

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES October 1, 2013

President Dan Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. All senators or alternates were present except Tanya McVay and Bill Proebstel. A quorum was determined.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the June 4, 2013 meetings were approved as presented.

REPORT OF OFFICERS

Report of the President – Dan Peterson

- Review of charges for Faculty Senate committees:

Welfare – chaired by Tanya McVay

- Investigate research on campus. Report and provide recommendations on a spectrum of research issues, including kinds of research being done, how research should be applied to faculty evaluation, the culture of research on campus, etc.
- Review and recommend options for new faculty development (annual reviews, mentoring, etc.). Junior faculty need assistance in learning how to progress toward tenure and promotion. Since faculty do not want a third year review, the committee will look at other options.
- Investigate whether the evaluation of teaching (IDEA forms) should be moved to an online format. This charge is continued from last year.
- Complete revisions of *Affirmative Action in Faculty Search, OIT 22-050*, and *Employment of Full-Time Instructional Faculty, OIT 20-010*. Last year the committee was looking at including lists of people for search committees, but there were a number of concerns beyond the lists. Therefore, the policies will be reviewed again this year.
- Complete revisions of OIT Grievance Policy. This policy was not completed last year due to the legal process.
- The Senate Executive Committee will give charges once recommendations on issues regarding governance inside Oregon Tech are received from the Academic Leadership and Structure Committee.

Rank, Promotion and Tenure – chaired by Jim Fischer

- Review and provide recommendations for change in the training of chairs in the evaluation of faculty during the rank, promotion, and tenure process. There is a sporadic difference in terms of what the chairs are currently doing to prepare faculty for rank, promotion, and tenure.
- Consider research expectations as a part of promotion and tenure at all faculty levels. What are the expectations for research, especially between the ranks of associate and full professor?

Faculty Compensation – chaired by Rick Hoylman

The annual FCC charges reviewed each year:

- Analyze CUPA and CPI data to recommend changes to institutional floors, comparator average salaries, and comparator floors.

- Recommend the distribution of available funds to COLA, market, and merit.
- Recommend the minimum balance required in the merit fund to trigger a release.
- Assist disciplines in obtaining comparator data if none is available from the OUS peer group. In the past two years comparators have been updated and information distributed regarding salaries and compensation. Some of the changes resulted in compensation adjustments for this year.

In addition to the above charges, four additional charges are to be considered:

- Investigate and provide recommendations regarding compensation ceilings that exist across faculty ranks. The ceiling mainly exists at the Associate Professor level.
- Review the overload pay policy. Make recommendations regarding any inadequacies found in this policy.
- Review and make recommendations regarding geographic stipends/differentials. Geographic stipends are being paid to faculty that live in Portland and Seattle.
- Review the process for updating the Oregon Tech comparator list, and make recommendations regarding the frequency and system for such updates.

Academic Standards – chaired by Karen Kunz

- Review and recommend changes to our institutional Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) policy. The policy is vague and creates confusion in academic departments as well as administratively. Further, with the advent of distance education and Massively Open Online Courses (MOOCs), what should be OIT's stance on CPL? This issue is being discussed not only on a campus level but across OUS as well. Marla Miller and Linda Young have been named to a statewide committee that is looking at these issues. The concern extends beyond MOOCs to Credit by Portfolio, Distance Education, etc. Provost Brad Burda mentioned that the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) has issued graph guidelines regarding CPL and wants recommendations on changes to those from the institutions by December. The institutions will be asked to come up with tracking mechanisms to count the number of students actually participating in CPL, how that is being done, and the efficiency and effectiveness of the processes in place.
- Review and revise P/NP policy in the OIT General Catalog. Consider the list of courses and the implications of the current policy in creating grade inflation that results by the overuse of P/NP grades. Strengthen the policy to reflect appropriate grading standards.
- Dan encouraged the committee chairs to review the policy on policies as they look at making changes. He will meet with chairs individually to do some training regarding managing these types of committees.
- Update on Academic Leadership and Structure Ad Hoc Committee, chaired by Mark Neupert: The committee has met with a variety of faculty groups and is trying to meet with departments in the next two weeks, and continues to take faculty input.
- Dan's summer activities:
 - Met with Administration regarding salary recommendations made by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Compensation Committee last year.
 - Met with President Maples, Provost Burda, MaryAnn Zemke, and Erin Foley regarding committee assignments.

- Met with Administration regarding governing boards and how faculty should be included in discussions about decisions.
- Met with Kristi Redd of the Foundation Board. She is interested in getting faculty involved with the Foundation, and the Foundation is considering whether or not to have a faculty member on the board.

Report of the Vice President – David Thaemert

- No report.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST -- Brad Burda

- The master's degree in family therapy was given approval by the State Board of Higher Education.
- Governance at the academic level: It was announced at convocation that meetings regarding choices for Oregon Tech structure would be on hold, but a letter from Governor Kitzhaber stated that meetings should be held now. The next Faculty/Administrator meeting is scheduled for October 15th. There will be a follow up open forum on October 18th. There are three options for governance:
 - Consortium board, referred to as the Technical and Regional Universities (TRU)
 - Independent board for the TRU
 - Branch campus

They would like to have a direction from faculty, staff, and external constituents about the best way for Oregon Tech to move forward by Thanksgiving.

- Salary increases: Last spring, Faculty Senate presented to President Maples and Provost Burda a one page recommendation of what the salary increases should be.

The recommendation was:

- 5.75% for the 2013-14 academic year, .75% of that for market adjustment across the entire university
- 2.75% for the 2014-15 academic year, .75% of that for market adjustment across the entire university

The agreement was:

- 6.00% for the 2013-14 academic year
 - 3.00% for the 2014-15 academic year
- Total = 9%

The breakdown is as follows:

- 3% retroactive to beginning of contract (2013-14 academic year); 12 month faculty members will receive 3% retroactive to July 1st; 9 month faculty members will receive 3% retroactive to September 16th; retroactive pay to be reflected on November checks
- 3% mid-contract (2013-14 academic year); 12 month faculty will receive this in January; 9 month faculty members will receive this in February
- 3% at the start of the next contract (2014-15 academic year)

The roll out will proceed as follows:

- The retroactive 3% is a salary adjustment for everyone. There is no market adjustment included in this figure.

- The mid-contract 3% will hold .75% for market adjustments to move faculty below market closer to the floors within their disciplines. 2.25% will be for everyone. If a faculty member is below market they may see an increase of more than 2.25%, and if a faculty member is above market they will see an increase of 2.25%. (The Faculty Compensation Committee may be asked to do new calculations after the mid-contract 3% has been distributed in order to see how the 2014-15 contract 3% should be broken down.)
- The 2014-15 contract 3% will hold .75% for market adjustments to move faculty below market closer to the floors within their disciplines. 2.25% will be for everyone.

One of the Faculty Senate compensation goals was to get 40% closer to market floors for those faculty below market floors. Administration arrived at the .75% figure because they are trying to get an equity increase of 20% in one biennium and a 20% increase in the next biennium. The effect of the .75% is that other money may become available for use in helping to boost faculty below market floors upwards in compensation. The compensation plan is based on Assistant Professor salaries because those salaries are more reflective of the current market value than full professor salaries.

A question was raised that if a faculty member has been recently promoted, which salary is used to calculate the 3% increase. Provost Burda explained that the 3% will be above the current promotion or tenure review increase that was awarded.

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 eligible for salary increases for the 2013-14 year and eligible for the final 3% distribution in the 2014-15 year.

If faculty need clarification or information on any of the salary issues, they may contact Provost Burda.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL DELEGATE – Dan Peterson

- No report.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

- **Rank, Promotion, and Tenure:** No report.
- **Welfare:** No report.
- **Academic Standards:** No report. Jim Ballard recommended to the Senate Executive Committee that they include the chairs of Academic Standards and GEAC as listeners. Provost Burda responded by saying that he is responsible for the creation of the ad hoc committee, and he is reticent to add new members to the committee at this time. The concern is that the committee began work last spring so any new membership would need to be brought current regarding said work. Provost Burda suggested that perhaps ad hoc committee reports could be presented at the Academic Standards, Faculty Senate, or GEAC meetings.

Dan Peterson mentioned that the same problem exists for the committee looking at academic structure. He would like a person from that committee to report to the Welfare Committee periodically to ensure that everyone is current on issues or, since Dan is on that same committee, he may report to the Faculty Senate about current discussions and activities.

- **Faculty Compensation Committee:** No report.

REPORT OF SPECIAL OR AD HOC COMMITTEES

- No reports.
- A group of faculty has approached Dan Peterson and is interested in creating an ad hoc committee to review the Faculty Senate Bylaws and Charter, and update those documents. Dan cautioned them that possible changes could occur this quarter based on the recommendations that are handed down from the Academic Leadership and Structure Committee, and that maybe it would be wise to wait until winter or spring terms. Provost Burda stated that the broader governance discussions may also affect the role of Faculty Senate, and agreed with waiting until winter term. Tim Thompson mentioned the Faculty Senate Constitution as well.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- None.

NEW BUSINESS

- None.

REPORT OF THE AOF REPRESENTATIVE

- Tim Thompson is no longer the AOF representative, but provided Faculty Senate with an update. AOF met in mid to late September. Current issues include:
 - The Legislature is concerned about whether they have enough votes to make PERS changes. If the Supreme Court throws out SB 822 it could affect higher education in the future.
 - Branch campus – some AOF members and faculty from other campuses think that the creation of branch campuses should be considered. Provost Burda stated that things to consider regarding this decision would be promotion, tenure, annual performance evaluations, salary, and expectations in terms of job and workload. His standpoint includes what is best for meeting our mission as a university, and how quality can be maintained in the applied programs that currently exist.

REPORT OF THE IFS REPRESENTATIVE – Feng Shi

- IFS met at Southern Oregon University on September 27th and 28th.
 - SOU Vice Presidents Craig Morris (Finance and Administration) and Sylvia Kelley (Development), Liz Shelby (Executive Assistant to the President) and Provost Jim Klein gave updates about various activities at SOU, including the new “HOUSE” experience for freshmen and trying to figure out their structure as a destination or regional campus and a financial structure that would help provide stability in the long term.
 - SOU carried out program prioritization. It is found that SOU has more than 200 programs and it is much harder to delete a program than to add a program.

- SOU was able to attract more than 1000 students from California. Those students turned out to be more stable in the student body of SOU. They extended their services to California regions.
- SOU will remove all of the deans and some department chairs to save on cost.
- Representative Peter Buckley described his perspective as a legislator in the process of developing the HECC and the individual institutional governing boards. Where is the money coming from to pay the small schools for loss of revenue from the larger schools that choose not to participate in the shared services?
- Virtual Program Reviews – Maude Hines (PSU) brought this issue from the Provost’s Council. The group had concerns about the loss of human interaction and accuracy of assessment in the virtual process.
- EOU endeavors to balance the budget by increasing the enrollment of students. The enrollment of online students has grown significantly.
- We discussed the need for more collaboration in online education and leveraging the best aspects of each institution for the benefit of students so our programs don’t compete with each other.

REPORT OF THE FOAC REPRESENTATIVE

- Met and discussed new reporting strategies.
- Discussed impact of salary increases on future budgets.
- The academic governance issue will be discussed at the next meeting.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL DELEGATE – Tony Richey

- No report.

REPORT OF THE ASOIT DELEGATE -- Michael Benedict

- ASOIT met September 30th and swore in the new hires.
- The non-traditional student representative office has moved upstairs in the CU to the program suite next to OP. This same space is now the non-traditional student lounge, which is in transition to become its own program.
- The Volley for the Cure pinkout is October 5th, 5 pm. 500 t-shirts will be distributed and the new shirt cannon will be tested.

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD

- No discussions.

ADJOURNMENT

- The meeting was adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robyn Cole, Secretary

/dw