUS committee that includes Brad Burda and Grant Kirby from OIT.
- IFS meetings in 2013 will be held at different schools instead of always in Portland.

REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE – J. Zipay – FOAC has held two meetings this academic year; one organizational and one working.

- For the 2012-13 budget:
 - * \$15 million is from the state and \$23 million is from tuition
 - * \$3.3 million deficit and \$2.5 million remains surplus

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE – R. McCutcheon – Administrative Council continues to work on administrative staff summer institute and monthly brown bag luncheons.

REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE – C. Borja – No report.

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD – President Maples, attending this meeting via phone, was asked if on-campus overload could be paid each term rather than only in June. This didn't seem like a feasible idea unless faculty were willing and ready to refund payments if necessary.

Terri Torres volunteered to report from the Distance Education Committee.

The search for a new HAS dean has been placed on hold due to funding. It is possible that Provost Burda may serve as Interim Dean.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wangping Sun, Secretary

/db