

Minutes

The Faculty Senate met on May 2nd 2023, in the Sunset Meeting Room of the College Union (Klamath Falls campus) and via Zoom for Portland-Metro faculty and others attending remotely.

Attendance/Quorum

President Terri Torres called the meeting to order at 6:00pm. All Senators or alternates were in attendance.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the April 4th 2023 Faculty Senate meeting were approved with minor corrections.

Reports of the Officers

Report of the President – Terri Torres

- Terri has provided her notes for this month’s President’s Report to me, and they have been included in this packet for your reference on **page 22**. For the sake of brevity, I will only record below any information she provided that is not already included in those notes.
 - Terri reported that SenEx discussed the possibility of creating a charge for next year to revisit and revise the Dead Week policy, but ultimately decided to leave it as-is.
 - Dr. Afjeh has created a process that should clarify and speed up the IRB process in the future, in response to faculty feedback.
 - Terri also read the text of a letter she received from the Board of Trustees Chair John Davis. The text of this letter has been included in this packet for your reference, on **page 21**. She offered to send a copy of the letter to anyone who wanted one, upon their request.
 - There will be a forum with the university President this coming Tuesday. Terri told Senators to encourage their constituents to attend.
 - Terri followed up on last month’s conversation regarding providing student photos in Canvas by reporting that she shared this request with Dr. Naganathan but that “more work needs to be done” still to clarify whether or not this is possible or desired.
 - The recommendation from Senate regarding revisions to our academic calendar has been forwarded to Dr. Naganathan and we are now waiting for his feedback.
 - Terri also reminded the Senators that because of the recent revision to the FOP/APE timeline and process, this is the term where faculty will be submitted their APE (for this year) and also their FOP (for next year).
- Questions?
 - Randall Paul asked for clarification on the timeline for the FOP/APE. Terri responded that faculty should be completing their APE for this year (which covers Spring ’22 through Winter ’23) and also their FOP for next year (which covers Spring ’23 through Spring ’24).
 - Kamal Gandhi clarified that the idea of the timeline revision was that each faculty member would meet with their department chair to discuss their APE and their FOP simultaneously this term. Through the course of the conversation, it became clear that some departments had been aware of this and carried their meetings this term out this way, while others had not.
 - Dr. Mott confirmed Kamal’s interpretation.
 - Sean Sloan asked what terms each form will cover in the future, and Kamal explained that each form will cover from the current spring term to the following winter term.
 - Cecily Heiner and Randall both asked for clarification on if the FOP form will also be migrated to DocuSign in the future (as the APE form recently was).

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

- Dan Peterson responded that the FOP form will be the traditional format for this year. There is a possibility that it will be migrated to DocuSign by next year, but there is no firm plan or timeline for that yet.
- Thomas Long asked for clarification on how it was decided that the Dead Week policy does not need revisions. Terri explained that SenEx had made this decision on its own, and Thomas stated that he would report with more details later in the meeting as to why this decision should perhaps be reconsidered based on student feedback.
- End of report.

Report of the Vice President – Yuehai Yang

- Yuehai reported that Academic Council did not meet last month.
- He also reminded Senators that the Faculty Senate elections will be happening this month. He sent out an email requesting nominations last week, and so far he's received seven nominations (including six self-nominations). There are five HAS positions open, one ETM position open, and one at-large position open. He encouraged Senators to nominate others or to send him the names of faculty who might be interested in serving.
 - Yuehai also reported that he reached out intentionally to some underrepresented departments (such as Management and HSS) to try to identify potential nominations.
- Questions?
 - There were no questions for Yuehai.
- End of report.

Report of the ASOIT Delegates – Thomas Long and Billy Kimmel

- Thomas's (KF Representative) Report:
 - Thomas reported that ASOIT has recently surveyed the students' opinions on the Dead Week policy.
 - He said that about ten percent of our students responded to the survey.
 - 63% of students want Dead Week "to be more lenient for them."
 - The policy was reformed most recently in 2009, which is a concern for Thomas.
 - Thomas also encouraged Senators to tell their students about the ASOIT-led forum coming up on May 10th from 4pm-5pm.
 - Questions?
 - Riley Richards asked what Thomas meant by "more lenient."
 - Thomas explained that when surveyed about the Dead Week policy, students were given four scenarios to choose from. Students generally preferred to have no exams or midterms be given during Dead Week, so that they could use that time to prepare for their finals during Finals Week.
 - Robert Melendy asked for clarification: aren't instructors *not* supposed to assign work during Dead Week?
 - Ashton Greer clarified that instructors are allowed to assign work and exams during Dead Week, but they cannot exceed 20% of the final course grade without giving students at least three weeks' prior notice.
 - Based on this detail, Robert asked Thomas if there was an overall consensus from students about what "more leniency" meant: do they specifically want no assignments or no exams?
 - Thomas reported that 43% of students wanted instructors to be kept from assigning work that was more than 5% of their class

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

grade during Dead Week, and also wanted to be able to take final exams during the weekend before Finals Week.

- He also said that 23%-27% of students wanted a Dead Week policy that allowed instructors to assign work that was worth up to 10% of their overall class grade, but that would require a majority vote from the students in the class to be allowed.
- Thomas also shared stories from students who are being assigned a large project or midterm during Dead Week and then immediately having to take a final during Finals Week afterward. Robert expressed sympathy for the students who are frustrated by this.
 - Thomas also shared that ASOIT is looking into how these kinds of practices affect students' final grades. He said that there should be some more information on this provided during the June Senate meeting.
- Sean Sloan spoke to point out an issue that would be raised if the policy were changed to make it so nothing can be due during Dead Week: for classes that are already on a tight timeline, it would make it impossible for those classes to fit all of the necessary assessments of student knowledge into the term if they aren't able to use Dead Week as part of that assessment process.
 - Robert said that he thought Thomas was concerned specifically about exams or midterms that are *being assigned during* Dead Week. Sean pointed out that this is technically not allowed under the policy as it is.
- Terri said that the Senate would consider revisiting this policy as a charge for the fall, but there isn't time to investigate it via Senate at this point in the current year.
 - Thomas asked if we could move this policy change to the June meeting, so to avoid it "falling off the radar" over the summer: he may no longer be the ASOIT representative next year and wants to make sure that it is addressed for the sake of the students.
 - Terri said that she will still be here in the fall and will make sure that this is taken up even if Thomas is no longer the ASOIT representative.
- End of report.
- Billy's (PM President) Report:
 - This month, Billy's report was given by an alternate, Nawaf Al-Wahaibi.
 - On May 30th, Portland-Metro ASOIT will be hosting an academic focus group to address the issues brought up during the recent academic town hall and the course modality survey that has been discussed in Senate previously.
 - Nawaf invited Senators to participate. All students, faculty members, and employees are invited to attend. It will be held in room 106 on the Portland-Metro campus from 4pm-6pm on the 30th. There will be no virtual option for this event, but dinner will be provided for those who are able to attend in person.
 - Questions?
 - There were no questions.
 - End of report.

Report of the Administrative Council Delegate – Kelly Sullivan

- Kelly reported that there were two Kudos Awards for April:
 - Josh Winters
 - Richard Ellis

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

- Admin Council is currently going through nominations for elections. Kelly shared that Becky Burkeen will be stepping down as chair after finishing her second term. Each term is for two years.
- Kelly reported that Admin Council also discussed concerns that job postings are not getting put out widely enough in some cases. She said that if you are a search chair or supervisor who have concerns about this, contact Savannah Fincher in HR and she will work with you to make sure that postings are reaching the right audiences. Another staff member urged faculty and staff to use their own connections and networks (Kelly mentioned LinkedIn specifically) to make sure interested parties know about posted positions.
- There was also a conversation about making sure that job descriptions are up to date in preparation for the compensation study for unclassified staff. Some supervisors would like more support to know what they can and can't change in job descriptions and Admin Council will be working with HR to provide the necessary information and trainings in the future.
- Questions?
 - There were no questions.
- End of report.

Reports of Academic Committees

Note: Since the Academic Committees' reports are intended to occur quarterly and all four committees reported last month, there was only a report from CCT this month.

Commission For College Teaching – Dawn Taylor

- Dawn began by reminding Senators that CCT's work for next year actually begins well before the fall term does.
- She followed up with a detailed report of all of CCT's activities this year, and provided me with the report after this meeting. As such, for the sake of brevity in the minutes and for your reference, Dawn's report has been included in this packet on **pages 23-26**. Any other necessary context or discussion that isn't available in the report directly will be provided below.
- Questions?
 - There were no questions.
- Terri thanked Dawn and CCT for their work this year.
- End of report.

Reports of the Standing Committees

Faculty Rank Promotion & Tenure – Matt Schnackenberg

- Matt began by referencing the most recent version of the NTT promotion policy draft. This version has been included in the packet – along with the associated list of changes – for your reference, on **pages 27-39**.
- Matt proceeded to explain a series of new, minor changes:
 - The first was a change in wording throughout the document from the phrase “professional development” to “professional engagement” to better line up with the CBA.
 - Dr. Mott and Beverly McCreary asked that the “professional engagement, scholarship, and creativity” bullet be moved up in the list of Non-Instructional activities to emphasize it more.
 - Matt asked the Senate if there were any questions about these changes, and there were none.
- Matt then proceeded to explain the new, substantive changes:
 - On page two of the policy, the definition of “Provisional Instructor” has been changed to clarify the wording. Matt reminded the Senate that this rank is for Instructors who are hired with their Bachelor's degree and will be working toward their Master's degree. They will transition out of this rank upon receiving their Master's.
 - Ken Usher spoke to explain that RPT is not looking to have a vote of approval on the policy draft tonight, because there are a few details about the policy that still need to be ironed out

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

between the committee and the administration. He urged Senators to share any questions or concerns they have now so that the later Senate meeting where the approval vote *will* happen can be shorter.

- Kamal Gandhi asked to clarify: do instructors hired without an “advanced degree” no longer have a way to be hired on the tenure track?
 - Matt explained that this is technically true; however, an instructor earning their Master’s during their time at Oregon Tech could later apply for a new tenure track position and become tenure track that way.
 - Ken said that the policy as written rules out the possibility of someone being hired in a NTT position and then being directly promoted to a TT position.
 - Matt and Ken agreed that even though the only way to move from the non-tenure track to the tenure track under this policy would be to apply for and be hired for an open tenure-track position, in many disciplines our internal candidate would likely be one of the best candidates precisely because they would have already earned their Master’s in a discipline where that level of degree is rare.
- Sean pointed out that hiring an internal candidate for a new tenure-track line would not fix the (potential) problem of a department needing to hire to increase teaching (or other) capacity; essentially, you would open a new line and hire someone who already works for Oregon Tech, negating the benefit of a staffing increase.
 - Vanessa Bennett added that this creates a difficult situation in which we may be hiring tenure-track Ph.D. holders in fields adjacent to fields that have the Bachelor’s degree as a terminal degree, creating a situation in which new hires are tenure-track but long-term employees with many years of experience cannot be.
- Terri asked a question about the fifth bullet on the “Substantive” changes list: why would non-tenure track faculty *want* to serve on these committees if they weren’t required to?
 - Ken agreed, and explained that this was more to make sure that faculty with that much time at Oregon Tech were not excluded from service opportunities they might be interested in.
 - Matt added that navigating these opportunities within the CBA’s allowances for workload will require more conversation. In particular, he reported that he and Beverly discussed, for example, the idea of adjusting a non-tenure track faculty member’s workload to allow them time to serve on Senate if that became necessary (or desirable) in the future.
 - Terri asked Matt if these workload adjustments can be made at the department level, and Matt wasn’t sure. Ken argued that such decisions would ultimately be confirmed by the Dean.
 - Terri also asked why the time limit given on this bullet is five years. Matt said because this amount of time is roughly the same as when tenure-track faculty need to be here long enough to receive tenure.
 - Ken reiterated that this bullet isn’t making it a *requirement* that non-tenure track faculty serve on these types of committees, but is merely making it possible that they can.
 - Randall Paul pointed out that there are times that turning down a “possible” opportunity to serve on a committee could reflect poorly on a faculty member, especially if that faculty member is non-tenure track. He suggested that we instead are clearer in the policy about what NTT faculty are expected to do and what they aren’t expected to do, so they themselves don’t have to create and enforce those boundaries in the fact of contingent employment.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

- Ken agreed that this is a valid concern, and acknowledged that the policy isn't entirely clear on this when it comes to service on promotion committees. He also pointed out, though, that on page seven of the policy draft there is language that suggests that a) NTT faculty should do some amount of departmental service, and b) the amount of that service should be proportional to their rank.
- Kamal pointed out, as well, that non-tenure track faculty *do* have *some* non-instructional workload, which could be fulfilled by the kind of service that we're discussing.
- Terri stated that the times she has seen NTT faculty *overwork* in terms of service, it has been because of mismanagement by the department's chair.
- Vanessa asked Matt and Ken if their sense is that Oregon Tech is transitioning toward being a university that *only* hires NTT faculty or not.
 - Ken answered that, in his opinion, we are moving more toward having fewer (but not zero) tenure track positions. He shared that Dr. Mott and Beverly have agreed in conversation with him that we do *not* want to end up in a position where we have no tenure-track faculty, or where entire departments are comprised entirely of NTT faculty.
 - Vanessa stated that it's already difficult to find faculty within her department who have availability to fill various service roles.
 - Matt said that The Chronicle recently said that the national average for tenure-track faculty at universities is 30%, and that our percentage remains much higher than that. He agreed with Ken that we aren't going all the way down to zero, but said that the remaining tenure-track faculty are getting squeezed by service more and more without a good solution in sight.
 - Cecily Heiner asked if that 30% number is across *all* universities, or just a certain category of universities (such as R1s, for example). Matt wasn't sure.
 - Kamal confirmed that the 30% number *is* across all universities. He also stated that two states are currently trying to ban tenure across all universities in the state.
 - Matt clarified that he doesn't think we *should* move toward only having 30% tenure-track faculty at Oregon Tech, and that maybe the national average is already too low.
- Yuehai asked if Provisional Instructors earning their Master's degree would be automatically put into the Instructor II rank, specifically.
 - Ken clarified that "Instructor II" is older language that no longer exists in the policy, but yes, the spirit of what Yuehai is asking is accurate.
 - Matt stated that this is one of the most important functions of this policy draft; currently, we have many non-tenure track faculty who have worked here for multiple years who are "stuck" at the non-tenure track Assistant Professor level and have no way to be promoted further. Ken shared examples from his department of faculty who fall into this category as well.
 - Ashton Greer asked what would happen to these faculty if this policy is passed: will they be put on the new NTT promotion track?
 - Ken said he doesn't think the policy should answer this question directly, but he plans for the policy's final draft to include a footnote that speaks to how there needs to be further conversation about how to transition these current employees in a fair and equitable way.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

- Terri urged Senators to check in with their constituents to make sure that everyone affected is encompassed by this footnote and not left out.
- Terri asked if there were any other questions for Matt or Ken.
 - There were no further questions.
- She reiterated that there will be a special Senate meeting on May 16th to have a final discussion and vote of approval on the policy, so all Senators should read and be familiar with it by then.
- Matt stated that as part of the development of the policy, he and Ken met with Dental Hygiene and MIT, and as a result is concerned about the possibility of a transition toward a more research-oriented Oregon Tech potentially leaving certain departments (or individual faculty) behind, when their work is very important.
- End of report.

Academic Standards – Vanessa Bennett

- Academic Standards has not met because their charges are already completed.
- Vanessa thanked the committee’s members for their work: Kamal, Rick Hoylman, Robyn Cole, and Riley Richards.
- Vanessa asked Terri about what happens with the committee’s recommendations next.
 - Terri said that the Registrar will take it from here and that the committee’s work is done for the year.
- End of report.

Faculty Senate DEI – Robert Melendy

- Robert reported that the committee met this morning. One of their current concerns is the wording on the APE form under “Instruction”: he stated that faculty should be able to indicate the modality of their instruction on the form. The concern is that faculty may be evaluated by students differently depending on the modality of their courses and so that information should be provided for more circumspect evaluation processes.
 - Robert said that there was discussion about maybe going back to faculty’s old APE forms (as far as eight years back) to adding this information, but that that was thought, in the end, to be too work-intensive.
- Questions?
 - Kamal asked how it was thought that different modalities were evaluated differently.
 - Robert explained that in particular, online instructors might be evaluated more negatively than on-the-ground instructors based on his department’s previous experiences.
- End of report.

Reports of Special or Ad Hoc Committee

Student Evaluations Ad Hoc Committee – Vicki Crooks

- Vicki said that Report #2 from the committee is nearly complete and will be mailed out to Senators ASAP. In the meantime, she provided a summary of the contents of the forthcoming report. For the sake of brevity, I will not transcribe her reading here, but instead have included the summary itself for your reference on **pages 40-41** of this packet. Any other necessary context or discussion that isn’t available in the summary directly will be provided below.
- Questions?
 - Randall asked what sorts of things students would be asked to evaluate in a student satisfaction survey or other student surveys.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

- Vicki explained that Report #2 will provide numerous examples of ways that students are surveyed meaningfully elsewhere, including a midterm survey that allows students to provide input on classes *during* those classes instead of after. She also explained that these midterm surveys have shown a statistical decrease in “personal comments” about instructors from students.
- Dibyajyoti Deb asked how the committee is going to decide to change the university’s evaluation process according to its findings. Will all faculty have to deal with a new way of being evaluated, or will the old method (SETs) also remain an option?
 - Vicki explained that it’s not really within the committee’s authority to make such a big change to the entire university, but we will be providing recommendations on how it thinks the larger faculty community should proceed.
- Matt asked whether or not the committee had considered peer evaluations of teaching and talked about how such a program might fit into faculty workload. He talked about the usefulness of a peer evaluation model that he experienced previously while working at Washington State University but expressed concern that such a model creates more work for faculty who are already busy as well.
 - I responded to explain again that the committee will only be submitting a set of recommendations; however, those recommendations take into consideration the fact that a) if adopted even partially, they will require more work of faculty than faculty are currently doing and b) they will thus likely require a certain allotment of faculty workload to be able to be implemented meaningfully.
 - Yuehai mentioned that peer evaluation can also be a method for professional development: if a junior faculty member sits in on a senior faculty member’s class, this could help them develop as an instructor through observation.
 - Matt pointed out also that senior faculty can learn just as well from junior faculty.
- Maureen Sevigny stated that she would be in support of a move away from summative evaluation of teaching (as we have now) to something that’s more formative. She also shared that at a previous university her department chair was responsible for observing and commenting on all of the department faculty’s classes. She found that experience to be extremely valuable. Based on this example, she argued that part of the faculty evaluation process should be the chair’s responsibility.
- Vicki explained that the committee has frequently talked about this potential revision of our evaluation processes as something that could be extremely positive for the university and in particular could help build bridges between the faculty and the administration.
 - Terri reported that based on a recent conversation with Dr. Mott, the administration is interested in contributing to this evaluation revision as well.
 - Riley suggested that this could be an effort that could involve the new Center for Teaching and Learning, and I stated that the Center has already been included in the committee’s final recommendations.
- End of report.

Academic Calendar Ad Hoc Committee – Kamal Gandhi

- This committee has already finished its charges for the year, so there was no report.

Unfinished Business

- There was no unfinished business.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

New Business

Ashton Greer

- Ashton gave a presentation highlighting the changes that SenEx has discussed making to the Faculty Senate Bylaws and Charter. This presentation was based on a set of PowerPoint slides Ashton shared, and that I have made available for your reference on **pages 42-50** of this packet. The Bylaws and Charter documents, with Track Changes highlighting SenEx's proposed changes, have also been made available for your reference on **pages 51-59 and 60-67 of this packet, respectively**. Any other necessary context or discussion that isn't available in the summary directly will be provided below.
 - Cecily asked if there is a way to consolidate the numerous DEI-oriented committees on campus to conserve faculty workload. Ashton explained that the Senate DEI committee was brought into existence to specifically address DEI issues as they pertain to faculty, while the other DEI groups (the university-wide committee and the CCT subcommittee, which Cecily pointed out) have other focuses and purposes. She said we can further discuss the necessity for each individual DEI-oriented group if necessary.
 - Matt asked about committee composition: maybe the Senate DEI committee should have representatives from the other DEI committees serving on it to cross-pollinate each group with ideas? Terri said that we've (SenEx) have been trying to do this when peopling the committees.
 - Kamal asked if the CCT DEI subcommittee was brought into being because there wasn't already (in the past) a Senate DEI committee. Terri said that the Senate DEI committee came into existence second, and the CCT subcommittee third.
 - Kamal asked that if the changes to the bylaws, while decreasing the overall amount of HAS and ETM Senators, would also decrease (or increase?) the amount of at-large Senators. Ashton answered that the number of at-large Senators is explicitly stated (there are six) and has not been changed from what it was previously.
 - Ken asked who is currently serving as the Academic Council delegate this year. Terri explained that we were not assigned a delegate from Academic Council this year despite asking for one. Ken pointed out that in the past, there "hasn't been much of a selection process" for this role, and it's been one that a department chair has typically stepped up to fill. He suggested that in the future, maybe an election should be held for the position to make sure it's consistently filled.
 - Dr. Mott clarified further, saying that chairs were asked to volunteer three times at Academic Council this year, and nobody wanted to fill the position.
 - Ken spoke about the newly proposed Faculty Policy Committee: he agreed with the idea of combining RPT and Faculty Welfare, and recommended that we minimize or remove the portion of the document that specifies that certain number of the committee members be tenured and a certain number be non-tenured.
 - Ashton explained that we (SenEx) originally kept these rules with the idea being that it would ensure that a certain number of members of the committee would have already gone through the tenure/promotion process(es) before being on the committee, but that we could reconsider that particular stricture before presenting the final version of the Charter to the Senate.
 - Mark Clark (who was attending as a guest due to his previous experience working with the Bylaws and Charter) spoke to defend the idea of including a number of tenure-track faculty explicitly on the various Senate committees (including the Faculty Policy committee), saying that the idea behind having such requirements originally was that they would make sure that a certain percentage of each committee was empowered to speak out without fear of retribution due to their tenured status.
 - Riley asked about why the Academic Standards committee is the only one that specifies that faculty must have a certain number of years served (other than requiring tenure, for example). Ashton explained that this change was made to address our decreasing percentage of tenured faculty: this

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

would allow non-tenured faculty to serve on the committee but simultaneously make sure that they have enough experience at the university to serve in an informed way.

- Andria Fultz spoke in defense of the idea of adding more location requirements regarding the election of Senators (and the peopling of particular committees) to make sure that campuses aside from the Klamath Falls campus are represented fairly.
- Matt asked what it means that the Elections Committee’s role will be fulfilled by the executive committee. Ashton explained that currently SenEx serves in the role of the Elections Committee (i.e., there is no separate Elections Committee and there hasn’t been for some time). This change is just codifying that in the Charter. Terri explained further that part of the reason SenEx has taken this role over is because the role has become much less work-intensive now that Senate elections happen electronically instead of through physical media.
 - Ken made the point that this change works well as long as the Senate finds the SenEx slate trustworthy. It *could* lead to favoritism in various ways (SenEx solicits nominations only from the people that they like, for example).
 - Yuehai responded that the best way to offset these potential issues is just make sure that SenEx and the Senate in general is as cosmopolitan as possible. He encouraged Senators to solicit nominations in the future, especially from departments who aren’t currently represented well, to ensure this.
- Ashton encouraged Senators to read through the full set of changes to the Bylaws and Charter if they haven’t already and to send any questions or feedback to SenEx. She explained that we hope to vote to ratify these changes at the June meeting.
 - Sean asked if we could push the dates for the next time these documents would be revised out further than the proposed AY of 2025-2026, and Ashton explained that we chose that year in particular because it would coincide with the next revision(s) to the CBA.
- Terri reiterated Ashton’s request for questions and feedback.

Report of the Provost – Dr. Joanna Mott

- Dr. Mott began by thanking everyone who participated in the accreditation site visit. She stated that they had a very short oral debrief at the end of the visit, and that the full report will be provided in July.
 - She shared that we received commendations for John Schoppert’s and Farooq Sultan’s work, and for our commitments to our polytechnic mission and to student success.
 - She said also that we had four recommendations, but we won’t know exactly what those are until the full report comes out.
- The DPT program approval is still pending. There will be an oral hearing on April 17th.
- There was a good response to the call for Summer Creativity Grants. A committee will be formed to make decisions on the applications in the next couple of weeks.
- The next Board meeting will be held on the first week of June, which will coincide with IdeaFest, which means the Board members will be on campus and be able to participate in that event.
- Dr. Mott thanked Matt and Ken for their work on the NTT promotion policy and for their cooperation with the administration on that work.
 - She also clarified that she has “never heard” anyone express the intention of transitioning Oregon Tech to being an R1 institution.
- Enrollment is “not looking very good” right now. Josephine is putting together a comparison between last year and this year, but right now it’s looking like we’ll be down in the fall.
 - In particular, the Portland-Metro Growth Committee has reported recommendations to the Board about what can and should be done to address enrollment decline at Portland-Metro specifically.
- Questions?
 - Deb asked what the recommendations from the Growth Committee were. Dr. Mott explained that the recommendations were presented at the most recent Board meeting and encouraged Senators to

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

attend and/or watch the Board meeting recordings. She asked Dr. Afjeh to provide some information, as he serves as a co-chair on that committee.

- Dr. Afjeh said that the committee’s work is not finished, but when it *is* finished the final report will be provided to the faculty so that they can see the committee’s recommendations.
 - One recommendation he mentioned was working closely with Admissions and Marketing to better market PM programs, particularly to transfer students (presently, since new student applications for this year have already passed).
- Dr. Mott also said that there are recommendations that deal specifically with how we can improve by this fall as well as longer-term recommendations that look beyond the fall.
- Terri encouraged Senators to pay attention to the questions the Board asked about Portland-Metro if they watch the recording of the most recent Board meeting. She called the questions “very interesting.”
- End of report.

Report of the President’s Council Delegate – Terri Torres

- President’s Council has not met, but Terri said they hopefully will soon.
 - Dr. Mott spoke later (during the IFS report) to clarify that President’s Council hasn’t met recently because there have been no policies to review. When there are new policies to review, they will meet.
- End of report.

Report of the Inter-institutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Representative – Maureen Sevigny

- Maureen reported that IFS will be meeting in Ashland on May 19th, which will lead to a report at our June meeting.
- She also encouraged people who have an interest in legislative processes as well as what’s going on statewide at our universities to consider replacing her as IFS representative at the end of this year. She framed this as a great opportunity for the right person with the right mix of interests. In particular, she encouraged us to try to identify a future representative from the Klamath Falls campus, because *both* IFS positions have historically been peopled by Portland-Metro faculty.
- End of report.

Report of the Fiscal Operations Advisory Council (FOAC) Representative – Yuehai Yang

- Yuehai reported that FOAC met on April 5th.
 - This meeting updated members on the February budget. At that point, our enrollment was down 5.9%.
 - Yuehai recorded that tuition revenue has dropped \$2.5M – 15% – over the last two years. Despite this, the budget has balanced at this point because of \$4M of “salary savings.” Yuehai reported that John Harman said that \$1M of these salary savings comes from administration, and \$1M from faculty. John did not say where the other \$2M came from.
 - Yuehai also reported that OSU and U of O are both growing in enrollment. In particular, the OSU Cascades campus is growing, and is a competitor in some ways to Oregon Tech.
 - John Harman’s forecast was that we still want to hire all necessary positions, but “we should think about whether our needs have changed, and be strategic about it.”
 - Yuehai reported that we need a 3.7% increase in state funding just to cover inflation. So far, the Governor has only approved a 5.4% increase.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

- One strategy that was discussed at FOAC as a way of increasing our revenue was to look at increasing out-of-state enrollment. Yuehai reported that Mark Neupert pointed out to FOAC that currently our out-of-state tuition is 31K, while the out-of-state tuition of our direct competitor, Cal Poly Humboldt, is 17K.
 - Randall asked how much OSU's campus in Bend is charging for out-of-state tuition. Yuehai didn't know, but said that information was provided on the FOAC meeting's slides, which he was not provided with after the meeting.
- The Boivin renovation project is 79% complete, and the stadium renovation is 89% complete. The stadium should be complete and ready by graduation.
- End of report.

Open Floor

Robyn Wilde

- As chair of the Faculty Emeritus committee, Robyn read off the bios of each of this year's Emeritus candidates as well as the committee's recommendations. For the sake of brevity in the minutes, I have provided this information in the packet for your reference, on **pages 68-73**.
- The three candidates were: Sherry Yang, Lloyd Parratt, and Maureen Sevigny.
 - The Emeritus vote took place during this Open Floor item, but the results were not announced until the end of the Open Floor session.

Matt Schnackenberg

- Matt brought up the necessity of faculty taking action regarding ChatGPT and similar AI tools. He stated that, initially, he and others had thought to have a session about ChatGPT during IdeaFest, but found out that that event is more geared toward faculty research. He restated Dawn's earlier statement that the OTET Conference next fall will engage with this topic in *some* ways. Then he asked the Senators generally if there are other ways this can or should be addressed in the future, including a review of the current Academic Integrity Policy. He made the point that AI can be used dishonestly by students, but also in productive ways.
 - Riley mentioned that one of this year's Summer Creativity Grant proposals was proposing a project that had something to do with ChatGPT. Matt said that Aaron Scher was the PI on this proposed project. Dr. Mott shared that that proposed project is concerned with the risks and benefits of ChatGPT and involves Aaron as well as David Johnston, David Hammond, and Ryan Madden.

Vanessa Bennett

- Vanessa explained that she chaired the Emeritus committee last year, and that she would like to see the Emeritus policy get reviewed and updated generally, but also specifically regarding how Emeritus faculty are rewarded.

Robert Melendy

- Robert brought up a concern about current hiring practices at the university. He shared that back when he was hired (in 2017), he was informed that Oregon Tech was primarily a teaching institution, and as such it was expected that his workload would be 80% teaching, 10% research, and 10% service. Since then, he has worked on a search committee that is part of a response to his department halving in size (going from eighteen faculty to nine). He reported that without more specific guidance, he has proceeded as a member of this search committee assuming the expectation of new faculty will be the same 80/10/10 split. He has heard elsewhere, though, that this division of workload has changed. He is concerned that potential new faculty

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

who are being interviewed are hearing different expectations from different groups on campus, and that this gives a negative impression of the university to candidates. He is hoping to get more clarification on these expectations.

- Terri asked Dr. Afjeh to speak to Robert’s concerns.
 - Dr. Mott responded that expectations for particular positions are made clear in their position descriptions, and that for two years now there has been a specific research expectation for all new tenure-track hires that has been made clear to all chairs as well.
 - Robert clarified that his issue isn’t with tenure-track faculty being expected to do research, but rather that the *amount of* research they’re expected to do has changed (from that “original” 80/10/10 figure he mentioned previously).
 - Dr. Mott explained that this figure is still accurate; however, tenure-track faculty may be expected to use that “leftover” 20% of their workload more for research and less for service, and are even able to request course releases in the event that they want to (or need to) exceed 20% of their workload when it comes to research.
- Robert also shared his concern that, as departments like his are trying to do more work with less faculty, faculty’s ability to meaningfully engage in research is reduced as they have to scramble to cover more and more other duties that can’t be delegated more widely.
 - Dr. Mott acknowledged that Robert’s department in particular has been hit hard by our problems with faculty attrition.
- Randall asked if we should be adjusting the formal promotion policy to reflect these changing expectations of faculty.
 - Dr. Mott said that she has talked a bit about this already with Matt and Ken (through RPT’s current charge). She said that, based on those conversations, the policy as-is currently still seems to cover all of the new expectations.
 - Randall explained that, at least when the policy was most recently revised, it was intended to set up a situation where tenure-track faculty could more or less choose between being service-oriented or research-oriented. Now that it seems like that choice is, to some degree, being taken away from new tenure-track hires, shouldn’t the policy be changed to reflect that?
 - Dr. Mott explained that either approach (service-oriented or research-oriented) is still relevant for tenure-track faculty.
 - Andria spoke in favor of working on updating the policy to better reflect expectations and address faculty’s concerns.
 - Dr. Mott said the current policy is flexible purposely to allow particular departments to be flexible in how their faculty set and meet expectations for their non-instructional workload.
 - Phong Nguyen spoke to support the idea as well that different departments have different needs (some *need* more faculty doing research for disciplinary reasons, and some not so much).
 - Riley spoke in favor of making the expectations for specific faculty clear primarily at the faculty level. He also said that in his opinion, it should be the department chair’s responsibility to “protect your time” and make sure that faculty aren’t being overworked or overcommitted.
 - Dr. Mott agreed with this.
 - Matt spoke to add that some expectations and how they are met is discipline-specific (not department-specific). He also pointed out that the reason that the

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 2 2023

reflection/narrative section of the portfolio exists precisely so that the candidate can justify how and why they did the work they did during the promotion period.

- Terri thanked everyone for this discussion and said that she found it illuminating. She thanked Dr. Mott in particular for participating.
 - Dan Peterson seconded Terri’s comments and encouraged faculty to pass the sentiments from this conversation on to their constituents so that the conversation goes “beyond this room.”
 - Terri clarified that part of the confusion has come from the Board and their comments about the “new direction” for Oregon Tech that faculty have found concerning.

Terri Torres

- Terri brought up the recent first-run of faculty completing their APEs via DocuSign. She said that while the process worked overall, there were some issues that will hopefully be corrected before next year. She encouraged Senators to share their concerns about this process with Beverly (McCreary) and/or Paul Titus.

Mark Clark

- Mark spoke briefly to support Maureen’s earlier statement about the importance of the soon-to-be vacated IFS Representative position. He said that this is our faculty’s “primary conduit” to the state legislature, and putting someone capable and motivated in that role for the sake of Oregon Tech’s future. He said that there has been no time in Oregon Tech’s history that IFS has been more important than it is now.
- Mark also spoke briefly regarding the conversation about changing expectations for faculty performance. He shared that when he was hired in 1996, research was completely optional for faculty members, regardless of rank. Since that time, he said, expectations for faculty have become highly differentiated based on department. He attributed this in part to the increasing numbers of Oregon Tech faculty that are hired with a Ph.D. instead of Master’s (or Bachelor’s). He argued that part of the confusion now likely arises from the fact that these slow but steady changes have been reflected in updates to the promotion policy (and potentially other, associated policies).
 - He made a distinction between what he called “formal” and “informal” policy, essentially saying that faculty often become frustrated and confused precisely because they experience expectations being set for them informally that does not match the formal expectations enshrined in policy.
 - Terri thanked Mark for his comments.

Terri Torres

- Terri announced that all three candidates for Emeritus status were approved by the Senate’s vote.

Adjournment

Terri adjourned the meeting at 9:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Bunting, Secretary