

Oregon Tech President's Council
Approved Minutes – December 4, 2018

Roll Call: See attached

Call to Order:

Chair Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

Approval of October 11, 2018 Minutes:

Motion made to approve minutes from October 11, 2018. Seconded. **Approved with no changes.**

Opening Comments by Dr. Kuleck:

Dr. Kuleck asked Sandra Fox to take over conducting the meeting so he may participate more directly in the discussion. Dr. Kuleck read a passage (Paragraphs 1-3) from the November 27, 2018 Memorandum from Dave Groff, University General Counsel Re: Legal Concerns Regarding Certain Agenda Items. Also referred to the opinion attached detailing further discussion.

Old Business:

1. OIT-XX-XXX (OIT-20-04x) Rank and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty – Sponsored by Faculty Senate

Discussion held:

Terri Torres questioned the appropriateness of discussing this policy based on her previous conversation with Counsel Dave Groff.

Counsel Dave Groff confirmed that it was his recommendation that this policy, as well as the four policies placed on the Agenda under New Business be withdrawn, as they are inappropriate to discuss with Faculty and Management at this time, and such discussions could be considered direct dealing.

Terri Torres inquired of Counsel Groff the possibility of putting an MOU into place for Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty that would last until bargaining takes place.

Counsel Groff clarified that such discussions with this Council would conflict with labor laws if we were to have a Management-Employee conversation about this policy. That does not mean however, that something concrete could not be put into place, such as guidelines, so that those employees have something concrete to look at. However, it cannot be the subject of conversation outside of bargaining.

Sandra Fox: Asked Prof. Torres if she wanted to table these matters or to remove them indefinitely?

Terri Torres moved to remove the following items from the Agenda:

Old Business:

Academic Rank and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty –

Sponsored by Faculty Senate

New Business:

Academic Rank and Promotion for Library Faculty – Sponsored by Faculty Senate

Academic Rank and Promotion for Instructional Faculty – Sponsored by Faculty Senate

Post-Tenure Review – Sponsored by Faculty Senate

Indefinite Tenure Selection – Sponsored by Faculty Senate

Seconded by Junmin. **Motion passed unanimously.**

2. Academic Standards Committee Proposal Regarding the Foreign Language Requirement – Sponsored by Faculty Senate

Discussion held:

Terri Torres explained that there was some concern about Oregon Tech's foreign language requirement. Academic Standards met and decided to support removing the foreign language requirement.

Erika Veth stated that she was of the belief that any changes to academic requirements should go through the President's Council, and then discovered it is actually a process but that there is no formal process in place for changing academic requirements. She and Erik Johnson drafted a proposed workflow, but did not believe the President's Council was the proper place to vet the workflow either. Erika opined that perhaps it should go to the Provost Leadership Team, the Faculty Senate and maybe the Administrative Council. It should also go through the Admissions Committee so all stakeholders have a say and then the Provost would sign off on it. Erika said she will send the workflow to the appropriate bodies for review.

Brian Fox commented that the admission standards are a major strategic question for the institution and requested that the end steps of the workflow review include senior levels of the institution, to include the President.

Erika Veth stated she would send the workflow to Brian Fox.

Sandra Fox: No further action required by this Council

3. Policy Template update – University Counsel

Discussion held:

Dave Groff explained OIT-01-001, Policy Addition and Revision (Policy on Policies) states that the VP for Finance and Administration maintains the template for policies. Suzette Yaezenko drafted the proposed policy template and forwarded it to Counsel. This proposed template updates the current policy format and includes some important information recommended in the policy template going forward.

Sandra Fox clarified the intention of the template is that any new policies or revised policies would be submitted in this format, but still have redline when submitted to the Council Secretary's Office for placement on the Agenda.

Gary Kuleck expressed his concern that redlining is not reflecting back to the original policy. It is very important that we are able to compare the policy, as it currently exists with what is being proposed.

Terri Torres raised a question regarding Section 7 – Policy Review/Consultation and the groups listed. Questioned if there is an existing flow chart that specifies which groups should be included in the review process of a proposed or revised policy.

Dave Groff clarified that the groups listed in Section 7 of the template are a possible list of some of the groups that may be included in the review process, not that they are mandatory.

Sandra Fox stated that this body may request that a proposal be sent to the groups it deems to be stakeholders. In addition, the sponsor bringing the proposal to this body can do so prior to bringing it here.

Erin Foley commented that historically, any policy or review of a policy has always gone before the Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, ASOIT, and then any other group that has a particular interest in it.

Gary Kuleck commented that in the interest of transparency and broad participation, policies should be shared with all groups represented on this Council.

Dan Peterson requested to clarify that it is the expectation that new policy coming forward will appear in this new format, as well as old policies that exist, as they come through for revision, they would rise to this standard.

Sandra Fox stated that would be ideal.