

Minutes

The Faculty Senate met on December 3rd, in the Sunset Meeting Room of the College Union (Klamath Falls campus) and via Teams for Portland-Metro faculty and others attending remotely.

Attendance/Quorum

President Yuehai Yang called the meeting to order at 6:00pm. All Senators or alternates were in attendance except Fuat Karakaya.

Approval of the Minutes

Yuehai moved to approve the November minutes. Ashton Greer seconded. The November minutes passed unanimously and with no discussion.

Reports of the Officers

Report of the President – Yuehai Yang

- Yuehai’s full report has been included in this packet as **page 16** for your reference. I have recorded any and all further discussion that occurred beyond the presentation of his report below.
- Questions?
 - Dibyajyoti Deb asked if there had already been a committee that worked on an AI policy last year.
 - Yuehai and Vanessa Bennett explained that that committee (a subcommittee under Academic Standards) had only worked on adding language about AI to the existing Academic Integrity Policy (OIT-14-030), they did not work on drafting a new policy dedicated to AI.
 - Ken Usher asked about the current status of the Academic Integrity Policy.
 - Yuehai explained that SenEx wanted to make a friendly amendment to the version of the policy that was passed by Senate last year to allow students to continue to use the software functions they’re used to using (such as spell check and grammar check). SenEx also wanted to emphasize in the final version of the policy that faculty shouldn’t use *only* AI detectors to “catch” students who might be using AI tools dishonestly.
 - Ken asked for clarification on the timeline.
 - Uriel Torres answered that a version of the policy with the changes Yuehai already described has been submitted to President’s Council and will be reviewed at their next meeting.

Report of the Vice President – Ashton Greer

- Ashton’s full report has been included in this packet as **pages 17-18** for your reference. I have recorded any and all further discussion that occurred beyond the presentation of her report below.
- Questions?
 - Krista Beaty asked for details on how the hiring process for adjuncts is getting streamlined.
 - Ashton explained that they are compiling information about all of the different steps that have to happen and who is responsible for those steps. In particular, they are trying to make sure the department chairs all have access to the information they need to complete the steps they need to complete. A particular concern is effectively training new chairs who aren’t familiar with the process to get them up to speed.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Beverly McCreary joined in to say that she is collaborating with HR, the Registrar’s Office, IT, and the Provost’s Office on this (because each of those offices deal with documents that need to be filled out in the instance of a new hire) to make sure that everyone is clear(er) on their timelines and responsibilities so that everyone is working in the same direction. HR and the Registrar have already agreed to truncate some of their processes where possible to make the whole process a bit shorter and easier to navigate.
- Riley Richards asked about the newly-installed security cameras: are they turned on? John Harman has recently said that they weren’t yet turned on, so he wants to verify that.
 - Ashton says no, they haven’t been turned on yet.
- Riley then asked about the status of OIT-30-008 (the camera policy).
 - Yuehai said that he would address that policy later in his President’s Council report.
- Ken asked if anyone knows when the cameras will be turned on.
 - Ashton didn’t know the answer to that question, but said she could request that information. She then pointed out that they can’t legally turn on the cameras without first putting up signs to notify those affected, and those signs haven’t been put up yet.
- Christy VanRooyen asked whether the cameras can or cannot record audio in addition to video.
 - Ashton said that either a) the cameras’ audio function isn’t going to be used, or b) the cameras *can’t* record audio to begin with. She has heard both answers at different times. The answer to this question becomes even less clear because, as she explained, she was also told previously that the cameras can detect a loud noise and alert the proper authorities, so maybe they *can* hear audio?
 - Yuehai asked Dave Groff about the legality of recording audio through our security cameras, but Dave didn’t answer the question (he was attending via Teams).
- Ganghee Jang asked if the devices are “still listening.”
 - Yuehai said that this is unclear. He said that he’s heard that it’s only video recording and only certain angles (i.e. there are no 360-degree cameras).
- Cristina asked about the project’s budget: how much did it cost and where did the money come from? She pointed out that the money spent on this project extends to paying for somewhere to store the recordings, how much it will cost to train authorized users of the system, etc. This system doesn’t just represent a one-time investment.
 - Ashton responded that the installation cost \$1M. That came from capital improvement and renewal money. This is state money. She said that it is unclear if that money could have been used for anything else except for the camera installation. Ashton was less sure about the long-term costs (including the examples Cristina cited), but said she would try to find an answer.
- Dave Groff was able to (re)join and this point and answer Yuehai’s previous question about the legality of audio recording. He said that the cameras *don’t* record audio. However, there is an algorithm running that will detect certain types of noises (like glass breaking, gunshots, etc.). These aren’t being *recorded* but are just detected and noted algorithmically to direct investigators to certain moments in a recording upon review after an incident. He said that “generally speaking,” Ashton is right that recording audio in this context would be illegal. He said that an “unnoticed recording” is a “yellow flag.” However, if you are told ahead of time that something is being recorded – as with the recording of this Senate meeting, for example – it’s legal. Because of this ambiguity, it is difficult to answer the question of when audio recording would be illegal and when it wouldn’t be in the context of campus security cameras.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Ashton expressed the concern that some faculty have had that audio functionality might be turned on later even if it isn't enabled right now.
 - Dave offered to talk with her in more detail about these concerns outside of the meeting.

Reports of the ASOIT Delegates

Report of the Klamath Falls Delegate – Uriel Torres

- Uriel reported that he recently met with SenEx about the Academic Integrity Policy (OIT-14-030), and reached a compromise about the wording in that policy (Yuehai also already discussed this a bit in his President's Report). Uriel then forwarded the policy to President's Council for their review.
- Questions?
 - Someone Andria Fultz asked if ASOIT-PM was included in this policy discussion. Uriel said that he emailed Ryland White to offer him the chance to join in, but never heard back.

Report of the Portland-Metro Delegate – Brice Wilson

- Brice reported that ASOIT-PM met and talked with Dr. Nagi about the group's platform for the year. Dr. Nagi told them that some of their platform items will take more effort to solve/make progress on than they had initially expected. They hope to meet with him again in the winter.
- ASOIT-PM held a town-hall-style parliament meeting recently. During that meeting, they presented their platform to the students, and got a lot of good feedback. Things that students are concerned about in particular included lab fee transparency: if students pay lab fee, they don't know what that fee goes to pay for. Also, students want better access to financial aid and a registration coordinator. It's hard for students to get ahold of the coordinator during busy times like right now, in the midst of registration for winter term. Third, students want advisors to be more familiar with the course content and workload associated with the particular courses they are advising students into. Finally, students are concerned about the lack of sanitation supplies within their study rooms.
- Brice also reported that during the parliament meeting, ASOIT-PM came to an agreement regarding renovating the student lounge. A budget for \$20,000 was approved to replace the lounge's carpet with laminate. It should be done over winter break, or by spring at the latest.
- ASOIT-PM has also been talking about the importance of adjunct representation on Faculty Senate. This is becoming more important as we hire more and more adjuncts, and they begin to make up a higher percentage of our total faculty body.
- Questions?
 - Ken asked if Brice had any concrete suggestions for how to make the lab fee information clearer to students.
 - Brice said yes, that ASOIT-PM has talked about having professors provide an "invoice" to students to show where their lab fees are going. After the discussion of broken and outdated lab equipment at the November Senate meeting, this transparency is especially important: if the students are paying high lab fees, where else are those fees going if their lab equipment remains outdated and/or broken?
 - Andria asked if having each faculty member explain what their lab fees are used for either in their syllabus or in their course's Canvas shell would alleviate this concern.
 - Brice said that it likely would.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Ken agreed that this seemed reasonable. However, he also pointed out that some faculty wouldn't comply with such a requirements, and those would most likely also be the ones who causing the concerns over how lab fees are used in the first place. Others in attendance agreed with this concern.

Report of the Administrative Council Delegate – Carl Agrifoglio

- Carl said that Admin Council was supposed to meet on the day campus closed because of weather (11/20), but they had to cancel the meeting due to the closure. Instead, they are meeting in two days, and he will report back on that meeting next month.

Reports of the Standing Committees

Faculty Policy Committee – Ken Usher/Matt Schnackenberg

- The Faculty Policy Committee had three items to report on:
 - First, they have come up with some charges to work on for the rest of the year. Matt described these proposed charges, which have been included in this packet as **page 19** for your reference.
 - Questions?
 - Cristina Negoita asked about tenure for administrators. Faculty receive a raise when they get tenure: do administrators get raises for tenure as well? It might be worth looking at comparators to see how they handle this sort of thing. She also suggested working with HR to see how this process is handled on their end. We shouldn't have to reinvent the wheel, as many other institutions have existing policies that address these questions.
 - Matt agreed with Cristina's suggestions. He said that he's already looked at some other institutions. Some of them automatically grant senior administrators tenure upon hire.
 - Cristina pointed out here that some administrators continue to teach, and that makes granting of tenure to those folks more straightforward. She contrasted those cases with hires who are brought into administrative roles from outside of Oregon Tech and are not teaching.
 - Matt argued that if administrators who are tenured revert to their home department (i.e., lose their administrator status and take up teaching within the department), then their salary should be adjusted accordingly.
 - Riley wanted to know more about the issues that have arisen with enforcing this policy.
 - One issue that Matt mentioned is that the current policy says that administrators with tenure should also be teaching a bit, and many currently aren't. So there is a gap between the policy language and reality.
 - Matt also emphasized that the policy is old and deserves to be revised just in general (it was revised most recently in 2004).
 - Second, they have a policy that they want to make a motion on.
 - Ken wants Senate's support on the Student Eval Policy (OIT-21-035). He made a motion to vote to approve it. Riley seconded the motion. A lengthy discussion followed.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Ken explained that the rush to approve this particular policy is because our CampusLabs contract is about to expire and we need to update the policy in light of that related (potential) change (the policy should be non-platform-specific). There's also need to make the policy fit the updated, modern template.
- Ken identified two of what he called the major proposed changes to the policy.
 - First, he explained that FPC has expanded on what student's, faculty's and administration's responsibilities are for making sure these evals are useful. In particular, for faculty, the policy emphasizes their responsibility to seriously consider student feedback and implement changes to their courses as appropriate. Faculty also have a responsibility to actively encourage participation in the evaluation process from students.
 - Second, the policy now explicitly states that CCT should have an active role in any future changes to the evaluation process and/or the evaluation questions themselves. Ken argued that we should review the questions that are asked on evaluations every five to seven years as a matter of course. This could, ideally, parallel future renewals of contracts with any student evaluation provider.
- David Hammond asked if there was a possibility of surveying faculty to see how everyone absorbs their evaluations, because there are a lot of different ways to utilize the information the evals provide, and everyone interprets them and implements changes based on them differently.
 - Ken liked this suggestion, but asked David if it was something that should be specified in the policy directly, or just a practice that should be taken up as a result of the policy changes, but independent of them.
 - David agreed that this shouldn't necessarily be part of the policy explicitly. On the subject of the evaluation questions, he shared that the answers to many of the questions asked on the current evaluations aren't really useful to him. He also pointed out that only the numerical scores (not comments or written answers to questions) percolate up to the APE level by default.
 - Ken then pointed out that the "written" (typed?) comments often also end up in faculty portfolios generated during various five-year review processes (if not in the APEs explicitly).
 - Linus Yu shared that there was a training last Tuesday with the Idea Center. He offered to share the recording with faculty. He said that Idea Center hasn't updated their evaluation questions since 2016 because they haven't done any new research since then. There are around one hundred institutions using these questions currently. Other universities have recommendations for improvement, and Linus said he would send these out as well.
 - Linus also said that he wants to pass this policy through Faculty Senate so that it can then be approved by President's Council. After that, he'll talk with CCT about the questions and see what changes (if any) need to be made.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Ken encouraged CCT to solicit faculty input more broadly when things get to that stage.
- Ken also asked if Linus could share a written summary of the recording he mentioned, so that faculty could get the pertinent information even if they aren't able to take the time to watch the entire recording.
 - Linus said that he would see if Copilot could generate such a summary.
- Matt brought the group's attention to item number two on page thirty-two (of the December Senate packet). He pointed out that the wording here seems to guarantee that faculty will have the ability to submit their own custom questions for their evaluations up to a certain deadline each term. Matt pointed out that not all course evaluation services may have this ability, so it's disingenuous to imply here that this ability is guaranteed regardless of the service we're currently using.
 - Linus requested that we add a stipulation to this item as a friendly amendment that says something like "if the platform allows it."
 - Ken and Matt both agreed that this is acceptable as a friendly amendment.
- Leah asked if passing this updated version of the policy would mean *everyone* (including tenured faculty, etc.) will be evaluated *every* term.
 - Ken pointed out that this had been discussed during the November Senate meeting and at the time there didn't seem to have been any real objections to tenured faculty always being evaluated. He then noted that we haven't already discussed whether intern/externships should be evaluated every term as a Senate. We can have that discussion now, though.
 - Ken asked Leah what the typical enrollment is in an externship section in her experience.
 - Leah said anywhere between fifteen to forty-five students.
 - Ken said that this is a difficult question to answer because while one faculty member might technically have oversight over all of the intern/externship students in a section as the "instructor of record," they often don't have much actual input into the student's experience at that intern/externship. They can thus end up being hurt by low evaluation scores that are actually reflective of the students' dissatisfaction with the behavior of someone else who is on-site.
 - Vanessa said that intern/externship sections have never been evaluated before during her time here.
 - Linus agreed. He said without being sure of who our future vendor will be, it's difficult to figure out now exactly how (or if) intern/externship sections will be evaluated.
 - Ken asked if there should be a provision for or exclusion for intern/externship courses added to the policy.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Linus suggested that we make it so certain formats of classes can be excluded from the process with the agreement of the Provost's Office.
 - Ken asked if it should be the Provost's Office who makes that decision or if it should be made elsewhere.
 - Beverly said that having the ability to opt in or out of evaluations with a rationale provided by the department chair and Dean and then approved by the Provost makes sense when it comes to intern/externship sections.
 - Ken asked if either of the Deans have input on what such an exclusion clause might look like, and what chain of approval it might/should follow.
 - Dean Alp requested that she think further on this question before giving an answer. Dean Bickford appeared to have left the meeting and did not provide an answer.
 - Ken then asked the Senate if we would be okay with him adding a sentence after our approval vote to reflect the content of this conversation as another friendly amendment.
 - In general, it seemed like Senators were okay with that. There were no objections.
- Riley asked if Leah wants externships evaluated.
 - Leah and Vanessa immediately answered “no.” The previously stated concern (about students’ “bad” intern/externship experiences reflecting poorly on the faculty despite those faculty not being directly involved) was brought up again.
 - Here, Leah provided some more context about the kinds of feedback she and other faculty who oversee intern/externships get outside of the Idea Center evaluations. So they *are* evaluated in a meaningful way, it’s just that using the Idea Center evaluations in this particular context doesn’t make much sense.
- Yuehai returned the Senate to the approval vote for this policy. The vote was to approve the new version of the policy with the two aforementioned friendly amendments: Linus’s suggested “if the platform allows” language and Ken’s yet-to-be-written exclusion clause as it was just discussed.
 - The policy passed unanimously.
 - After the vote, Linus thanked the FPC for working so quickly on the policy. He also thanked Faculty Senate as a whole.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Third, Ken provided an update on where the committee is at with the Faculty Evaluation Policy (OIT-21-040).
 - There are ways in which the current policy doesn't reflect what we currently do, and that should be fixed.
 - Aside from that, the committee has been focused on a few particular concerns with this policy. Broadly, they want to bring this policy in line with the recently-passed promotion policy. In particular...
 - The current draft of that promotion policy calls out external service to the community as a semi-separate thing from "Service" writ large, even though it isn't represented this way on the APE. It's unclear whether or not this type of service is required *in addition to* general "Service," or if it should be seen as a subset of same. Should we emphasize the differences between these two things, or remove the wording and get rid of the separation?
 - The committee has been making sure to emphasize that NIT faculty have lower service and research expectations than IT faculty because they are here primarily to teach (even more so than IT faculty). With that in mind, would doing literally *nothing* in one of the two "other" categories (Professional Development or Service) be acceptable?
 - Ken asked for input on either or both of the above concerns.
 - I shared my opinion on the first concern. Specifically, I explained that I always found the separation between "Service" writ large and external community service to be confusing. It has always been unclear if they're meant to be different things or not. I suggested removing the "extra" clause.
 - Andria responded, saying that she actually does a lot of external community service and therefore having this clause helps her.
 - Jessica Luebbers agreed.
 - In response to those comments, I suggested a compromise: it might be easier to understand the policy if external community service was described clearly as being under the larger umbrella of "Service." This way, those who do a lot of it would benefit (i.e., it would "count" as Service), and those who serve the university and/or their departments in other ways wouldn't feel obligated to find a way to focus on external community service specifically
 - Matt and Riley pointed out that in the promotion policy, this is already how it's set out. It's just that in the Faculty Evaluation Policy "institutional service" and "professional service" are described separately. Matt said that the question is why are these things made separate in some places and not in others? And, ultimately, which set of definitions do we want to instantiate in the new, revised policy?
 - Christy VanRooyen said that she's fine with all service all being under one category, but maybe it was called out separately initially to draw attention to community projects in particular, and to incentivize faculty to think more about outwardly-facing service?

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Christy also said that she'd be happy to have NTT faculty able to opt out of one of the two "extra" categories so that they can focus on the other one (inasmuch as they do work outside of teaching).
- Stefan Andrei jumped in here to talk about Giving Tuesday. He talked about his donation and reminded everyone to donate before the end of the night if they are able.

Academic Standards Committee – Christy VanRooyen

- Academic Standards hasn't officially met yet, but Christy herself met with Uriel and they were able to discuss the AI piece that's being added to the Academic Integrity Policy. It was a great conversation.
- The committee has recently received some charges and they hope to start working on those right after winter break.
 - Specifically, Christy received a request from Dean Bickford to take a look at the Graduation Policy (OIT-15-011) and consider how many credits are required for graduation. Some online students aren't able to graduate without taking extra courses because of the credit requirements, and revising those requirements would make things easier for them.
 - Additionally, the committee wants to make sure that the summer term policy that they worked on last year is in place and ready to go.
 - Finally, they will work to defend the faculty-proposed changes to the Emeritus Faculty Policy that were discussed last month.
- Questions?
 - Riley asked for clarification on the conversation Christy had with Dean Bickford: what changes does he want to see here and why?
 - Christy said that we currently require forty-five credits from Oregon Tech to graduate, and degree completion students struggle with meeting that requirement because they transfer in so many credits. She wants to survey the Registrar's Office and other affected groups before making a decision on this.
 - Vanessa clarified that this also affects students who transfer in a lot of credits from elsewhere but ultimately want to have an Oregon Tech degree, but maybe not necessarily in a way we want to: how much should we really accommodate these folks? This was discussed last year in the committee and Wendy Ivie was involved in those conversations.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee – Chitra Venugopal

- Feng Shi was attending in Chitra's place this month as her alternate. There was no report.

Reports of Special or Ad Hoc Committees

Student Evaluations Ad Hoc Committee – Vicki Crooks

- Eean Grimshaw was attending in Vicki's place this month as her alternate. There was no report.

Unfinished Business

- None.

New Business

- None.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

Report of the Provost – Joanna Mott

- Dr. Mott is retiring at the end of the month, and was not in attendance. There was no report.

Report of the President’s Council Delegate – Yuehai Yang

- Yuehai’s full report has been included in this packet as **page 20** for your reference. I have recorded any and all further discussion that occurred beyond the presentation of her report below.
- Questions?
 - Krista asked about office managers and classified staff: are they being considered as well when it comes to the placement and use of security cameras? Who should they speak to if they have concerns?
 - Yuehai said that he mentioned this concern as well, especially when it comes to office managers, etc. who work in open floor-plan offices.
 - Beverly said that feedback from office managers, etc. should have gone through Admin Council. She said that this step in the process has already happened (i.e., there was already an opportunity for this feedback to be provided).
 - Yuehai asked Beverly if Admin Council includes representation from our classified staff.
 - Beverly wasn’t sure.
 - Ken asked Carl whether or not Admin Council represents classified staff.
 - Carl explained that Admin Council represents all unclassified staff. Classified staff, on the other hand, is represented through SEIU.
 - Ken then asked if anything came from Admin Council’s discussions of the camera policy.
 - Carl said they had some discussions and were planning to talk more about the policy this coming Thursday, but now that’s moot because it was already approved by President’s Council. He was legitimately surprised by the speed with which this policy was passed.
 - Cristina expressed concern about security cameras being located in student housing. She wondered about student representation on President’s Council. “Housing is housing,” so is it a public space or a private space? She wants to make sure that the students are being included in the decision-making process.
 - Uriel spoke up here: he lives on-campus, and he says that what the students have been told is that the cameras will only be placed in lobby areas within student housing. His understanding is that there will be no cameras in the hallways, to preserve students’ privacy as they are going to and from their rooms.
 - Carl spoke up here to say that there was a lot of deliberation to make sure that students wouldn’t be observed traveling to/from showers and such. They will only be placed in “appropriate” locations.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- Ken says it makes sense that these sorts of distinctions aren't part of the policy directly. He is concerned, however, that such decisions will apparently be made in the future by a new committee that is less representative than the current Campus Safety Commission.
 - Cristina recommended that we put this in front of the Board to see what they have to say about it.

Report of the IFS Representatives – Cristina Negoita and David Hammond

- IFS has not met since the November Faculty Senate meeting. There was no report.

Report of the FOAC Representative – Ashton Greer

- Ashton's full report has been included in this packet as **page 21** for your reference. I have recorded any and all further discussion that occurred beyond the presentation of her report below.
- Questions?
 - There were no questions.

Open Floor

Krista Beaty

- After the November Senate meeting, Krista took some of the items the Senate discussed regarding faculty retention back to her department. She focused in particular on getting input from adjunct faculty. The faculty she spoke with said that they stay at Oregon Tech because our staff (faculty) and students are “awesome.” She said that adjuncts don't want to have to pay for parking, especially because they're expected to park here at night for night clinics. The faculty she spoke with really appreciate Gaylyn's Wellness Program efforts. Krista has also been doing a lot of recruitment for new faculty, so she's also been asking new hires what can be done to retain them. Suggestions that she received included: flexibility in scheduling, improvement of work/life balance, and the development of a growth mindset. Full-time instructors were interested in improving work/life balance, and issues around overload and workload.
- Another topic she discussed with her faculty was the question of how to manage low faculty presence in institutional service roles/university committees. She argued that service needs to be incentivized somehow. It's a problem that “big” committees aren't distinguished from “small” committees. The faculty she spoke with would like to see a way for committee chairs to indicate who is actually doing work on the committee (and who isn't), maybe a sort of committee “review” form? Another suggestion was to make committee service responsibilities clear before the FOP is due (so faculty can meaningfully plan ahead of time).
 - Yuehai pointed out that even though the quantification (or lack thereof) of NIWL used to be a Faculty Senate discussion, it now falls under the purview of OT-AAUP.
- Questions?
 - There were no questions.

Linus Yu

- Linus wanted to engage in discussion with the Senate about the Academic Program Review Draft document that he had included in the December Senate packet. He has been working on this document for a few months and wants suggestions from faculty, since they will be doing all the work of evaluating their programs.
- He has tried to create a process for program review that complements the program accreditation processes that some programs already have in place, so there isn't a need to duplicate effort unnecessarily. The harder

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

part is dealing with programs that haven't previously had accreditation requirements. His goal is to try to help these programs build their report using the information included in the Program Review Draft document's Appendix D. This will help programs track enrollment, etc. over five to seven year cycles.

- Linus has already received some comments on this document and the processes described within it. For example, some Master's programs asked for an adjusted timeline because their students typically graduate in two years, not four.
- He again asked for feedback from faculty. He admitted that the process isn't going to be a perfect fit for everyone, but he's trying to make the process general enough that it applies to everyone and every program in a meaningful way.
 - Matt asked if we could add something to the section on Institutional Support about Marketing. He said that it is really helpful to have Marketing's support when it comes to bringing attention to new programs, and that that was really hard to accomplish back when he was trying to market the then-new Professional Writing program.
 - Linus liked this suggestion and suggested that Matt reach out to him after the meeting.
- Linus said to send any suggestions that you have before the end of the year (the calendar year, not the academic year).
 - Ken asked for a clarification: is the program director or department chair in charge of this Academic Program Review process?
 - Linus clarified that the department chair is meant to be in charge of the process.
 - Ken expressed concern about the amount of new work this will put on the plates of (especially) programs that don't already have to follow an accreditation process.
 - Linus acknowledged this. He said these programs can build each year's report based on the previous year's report, so that should make the process a bit easier for them.
 - Riley asked how different this Program Review process is from the current assessment reports that most (?) programs have to do.
 - Linus said this process is much different. They're trying to determine if your program is up to date, if it has all the necessary support, and so on. Assessment is different: it's more about the content you teach and how well you're teaching it.
 - Riley wanted to know what happens after departments provide these new reports.
 - Linus said that the next step is to have outside professionals come in to assess your program based on your program's report. Then, step three would be making any necessary adjustments based on the two reports (the program's report and the external report).
 - Riley asked what the "So what?" of this whole process is.
 - Linus explained that this is to standardize how programs evaluate their performance, and to make sure they're doing so on a regular basis. It seems like he's thinking of this as something that will better allow us to plan for the health of our programs on a long-term basis.
 - Riley expressed some frustration that we regularly collect data already (in a variety of ways, for a variety of reasons) but don't seem to do much with it in the end.
 - Linus said that program accreditation and program review are separately important. This program review process will better enable all programs (but especially programs that aren't required to complete accreditation reports) to proactively make their needs and concerns known.
 - Ken pointed out here that for some programs, accreditation requires that those programs are given certain resources. That gives those programs a "big stick" to wield when it comes to getting what

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

they need. He's concerned that the "other" programs, which are "only accountable to themselves" could get left high and dry even after doing the extra work of this proposed annual Program Review.

- Linus pointed out again that in the past, the kinds of information about programs that this new Review process seeks to collect on a regular schedule were only collected from program directors and/or department chairs on an ad hoc basis. While the process might not serve all programs equally, it will allow everyone a chance to better articulate their needs and, hopefully, see those needs met.
 - Ken said that in the past, his program has produced the kinds of data Linus is describing reactively: if they wanted a position, they collected data to support that request. It seems like what Linus is shooting for is something that's more proactive.
- Ken then pointed out that the process he's laid out seems aimed in particular at departments with programs: once again, general education is not entirely getting captured by this process.
 - Linus agreed, and said that he's open to faculty input on how to better capture general education courses.
- Andria talked about how we should be focusing on showing how our programs are good: what are we comparing them to and how do we know that they're good? What needs to be improved? Nobody wants to do extra work for no reason, but she sees this process as important because it would allow her to explain how and why her program is working in a meaningful way.
 - Riley expressed hope that this process works, and he said he looks forward to seeing the first results a year from now.
- Leah asked if this Academic Program Review will replace the current assessment report.
 - Linus and others clarified that it will be done in addition to any current assessment/accreditation reports, not in place of.
 - Linus stated again that this report will be similar to existing accreditation reports, so programs can use their existing reports to inform this one in a way that will save time and effort.
 - Vanessa asked: we do this new Academic Program Review, an accreditation review, an assessment report, *and* an end-of-year report?
 - Linus explained that "nothing has changed." Department chairs are doing a little bit every year to prepare for accreditation.
- Christy asked how often the external review will happen for non-accredited programs.
 - Linus said it will happen every five to seven years.
- Andie added that Rachel Barrett has been working really hard on trying to figure out how to streamline the assessment process. If people have ideas on how to improve this process, let her know.
- Christy said that she doubts that department chairs will take all of this on their own, and that delegating to people within the department (with a stipend and/or release) would be really helpful. She hopes that this might come up in negotiations, since this sort of thing falls under the CBA now.
 - A variety of other faculty repeated concerns about how all of these reports are still going to take a lot of time to create, even if they complement each other in ways that make them easier to produce than they would be otherwise.
- Linus shared that he was once a department chair and a Dean, and he found following a similar process to be pretty straightforward. It wouldn't be difficult for the department chair to put all of these reports together at the same time, because he's done it before.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – December 3, 2024

- In light of this comment, Cristina pointed out that we could use department chair training in the future to prep department chairs for handling this variety of reports. She also recommended that faculty document how much time they end up dedicating to producing these reports, as that would be helpful for OT-AAUP at the negotiating table.
 - Linus was at a retreat recently and they discussed how to bring chairs up to speed on these processes and how department chair training might look in the future. He said there was no chair training this year because so many of the chairs are interim hires.

Riley Richards

- Riley asked about the results of the stay survey: has there been any recent progress on this? Yuehai said that Sandi Hanan will be meeting with SenEx next Monday. Riley is invited.

Yuehai Yang

- Yuehai mentioned that there was a search for an instructional designer. Is there an update on the status of that search?
 - Beverly said that the search failed and the job will be reposted in January.
 - Deb asked: if the new search succeeds, would the new hire start in the fall?
 - Beverly said hopefully it'll happen even before then.
 - Deb also asked what's being done now, in the absence of a new hire, and Beverly said that right now that Carrie and Dr. Black are “picking up the slack” that has resulted from the empty position.
 - Riley asked if there were any new updates on the HAS Dean search.
 - Beverly said no, there are no updates now, but there should be soon, before the end of 2024.
 - Ashton asked for an update on the status of the Dean search.
 - Beverly said that they've had candidates to campus, and based on those visits and the resulting feedback there are negotiations being carried out.
 - Riley asked for more details, and Beverly said that the feedback on candidates was taken back to the President and from there negotiations for a hire began.
- Yuehai thanked everyone and wished us all happy holidays!

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Bunting, Secretary

Senate President report:

Following discussions from our last Senate meeting, Uriel and ASOIT collaborated with Christy, Matt, and SenEx to address student concerns regarding the AI component in the academic integrity policy. Thank you Uriel and ASOIT for their work on this with us. Overall, we all acknowledged that GenAI presents both challenges and opportunities. After several rounds of discussions in person and through email chains, we are in the final stage of addressing these concerns, incorporating feedback from faculty, especially those teaching writing-intensive courses, and students. These courses are among the most impacted by GenAI. We agreed that the academic integrity policy is not the ideal platform to address all GenAI-related issues comprehensively. Therefore, we propose forming an ad hoc committee to draft a dedicated AI policy this year. Christy has kindly agreed to chair this committee and represent the academic standards committee. We hope to include ASOIT representative, a member of CCT (as suggested by Matt), a librarian, and an administrator to ensure perspectives from all stakeholders are considered.

SenEx also met with three interim provost candidates introduced by a firm called Registry. All three candidates were experienced senior administrators. We were asked not to rank the candidates but to have a 45-minute conversation with each. Following these discussions, we provided summative feedback, including the pros and cons of each candidate, to Dr. Nagi. Today, Dr. Nagi announced the final candidate selection. We are sure at this moment whether the chosen person, Dr. El-Rewini is the first choice or not.

SenEx met with David Cauble, our trustee, also the president and CEO of Sky Lakes, for a discussion regarding the establishment of a medical (DO) school. Terri attended the meeting as our honored guest since some of our members have other duty to fulfil. According to Trustee David, the sky lake board is in support of this initiative, and he has had conversations with other schools and sky lake partners in the state and has received substantial verbal support, at least from Sky Lakes' perspective. He views Oregon Tech as uniquely positioned to make this happen. Although there is no detailed funding plan yet, he hopes to see the first cohort of students coming to Oregon Tech in 5 years, as this opportunity may slip away if we delay.

Asking him to wear the hat for our trustee, SenEx expressed concerns about the lack of support for existing programs and the potential growth faculty could achieve if that support were in place. It seems he is aware of many of our challenges.

End of report

Faculty Senate VP Report – 12/3/2024 Meeting

Academic Council Report

Academic council met on November 12, 2024. There was no old business, but several new businesses were discussed.

1. Human Resources (HR) – Hiring Adjuncts/Part-time Employees
 - a. Benefits Eligibility
 - i. No side deals regarding health insurance coverage; strict federal and state regulations governing insurance
 - ii. Discussed thresholds and eligibility – contracts should be accurate to avoid issues of benefits eligibility and retroactive fixes
 - iii. Questions should go to Sarah Henderson Wong
 - b. Adjunct Hires
 - i. HR working with various individuals to streamline process for hiring and onboarding adjuncts. We discussed a few of the elements of that process
 - ii. Contract period – current contracts start at beginning of term and run through Thursday of Finals week. Could likely put individual over threshold for benefits eligibility.
 - iii. Adjuncts receive noticed once per year of benefits eligibility, and it's on them to apply
2. Workload and FIF Tracking
 - a. Provost's office is working on tracking sheet for FIF and underenrolled courses for fall term – will reside in Coursedog once up and running
 - b. Need FIF information from chairs, including documentation and approval from dean and provost. Qualifying courses include internship, externship, thesis or graduate project. Based on week 4 enrollment data.
3. Program Review
 - a. Linus has been leading the development of a document outlining a process for Program Review and is taking feedback on the document and process improvement.
 - b. Discussion regarding reports and dashboards.
 - c. Program review and accreditation done together
 - d. External evaluators will be paid
 - e. Faculty Senate will have opportunity to review document.
4. ANNOUNCEMENTS
 - a. December 20, 2014 – update to Web for Faculty; Registrar's Office will offer trainings and open labs beginning November 14th; can also attend department meetings for training purposes.

End of Academic Council Report

Facilities Planning Commission

We met on November 14, 2024.

Updates on capital projects:

1. New student housing (\$35M) – 25% complete
 - a. 5,000 sqft, 4-story building, 511 beds
 - b. Structural concrete just completed – building will be going vertical in December 2024. planning to open dorms for Winter 2026
2. Geothermal Systems Emergency Renovation (\$18M) – 8% complete. 5 phase project:
 - a. Phase 1: Geo HX Building Renovation – new 20,000 gal storage tank is in place, design complete and renovation is underway
 - b. Phase 2: Geo distribution piping – direct bury pipe design complete & pipe procured, tunnel piping design underway
3. Industrial Park Drive Improvements (\$2.5M) - 98% complete
 - a. Complete rebuild of IPD from Dan O’Brian Way to Facilities loop. New storm system, concrete curbs and sidewalks and striped bike lane as well as landscaped center median with new street lighting
 - b. Project required by “deferred improvement agreement” with City of Klamath Falls specific to CEET building
4. ABA Clinic Renovation (\$1.35M) – 15% complete
 - a. Full interior renovation and some exterior improvements. Interior demolition is complete
 - b. Design services pro bono by Soderstrom Architects, SCS Engineering (Structural), and Interface Engineering (MEP)
 - c. June 2024 – April 2025
5. Campus Security Cameras (\$1M)
 - a. Installation of security cameras on both KF & PM Campus
 - b. The cameras are not on yet
 - c. The cameras are not 360 degree cameras
 - d. Final Completion December 21, 2025

End of VP Report

Faculty Senate Charges 2024-25

Faculty Policy Committee (FPC)

1. Complete the revision of OIT-20-030 Indefinite Tenure Selection, started in 2023-24. Having revised OIT-20-040 Academic Rank Promotion for Instructional Faculty and OIT-20-041 Academic Rank Promotion for Library Faculty, focus on parallel language while allowing for necessary differences between promotion and tenure.
2. Revise OIT-20-035 Post Tenure Review with attention to interconnections to OIT-20-030 Indefinite Tenure Selection. Further, given the decrease in compensation for successful post tenure review and the long-term employment of candidates, consider ways to simplify the review process.
3. Revise OIT-21-035 Student Evaluation of Instruction, responding to the initial rewrite provided by the Office of Academic Excellence.
4. Revise OIT-21-040 Faculty Evaluation Policy with attention to interconnections to OIT-20-040 Academic Rank Promotion for Instructional Faculty and OIT-21-035 Student Evaluation of Instruction. Additionally, as part of the revision, incorporate recent changes to the Annual Performance Evaluation (APE).
5. Review and report on Oregon Tech’s growing—and at times inconsistent—practice of granting tenure to unclassified administrators, including the positions of President, Provost, Dean, Vice-Provost, and externally recruited Department Chair. What are the processes by which recent hires have been approved for tenure?
6. Revise OIT-20-031 Academic Rank and Tenure for Unclassified Administrators with attention to interconnections to OIT-20-030 Indefinite Tenure Selection, As part of the revision, draw on the best practices in recent evaluations of unclassified administrators for tenure (see charge 5).
7. As time allows, provide consultation to President’s Council concerning their work on interim policies:
 - a. OIT-01-020 Interim Proscribed Conduct.
 - b. OIT-30-002 Interim Campus Speech Activities.
 - c. OIT-03-008 Interim Security Cameras.

President Council report:

President Council received 3 interim policies (03-008, security camera; 03-002, campus speech activity; 01-020, proscribed conduct) on Nov. 8th, after we synthesized faculty comments. Ken also provided a revised version of the camera policy for council discussions. I would like to thank Cristina, Andi, and other faculty who provide input on these policies. The council then met twice on Nov 18th and Dec 3rd and mainly discussed emeritus Faculty policy and Security camera policy. On the 18th, the council had a lot of conversational discussions on these 2 policy, and I personally raised a lot of concerns based on our comments about the security camera and the discussions took most of the time and the council did not vote on any of the policies. In between Nov. 18th and today, I had made appointments and had individual discussions with AVP Tony Richey and VP John Harman about these 2 policies, especially on the camera policy and camera installations.

Today, the PC meeting was hosted in a different format, and the host decided to ask for a motion on each amendment, allowing everyone to vote on them individually to move these policies forward. We again discussed the Emeritus Policy and Camera Policy, both of which were voted on and passed. For the emeritus faculty policy, one of the main discussions is on whether emeritus faculty can keep their original email address. The conclusion today is that the emeritus faculty will get to keep their email usernames, with the addition of a mandatory footer indicating their emeritus status in their emails. This allows them to keep their original email addresses to continue their existing connections and external affiliations. I would like to thank AVP Richey and IT service to accommodate our needs.

VP Harman then introduced all the amendments from his side and each was quickly voted on and passed. I introduced our suggested amendments as motions based on faculty comments. Unfortunately, only 1 of the 6 proposed motions received a second after presenting the rationales with the rest of the council. In summary, emergency management and safety office will decide where to install the cameras including any hallway they deem appropriate. A clause was added by VP Harman and executive director Tripp to ensure cameras will not be installed in faculty offices. However, faculty offices are still considered as a "public" area. The policy specifies that there is audio recording, which both John and Doug have reaffirmed multiple times. And therefore, the council decided it is not needed to state in the policy the consequences of recording the audio. I voted against passing the policy in its current form since I felt the current form of the policy did not take enough of our concerns into consideration. The only amendment the president council did agree to include per faculty suggestion, is including a clause stating that cameras will not be used for "job performance evaluations". I do want to thank Ken, Matt, Ben, and other faculty members who provide the comments to the interim policies. I also expressed to Doug my hope that when deciding camera placement, they consider faculty office privacy; we will see if he truly takes this into account. I do hope so.

End of report

FOAC Report

We have not had a general committee meeting since last month, but we have had all 3 of the FOAC knowledge building sessions:

1. Budget Basics: funding sources, fund accounting, organizational structure, salary savings, remissions (11/7)
2. Budget Process: overview of budgeting process, position budgeting (11/13)
3. OMIC (12/3)

Our next committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 9th

Summary of the main revisions made to OIT-21-040 Instructional Faculty Evaluation:

- Made language for the instruction, scholarship/research and service categories that closely align with what's in 20-040 (Academic Rank & Promotion for Instructional Faculty).
 - Essentially we copied/pasted the details from 20-040 (Assistant to Associate professor), then added some 2nd-level sub-bullets that included additional examples that are in our existing Faculty Evaluation Policy, plus a couple of new ones.
 - Added a note that this mirroring cannot be exact, since it is not identical in the various levels of 20-040.
 - we also mostly merged internal and external service, which were described pretty separately in the old policy but are considered together in 21-040.
 - Edited language around external service to make it clearer that it should be professionally related.
 - Also added that “While there may be modest honorarium for this work, it is done as a part of the faculty role which does not amount to work that would be considered an outside activity.” [Old policy stated “Faculty may choose to make connections in the public sector for no fee...”]
- NTT: Wrote a statement (in 5.1 Criteria for Evaluation) stating that “Both tenured/tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated relative to all three areas, but expectations of non-tenure track faculty will generally be substantially lower in scholarship/research and service, due to their increased instructional workload and lower non-instructional workload. In some instances it may, with the agreement of their department chair, meet expectations for a non-tenure track faculty member to have no accomplishments in one of the two non-instructional areas, with increased expectations and workload in the other.”
- Deleted part of the section on Student Evaluation of Instruction and referred to that policy (OIT 21-040) instead. Revised language about how those results are to be reported and used on the APE. Suggested that we should have “Attachment C: instructions for filling out the student numerical evaluation table of the APE form”.
- Wrote definitions for tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty and of student evaluation of instruction as they pertain to this policy.
- Re-stated how the FOP and APE are meant to relate to each other.
- Did ***not*** delete: “mandatory annual department chair workshops will be facilitated by the Provost's Office in order to review the purpose and process of the APE.”
 - This has seldom happened in the past decade
 - Some folks feel it's unnecessary.

- Ken feels (based on reading many APEs in portfolios over the years) that we'd benefit from more consistency and communication between academic departments about how APEs are filled out and evaluated by chairs.
- Edited the timeline to reflect our current/recent practices, as agreed upon a couple of years ago by Faculty Senate
 - FOP & APE both in spring
 - FOP not due from faculty member until after APE is returned with feedback from chair
 - [APE also gets feedback from Dean, but not in time to incorporate on next-year FOP]
- Re-titled the policy to "OIT-21-040 Instructional Faculty Evaluation" instead of "OIT-21-040 Faculty Evaluation Policy"

Oregon Tech Policy OIT-21-040

Instructional Faculty Evaluation

1. Policy Statement

A regular review of faculty improves the quality of the teaching, service and professional development functions of the university. In addition, it benefits individual faculty members by assuring that they are regularly informed of their status. Such a review shall include input from the faculty member's Department Chair, Dean, and students. With the exception of student evaluations, no anonymous input will be accepted. The written summary of the review shall be provided to the faculty member and he or she shall have an opportunity to respond, if desired.

The Department Chair plays a critical role in ensuring the Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) is meaningful and useful to both the faculty and administration.¹ Therefore, mandatory annual department chair workshops will be facilitated by the Provost's Office in order to review the purpose and process of the APE. Oregon Tech employs the APE in conjunction with the Faculty Objectives Plan (FOP) to provide a complete assessment. These reviews are both completed in the Spring Term; however, each has a unique focus.

The APE provides an opportunity to review the work of the current academic year while the FOP provides a year-long plan for the following year, with objectives for faculty growth and progress. The APE provides the faculty member with the opportunity to review the FOP developed the prior academic year and assess how they have met or exceeded identified objectives. The APE will lead faculty to identify changes or plans for the upcoming year which will be included in the FOP. This assessment creates a concrete record of the work accomplished, provides a way to identify areas that need attention, and articulates ways to improve the areas of deficiency.

2. Reason for Policy/Purpose

The goal of faculty evaluation is to provide regular feedback to faculty, to assess contributions, and evaluate performance, as well as to provide concrete guidance on ways to improve in any areas that do not meet expectations. The focus of a faculty member's professional activities may shift over time. As faculty progress through their careers, they may devote proportionately more time to different activities, such as institutional or departmental leadership, program and curriculum development, teaching, advising, or research/scholarship. Consequently, the expectations for individual faculty members may change.

¹ See OIT Department Chair Job Description, section 3, a, b, c, and e.

3. Applicability/Scope

This policy applies to all instructional faculty with annual appointments of 0.5 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) or more, in both tenure track and non-tenure track classifications.

To the extent that there are any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between Oregon Tech and the Oregon Tech Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (OT-AAUP) takes precedence over this policy.

4. Definitions

Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty: these appointments refer to instructional faculty who either were hired into annual tenure appointment, or who have been awarded tenure at Oregon Tech. Faculty who have voluntarily relinquished tenure within the previous three years are also included in this category.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty: these appointments refer to instructional faculty who teach half-time or more at Oregon Tech but are in fixed term appointments or non-tenure track lines.

Faculty Objectives Plan (FOP): The FOP is a form (see attachment A) and a process that helps faculty communicate with their department chairs about their planned activities, workload and priorities for the coming year, spanning from spring term of the current academic year to the end of winter term of the following year. The FOP process allows department chairs to provide informal feedback about those plans and how they fit with professional, departmental and university objectives, but does not evaluate the faculty directly. The FOP should not be viewed as a contract or template for whether performance met or exceeds expectations. If plans made via the FOP change during the year, the faculty member and their department chair are expected to communicate about those changes, but they generally do not need to be formally documented via a revised FOP.

Annual Performance Evaluation (APE): The APE is a form (see attachment B) and a process that evaluates what the faculty member has done in the previous year, spanning from spring term of one academic year to the end of winter term of the current year. It may include activities done while the faculty member was off-contract, but such activities are not required. It documents what the faculty member has actually done, whether it was listed on their previous FOP or arose since then. It also evaluates the quantity and quality of that work and how it fits with professional, departmental and university priorities, and provides feedback for future improvement. The completed APE form becomes part of the faculty member's permanent employment record and is subsequently used in evaluative processes such as tenure review (if applicable) and promotion. It may also be used to articulate merit performance.

Student Evaluation of Instruction: These evaluations are conducted by the university each term in accordance with policy OIT-21- 035, and summary numerical results from them are included on the APE form (attachment B), with instructions about which numerical results and how they are to be reported provided in attachment C. Student evaluations are intended as a tool to help evaluate some aspects of instruction, but should only be used in combination with other sources of information.

5. Policy

5.1 Criteria for Evaluation

According to the Administrative Rules of the Board of Higher Education (OAR 580-021- 0135), “criteria for faculty evaluation is [sic] established as a guide in evaluating faculty in connection with decisions on reappointment, promotion and tenure; and as a basis for assessing those aspects of the faculty member's performance in which improvement is desirable, whether the faculty member is tenured or nontenured, with a view to stimulating and assisting the faculty member toward improvement through the resources available under the institution's staff career support plan.”

Faculty will be evaluated in three areas: (1) instruction, (2) scholarship /research, and (3) service to the department, university, and/or profession. Both tenured/tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated relative to all three areas, but expectations of non-tenure track faculty will generally be substantially lower in scholarship/research and service, due to their increased instructional workload and lower non-instructional workload. In some instances it may, with the agreement of their department chair, meet expectations for a non-tenure track faculty member to have no accomplishments in one of the two non-instructional areas, with increased expectations and workload in the other. The following guidelines are intended as an institution-wide standard to which each department and faculty member is held yet allow for the flexibility to include other criteria warranted by the varying disciplines and professions represented at OIT.

In order to align with OIT-20-040 Academic Rank and Promotion for Instructional Faculty, OIT-21-040 Instructional Faculty Evaluation utilizes the same wording for first-order bullets in the Criteria for Evaluation section as the bullets that appear in OIT-20-040 Rank and Promotion of Instructional Faculty, Assistant to Associate (e.g., “Foster student learning . . .” and “Assume initiative . . .” in the Instruction/Teaching section). Faculty should consult the appropriate section for their rank. However, faculty evaluations occur every year while promotions occur every 5 years. For this reason, there are additional second-order bullets in OIT-21-040 Evaluation that are more granular, providing shorter-term examples. Further, Instruction/Teaching in OIT-20-040 Promotion requires that faculty demonstrate excellence in all of the first-order bullets, but OIT-21-040 Evaluation does not because of the shorter timeframe. In other words, faculty must demonstrate excellence in all of the first order bullets over a 5-year period but not every year.

Instruction/Teaching

Oregon Institute of Technology is committed to providing exceptional student learning experiences. To achieve this, faculty will excel in instruction in the following ways:

- Foster student learning in an environment that promotes student mastery of course objectives. Doing this generally includes:
 - Demonstrate knowledge and expertise of subject matter, including regular revision of course curriculum to remain current with best practices and knowledge within the field of study. Organize and deliver course materials to stimulate student interest and discussion.
 - Provide an inclusive learning environment for students; be responsive to student

questions and feedback and grade and return assignments and exams in a timely manner.

- Employ a variety of assessment tools for evaluation of teaching effectiveness and student learning.
- Maintain student numerical course evaluations at a departmentally established standard.
- Demonstrate growth in instruction.
- Assume initiative in carrying out departmental objectives.
- Contribute to the design and improvement of departmental courses and curricula.
 - If applicable, this includes revisions to reflect changes at the national level, in accreditation requirements, and in industry standards.
- Participate in professional engagement related to teaching and learning.
-

Scholarship/Research

Faculty will advance knowledge in scholarship, research and/or areas consistent with institutional, departmental, and professional goals/objectives. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Applied and/or theoretical research,
 - Including mentoring undergraduate or graduate students in research.
 - Including research leading to patents, intellectual property, or innovations.
- Contributing to state, regional, or national/international professional organizations,
- Pursuit of internally and/or externally sponsored grants,
- Refereed publications,
- Professional certification,
 - Including earning continuing education units related to licensure or accreditation, or earning a higher degree.
- Professional consulting work,
- Open Educational Resource (OER) development,
 - May include other public scholarship in education and/or their discipline.
- Continuing coursework,
 - Related to licensure, professional expertise or accreditation .
- Conference participation,
 - Especially presenting or being on an expert panel.

Service

Faculty will demonstrate service internal to the department, college, and/or Oregon Tech; and/or external service to the profession and community. These contributions should be consistent with institutional, departmental, and professional goals/objectives. While there may be modest honorarium for this work, it is done as a part of the faculty role which does not amount to work that would be considered an outside activity.

Internal service may include but is not limited to:

- Contributing to departmental objectives
 - Some examples include academic advising of students, student recruitment or retention activities
 - Some examples include leading or participating in program accreditation or assessment.
- Participating in campus activities outside the department,
 - Some examples include leading or participating in university grants, on-campus presentations, workshops and conferences, or advising student chapters or clubs.
- Active committee work, and/or mentoring less experienced faculty.

External service may include but is not limited to:

- A role in a professional society, editorship, manuscript reviewer
 - A further significant example is a role in organizing a professional meeting, either at Oregon Tech or elsewhere.
- Community leadership related to the academic field of the candidate.
 - Some examples include university outreach to high schools, or professionally-related public speaking.

5.2 Timeline and Procedure for Evaluation

All faculty with an FTE of 0.5 or more shall be reviewed annually.

To provide a comprehensive assessment, the review of the FOP and the APE will occur within the same time period during the Spring Term.

1. Faculty members will be assigned an APE and a FOP in the first week of Spring term. The review and assessment involved in the APE should occur first in relation to the prior year FOP, with the FOP built from the feedback and discussions.
2. The faculty member will submit the APE to the Department Chair by the end of the 2nd week of Spring Term together with the prior year FOP.
3. The Department Chair will review the documents, meet with the faculty members, and provide feedback and recommendations during the 3rd and 4th week of Spring Term.
4. The faculty member will submit the final APE by the end of the 4th week of Spring Term.
5. The Department Chair will complete the assessment and ratings the 5th week of Spring Term and the faculty member will have the opportunity to make comments.
6. APEs are due to the Deans by the end of the 6th week of Spring Term; Deans review, comment and provide approval by the end of the 10th week of Spring Term.
7. While faculty may begin the work on their FOP at any time during Spring Term, an initial version is due to the Department Chair by the end of the 8th week, and their final version with any revisions is due by the end of the 10th week of Spring term.

New faculty hired will meet with the Department Chair to discuss the components and possible objectives for their FOP and submit a FOP to the Department Chair for comment by the end of the

second week of the term they are employed. Department Chairs may provide feedback to the faculty member with suggested edits (if any). This will be reviewed with the APE in the following Spring.

Faculty Objectives Plan

The purpose of the FOP (Attachment A) is to ensure that individual faculty objectives support and address institutional and departmental objectives. The Department Chair will review the documents and provide comments, suggestions and feedback, and meet with the faculty to discuss objectives and, as necessary, to provide direction and assurance contribution in the three areas of required criteria. The faculty member's accomplishment of those objectives will be the basis of the APE. The FOP will be signed by the faculty member and the Department Chair. The FOP will then be forwarded to the Dean for approval

The FOP may be completed in conjunction with the APE but must be turned no later than the end of the 8th week of Spring Term to the Department Chair. Department Chairs are to review this document in light of the conversations and assessment of the APE. The Department Chair is to provide any feedback to the faculty member during the 9th and 10th week of Spring term. The final FOP is due to the Department Chair by the end of the 10th week. The Department Chair will review and forward to the Dean by the 11th week of Spring Term.

Annual Performance Evaluation

The APE form (Attachment B) will be completed by the faculty member and a copy will be provided to the Department Chair by the Friday of the second week of Spring term. The APE provides a review of the current Academic Year's accomplishments. It should utilize the prior year's FOP as a guide for accomplishments (the prior AY FOP should be appended). This part of the review allows for the Department Chair and Dean to provide concrete feedback on the work of the faculty member. The Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the APE and FOP, align goals with departmental needs, review student evaluations and other assessments of instruction, and provide feedback and guidance on non-instructional work.

The APE forms will be assigned to the faculty the first week of Spring Term. The faculty member will provide the Department Chair with a draft by the end of the 2nd week of Spring Term. The Department Chair will meet with the faculty member during the 3rd and 4th week of Spring Term. The faculty member will submit a final APE no later than the end of the 4th week of Spring Term.

Based on the discussion with the faculty member, the Department Chair completes the APE and submits it to the faculty member for concurrence or nonconcurrence, and comments, if any by the 6th week of Spring Term. The faculty member signs the APE form and adds any comments. The APE is then routed to the Dean for review and approval by the 10th week of Spring Term. The Dean will consult with the Department Chair regarding the faculty member's performance as needed. The Dean will review, assess and approve the APE form. The Dean will complete their review by the end of Spring Term and the form will be routed to the Provost's Office, as well as copies returned to all parties.

Student Evaluation of Instruction

Student Evaluation of Instruction is conducted in accordance with OIT 21-035. A copy of the faculty's student evaluation results will be provided to each faculty member by the administration. A numerical summary of these results for all courses will be included in a table within the Instruction section of the APE form. Additional voluntary evaluations done at the request of the faculty member may be included on the APE form at the discretion of the faculty member.

6. Links to Related Procedures, Forms, or Information

Attachment A: blank Faculty Objectives Plan (FOP) form

Attachment B: blank Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) form

Attachment C: instructions for filling out the student numerical evaluation table of the APE form

7. Policy Review/Consultation

This policy was reviewed and open to consultation by the following Oregon Tech committees and/or advisory groups:

- Faculty Senate

This policy was adopted pursuant to Oregon Tech's policy review and making process.

8. Policy Approval

Approved by the President on January 28, 2025.

Nagi G. Naganathan, Ph.D., ASME Fellow
President

Adoption Date

May 19, 2009

Supersedes, Renames, and Renumbers

OIT-21-040 dated May 29, 2014

Revision Dates

May 29, 2014

May 19, 2009

Academic Standing Changes

In Academic Year, 2023-2024 the AP&P committee in conjunction with Provost Mott, Dr. Yu, and Retention/Advising, have proposed a revision to our academic standing. The change includes renaming the different levels to be more student friendly and success minded; as well as changing the criteria for each level. The focus is to find ways to intervene quicker when students are struggling, to help them find corrective measures before it is too late.

Proposed Academic Standing

GOOD STANDING

Students with a term and cumulative GPA of 2.0 or above are in good academic standing.

ACADEMIC NOTICE

- Students who have attempted 1 or more terms at OT and have a cumulative GPA below 2.0 will be placed on Academic Notice.
- Students who have 2 consecutive terms of no earned credits will be placed on academic notice.

Students who attain a term GPA of 2.75 or better are removed from Academic Notice.

ACADEMIC DISQUALIFICATION

Students on Academic Notice who have a subsequent term GPA of below 2.0.

Current Academic Standing

Academic Warning

Students, including first term freshmen, who do not achieve a 2.0 in any given term will receive an Academic Warning. Students who have no earned credits, withdrawals (i.e., all Fs, withdrawals (W) and/or incompletes (I)), for two consecutive terms will also receive an Academic Warning.

Academic Probation

Students who have attempted two or more terms at Oregon Tech and have an Oregon Tech cumulative GPA below 2.0 will be placed on Academic Probation. Students who have no earned credits, (i.e. all Fs, withdrawals (W) and/or incompletes (I)), for three or more consecutive terms will also be placed on Academic Probation.

Academic Suspension

Students on academic probation for one term who do not meet the 2.0 cumulative GPA requirement in the successive term of enrollment will be placed on Academic Suspension for at least one term.