

Minutes

The Faculty Senate met on March 11 2025, in the Sunset 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.

Approval of the Minutes

Yuehai introduced the approval of the minutes, and Heather Ritter requested that “Dr. Nagi” be changed to “Dr. Yang” in the summary of her report. This change has since been made (the change is to “Yuehai” to be consistent with the wording of the rest of the minutes document).

I made a few comments before the vote to approve the minutes:

- I noted that for the purposes of the minutes, there are now two “FPCs”: the Facilities Planning Committee and the Faculty Policy Committee.
- I noted that due to the subpar quality of the audio recording of last month’s meeting (because of our temporary location in the Mount Mazama room) there are a few places where the February minutes are unclear or incomplete. I apologized for this inconsistency.
- Finally, I noted that some committees and/or Senators have been informally sending me the text of their reports each month to be included in the minutes (instead of my summary of their reports). Traditionally, I have included these reports as separate documents from the minutes, but this month have started pasting those reports directly into the text of the minutes for ease of reading and access. I requested feedback on this change if anyone had any to provide. I also said that if anyone else writes up their report each month and wants to send it to me for inclusion in the minutes, that would be appreciated, but is certainly not expected or required.

Riley Richards motioned to accept the minutes with the one change requested by Heather. Rebekah Yocum seconded. The minutes passed unanimously.

After the approval of the minutes, Yuehai welcomed Dr. Nagi to the meeting. He then suggested a motion to alter the agenda to let Dr. Nagi speak first. Riley motioned to make this change, and I seconded. There was no discussion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Open Floor

Dr. Nagi

- Dr. Nagi began by saying that it is an interesting time to be a university President, with everything that’s happening at the national and state level. He thanked Kari Lundgren for reaching out to him with her concerns. There is so much going on, and we don’t even know what’s being talked about in the State of the Nation address that’s going on right now as we’re here in Senate. He said that he’s been in touch with state and national elected officials. Everyone is counseling being careful and not speaking out at this point. He met with PM-ASOIT last week (or ten days ago?), and he spoke with Uriel last week, so that he could better understand our students’ concerns. Student success is a value, and should be prioritized. He thanked Yuehai for sharing the

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

Senate Resolution On Recent Federal Executive Orders last week and deciding to keep it internal as much as possible for the time being. Jennifer Wilson and Mandi Clark met with students in the Treehouse last week (or the week before?) to discuss various issues. There have been lots of meetings.

- Our students get about \$30M in aid every year, and \$20M of that comes from federal sources. \$14M in loans and \$5M in grants came from federal sources last year. 7,000 students received a loan or aid from federal, or state, or other institutional sources (last year?). This is important for our students, and so we need to be careful. The seven Presidents of the state's public universities are meeting weekly to keep up to date on what's going on throughout the state. The American Association of Universities did an analysis, which said that there's nothing illegal about many of these things. Places like the University of Oregon and Oregon State, and to some extent Portland State and OHSU have a lot of concerns about research grants. We also have these issues. He mentioned Christy VanRooyen's research grant getting held up.
 - Christy weighed in here to say that they recently received an update on this grant: the money is there now, but it might not be in the future.
- Dr. Nagi asked: how do you pay attention to these things? Next week, he'll be in Portland and Salem and the week after in D.C. talking to lots of people. He showed up for this meeting right at the last second because he was responding to an email about how much the state should keep in reserve without really knowing how the federal government is going to impact Oregon. The four Oregon universities he mentioned earlier are appealing to the state: we are going to have \$100M impact on our revenue, can you keep something in reserve? We (Oregon Tech) get 7% of what the state sets aside. A lot of this is for student support, including the Oregon Opportunity Grant(s) for our students. We have two good government relations folks as well as Gaylyn Maurer and David Cauble who are working to make clear how Oregon Tech is relevant to the state of Oregon. We are making a big impact.
- There are some "new twists." People's planned careers are now changing based on what's happened recently (he mentioned students no longer wanting to study forestry and how that is affecting Oregon universities). How do we help students pivot to new careers when necessary? He is going to ask Mandi to talk about this. He asked Mandi if it's true that we only have one career (counselor?).
 - Mandi responded that currently, we only have one, but we hope to have additional support soon.
- We need to help each other. We need to help students. This was going to be part of his question (to the Senate?). When students come and talk about their concerns, he hears two things: first, they are concerned about educational access in terms of state and federal funding. Second, is there a risk of us being discriminated against more openly in some areas? It's important to listen to students when they are being discriminated against.
- The good news is that nothing explicit has been forced on us yet. The General Counsels are meeting every week now, and our Financial Aid folks are consulting across the state so we can be responsive to any edicts. There was an FAQ from the Department of Education that said that we may have more breathing space than we might have originally thought. Maybe Dave Groff can say a few things about it, specifically about how it explained the origins of the "Dear Colleague" letter. We're in a good space and in a good position to do good work and help our students. Student success is the number one value and DEI is a value. We need to be empathetic! Dr. Nagi once helped a student who needed an extra course to graduate on time. We should be doing things like this to help.
- The private sector is suffering under the latest tariff imposition (as of last night). There is a special executive committee meeting of the Board this Thursday. This is partly in response to the tariffs, which might cause some bids to go up. We have a good bid on the Fieldhouse, but the tariffs might change this.
- Dr. Nagi is meeting with Ben Cannon every few weeks to discuss what's happening at the state level. And he'll be going to D.C. to talk with people at the federal level soon. Jeff Merkley will be in town on March 16th.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

We offered a space on campus, but they'll be meeting elsewhere for capacity reasons. (**Secretary's Note:** Senator Merkley does not appear to have actually come to Klamath Falls on the 16th, though he did hold a town hall in Ashland on that day.) Senators Merkley and Wyden have been very supportive, so please go and support them when they come to town.

- The federal fiscal year started last October, but there is no budget yet. Hopefully this will be resolved by the 14th. We expect to get \$1.7M for two mobile clinics for Dental Hygiene. Those clinics will take students and faculty into rural Oregon to help patients learn. This is a real learning opportunity for our students. There is another Air Force project for \$1.1M that the Mechanical faculty have been working on, and another \$1M directed toward quantum science. There is also a Natural Sciences project with no money attached to it right now, but when the program gets money the faculty will get funding for other projects and to help our students. Dr. Nagi thanked "Christy and others" who contributed to their conversation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. It was a very positive conversation.
- We've submitted our projects for fiscal year '26. One will be \$1M for a camera in MIT. We'll be adding to Manufacturing. We're doing "something" around energy. All the talk right now is around "domestic energy resilience," so that's what we're working on. This is building on our green energy initiatives, but "green energy" no longer gets interest, and we don't want to get caught up in politics. These are the things that he'll be lobbying for in Congress in two weeks, in addition to the other things.
- Going back to the Executive Orders: we're monitoring them closely, but you don't want to get "stranded alone." There are universities in some states that have gone ahead with different things. Dr. Nagi thanked Kari again for reaching out to him about Ben Cannon's letter. He then said that the reason Ben Cannon sent out the letter at the state level is *not* because he asked him to, but Dr. Nagi was the one who said that it is time that the state speaks up. There's the question of whether we're going to follow national law or state law: if they don't agree with each other, then the courts decide.
- There are a lot of moving parts, and we're watching it closely, but we have to stay "laser-focused" on the students. Don't assume that the past will continue as far as careers. There may be new opportunities where old ones disappear. Apple has recently invested in Oregon, and we (Oregon Tech) are talking to Google. He thanked Tony Richey for being here. These are all examples of these opportunities. If you have ideas, pass them on. He thanked Kari a third time for writing to him.
- He talked to a community college President today who has a different set of problems from ours. We're all trying to learn from each other. We shouldn't overreact, but we shouldn't wait and see either. "We need to plan and wait."
- Dr. Nagi said he would be happy to take questions. Then he asked Ken and Mandi to speak. He asked Ken in particular to speak about his work with alumni.
 - Ken said that Mandi and the Career Services folks have great resources, but if you have students who were looking at Bureau of Land Management jobs or "other federal occupations," let him know. There's a vibrant alumni group out there that they can tap into to help out.
 - Mandi said that some federal agencies aren't going to be participating in the April Careers Fair(s) because of funding freezes and hiring freezes. Feel free to send affected students to Career Services.
- Dr. Nagi next told a story about how five years ago, some Boeing employees and Oregon Tech alumni came down to Klamath Falls because none of our students were planning to apply to Boeing. Because of that effort, ultimately six Oregon Tech students applied. If you know professionals, we can potentially attract them to Oregon Tech.
- We are able to do these things unlike the other universities because of our increase in enrollment this year. Oregon Tech is paying our bills, compared to PSU, Southern Oregon, and Western Oregon who are really struggling to stay afloat. We are hoping that we can do a budget for next year without any cuts.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- Dr. Nagi next asked Dr. El-Rewini to speak about faculty hirings. He explained further that Dr. El-Rewini had long meetings with both Deans. He can talk about hiring and faculty positions.
 - Dr. El-Rewini began by sharing that in two days, he will have been at Oregon Tech for three months. Since he's come to the university, Dr. Nagi has emphasized to him the need to meet the needs of the faculty, and he's been working on getting a sense of what that means.
 - In the last three months, we've made eleven offers. Nine have been accepted, and two are still pending. Three people already started in January, two are starting in March, one started in February, one is starting in June, one in August, and one in September.
 - There are five positions in the interview phase currently. Those offers should be made soon.
 - Six positions are posted, and nine positions that aren't posted yet, but are now approved.
 - Dr. El-Rewini added up some numbers here that were slightly different than what he previously said ("nine posted and ten not posted equals nineteen" plus "eleven offers" and the five that are in the interview phase) and came up with thirty-five positions total. (**Secretary's Note:** Not to be too pedantic here, but Dr. El-Rewini's first set of numbers add up to thirty-one, and his second set of numbers add up to thirty-five but it's unclear how the six posted positions became nine and the nine not-posted positions became ten, unless the original numbers were just misquoted.) This is a lot of positions; however, there are problems filling some of the positions.
 - Ever since he got here, he's been hearing "MIT." The problem with filling some of these positions is that we have a Chair position, and three other positions that are unfilled. We post the positions, but we don't say anything about salary, and so either people don't apply or something happens. We're going to try something new. He's authorized Dean Seabert to try using a search firm to try to find faculty for some of these positions. To find faculty, we can't just put out an ad and wait. It's a very competitive market and we need to work together to make sure that we use our networks.
 - We have a lot of great things happening on campus. We have problems, like every other university, but we have great things. He mentioned meeting with Don (McDonnell?) and Debbie (McCollam?) during tea time yesterday. He talked with them about making sure that when they try to recruit people, they mention the "unparalleled benefits" we have here in Oregon. Our benefits are almost 50%-60% of our salary, which is "extraordinary," and a good selling point. It's not the location that's the problem – Klamath Falls is a beautiful place – we just need to sell people on the positions.
 - Yuehai comes to see him every Friday, and talks about needing new positions for MIT. He's trying to solve the problem. Faculty contribute a lot of credit hours, and students love to come here. We'll find the people.
- Dr. Nagi then talked a bit about his plans for the College of Medicine. It's gone beyond the feasibility stage and into the planning stage. He has asked the state for a \$1.8M planning grant for the College. The other six public Oregon university Presidents are supportive of the idea of a medical school at Oregon Tech. This is a very aspirational lift for Oregon Tech, but it's going to be a tide that's going to lift a lot of boats. There has been some interest about building a medical school in Medford, but we are more about health at this university than about other things and have credentials and programs that make us better suited to take on this project. We are actually more of a medical university than an engineering university, despite what people think. Oregon State is asking for a bill to expand the Cascades campus in Bend. We need to be proactive and see where we can build. David Cauble (from Sky Lakes) is passionate about this, and he's been talking to other hospitals CEOs about it: there's a lot of enthusiasm all around. Dr. Nagi said that he recently met with two or

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

three OHSU executives on the Klamath Falls campus to discuss the possibility of Oregon Tech opening a medical school. They had a very good conversation. Six years ago, this wasn't a possibility, but now it is. Dr. Nagi said that if he asked Gaylyn to say a few words, she would give an hour-long presentation. This is an opportunity, and the need is there. We have just prepared a brochure to take to the state legislature, and to raise awareness about this plan. Now the legislature is thinking about Oregon Tech when they weren't before. As the result of one conversation, one philanthropist has given \$300,000 for the project already. Dr. Nagi next asked Ken to say a few words about philanthropy.

- Ken said that we've had some success within the last month with philanthropic gifts. We've had a very substantial "seven-figure" gift, as well as some significant scholarships that have come in. We're working right now on getting some equipment for Diagnostic Imaging. We hope to raise funds for that.
 - Give A Hoot Day is coming up on April 9th. If you're interested in fundraising for any particular program or opportunity, please let Jacie Wyatt know. Last year we raised \$3.4M, and we've already surpassed that this year.
 - We're right in the early stages of a \$35M capital campaign.
 - Thanks, and if you have needs that are fundable, let us know.
- Dr. Nagi told a story about a recent dinner meeting in Bend that resulted in a couple giving \$600,000. He thanked Dr. Alp for her assistance on this.
 - Ken encouraged everyone to "support the Gala" as a result.
- Dr. Nagi said that student scholarships are dear to many of our donors, so we're capitalizing on that. The institutional and "other" aid numbers are high, and he was surprised by that when he looked at them.
- The stable enrollment this year went a long way toward letting us do things we wouldn't have otherwise been able to do. Let's keep that going. Dr. Nagi seemed to ask faculty Senators how they thought they could help with retention and enrollment here, but then he moved to talking about staff instead. He described how Mandi is not just the VP of Student Affairs, but is also directing the Student Health Center. Gaylyn is "working in many ways" in health and wellness. In the middle of this, the state wants to change the funding model, so John Harman and others are trying to be proactive about a potential coming change that would affect our finances. Dr. Nagi next threw to John Harman to talk about funding and the state budget.
 - John said that budget templates are rolling out this week to the VPs. We want a budget without reductions. Going into next year's budget, though, it'll be easier because of our level enrollment. We're budgeting using the Governor's recommended budget, but that only provides for a 7% increase. We need more than this (he said 9.5%) to sustain operations.
 - Nagi asked if it was true that when they say 7% they actually only mean 3.5% because we only get 50% of our expenses from the state?
 - John agreed.
 - If we don't get at least the Governor's budget this year, we'll have to revisit our budget. The revenue forecast from last Wednesday was "fairly strong." The real worry is what's going on at the federal level: there are forty- or fifty-thousand federal employees in Oregon, and if many of them get laid off, that affects income tax, etc.
 - Even with all of that said, John thinks we'll be able to meet our budget. He'll be presenting to FOAC in early April.
 - Sustainability funding has been important for five universities in the state: we got \$1M in January but could only use it on new initiatives to sustain the university. A lot of it was spent on retention and Admissions. He mentioned Greg Stringer and Ruth Black and their groups specifically here. They

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

also got some funding to replace the university's financial reporting system. This will put us on the same footing as the other Oregon universities.

- Banner is still a stable project that works well for us, and FAST will be coming back for budget reporting.
- There's another element within sustainability that the HECC asked John to lead at Dr. Nagi's recommendation. It wasn't entirely clear here what specifically John was describing. We've released an RFP on behalf of the five TRU universities. What are some of the commonalities between us and these other four universities that we might be able to align? Synergy is the goal. There could be some opportunities to get those synergies and lower our business costs. We won't know much until late summer, but the contract will be rewarded by the end of the month.
- Dr. Nagi thanked ASOIT on both campuses. They listen and don't jump to conclusions.
- The Tuition Recommendation Committee met and made a good recommendation today.

Discussion

- Kari asked if there's a possibility of releasing Ben Cannon's response to the "Dear Colleague" letter to the entire university community.
 - Dr. Nagi said that he's worried that it would be missing context, and he wants to provide that context for clarity before just sending the letter out on its own.
 - Kari then asked if there was a plan of how to provide that context.
 - Dr. Nagi asked Dave to respond here.
 - Dave said that we have to be careful about how aggressively we pursue these kinds of conversations "out in the open," so to speak, because Portland in particular (and PSU especially) has drawn a lot of negative federal attention lately, and we don't necessarily want to join them in that sense.
 - Dr. Nagi reiterated that he doesn't want to confuse people by sending out a letter they won't necessarily understand. He also suggested that Faculty Senate include a link to the letter in the March meeting minutes. The text of the letter (rather than an impermanent web link) has been included in this packet for your reference as **pages 22-25**.
 - Ken Fincher weighed in to say that since January 20th, they've been working with a communication consultancy to make sure we're getting important work done without making a public spectacle out of it. In terms of communication, we don't want to play "Whack-A-Mole," here we get whacked for sticking our head up. We can work with our students to help them while keeping our heads down at the same time. Ben Cannon's letter was one exemplary result of this approach. They've already spent "thousands of hours" in conversation about how they can help without drawing too much attention.
- Dibyajyoti Deb brought up Nagi mentioning the CHIPS Act at Convocation last year: we received some amount of funding from Intel as a result. Has the administrative change at the federal level changed this?
 - Dr. Nagi said that this hasn't affected us very dramatically. Intel did give Oregon Tech one grant, but they didn't give a lot of money. We were successful at getting \$1M from the federal government to set up a semiconductor lab in Portland. We also got \$700K from the state of Oregon for a semiconductor lab in Klamath Falls. Those monies are being used. Nothing has been "paused" in these cases. Tomorrow, Dr. Nagi is going to be interviewed about what we should do about semiconductors in Oregon. The question is what's going to happen in that space now that Senator Wyden is a member of the minority party. We don't know yet.
- Deb then asked what happens if the Department of Education is abolished.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- Dr. Nagi that something like that wouldn't happen overnight. It required Congressional action to be created. What they *can* do quickly is affect the funding streams as they stand now. That's why the FAQ from the Department of Education that came out last Friday gave us some breathing room. We are okay, we just have to make sure to do the right things.
- Matt Schnackenberg asked about funding: John was saying that our funding might be affected by federal workers losing their jobs and income tax decreasing. Do we get money from the federal government?
 - John said that most of our federal funding comes from student aid packages and Pell grants. Other innovation-centric grants could be affected.
 - Dr. Nagi repeated what John said earlier about the firing of federal employees in the state and the resulting income tax decrease negatively affecting us.
 - Dave mentioned the value of "setting the right tone." Of all government employees in the United States, only about 10% are federal employees. 20% are state employees. The other 70% are city, county, etc. employees. The federal firings, then, are a small portion of the overall picture. Dave emphasized that these jobs *are* important, but we should understand the scale of the issue.
 - Dr. Nagi said that the principal thing that the state fears is what could happen to Medicaid. If we lose Medicaid funding from the government, where will that money come from?
- Riley asked if there was a timeline for launching the Provost and Dean searches.
 - Dr. Nagi said that the search firm's advice is to "have things going" in spring, source candidates in summer, and do on-campus interviews in the fall (for the Provost). Once the Provost search is part-way through, the Dean search will start.
- Cristina Negoita asked how many of our students receive Pell Grants.
 - Dr. Nagi said that he does have those numbers for the last five years, but not offhand. He can get them to Cristina.
 - Cristina received an email after the Senate meeting addressing this question and the text of that email has been included in the minutes for your reference, as **page 26**.
- Cristina asked how we can say we gave funding to 7,000 students when we don't have that many enrolled.
 - Dr. Nagi responded to say that that number is based on awards that are given *each term* (so the same student can receive multiple awards throughout the year, leading to the larger number).
- Vanessa Bennett asked where the Fieldhouse is going.
 - Dr. Nagi said it will be adjacent to the Rec Center.
 - Ken said where the old outdoor basketball court is is where it will be.
- Vanessa asked if it is already funded, and Ken said yes. It has already been fully-funded by donors.
- Vanessa asked when construction starts on this, and Ken said "hopefully very soon." He then gave an estimate of ten to twelve months.
- Riley asked for a general timeline for the College of Medicine.
 - Dr. Nagi said "It depends on how fast we can get the money." We will need somewhere between \$100M and \$150M. John Harman has already started a medical school in Texas. We need a plan to get this kind of money, which is why we're spending \$1.8M ahead of time to come up with a good plan.
 - John said that it would take three to five years if we get the money quickly.
 - Dr. Nagi reiterated that Medford wants to build a medical school "not because of a medical school, but because of economic development." They've been discussing regional partnerships throughout southern Oregon.
- Dr. Nagi thanked everyone and encouraged anyone who has other questions to send them to him. He thanked Kari for the fourth time. Then he asked Tony to provide any updates that he had.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- Tony said that IT is currently working with Google to connect with their grant-writing AI. They're also working on security: they want to make sure that the university is safe. Security measures are going to be implemented slowly over time.
- Dr. Nagi asked us to think about how we prepare for "the AI university for the future." He encouraged faculty to reach out with ideas.
- Yuehai asked Dr. Nagi if, based on his earlier, abandoned, question, he wanted to hear anything from faculty about what they're doing to increase student enrollment and/or retention.
 - Dr. Nagi said he wanted to be conscious of faculty's time and "would love to hear if you have ideas."
 - Yuehai asked faculty to jump in and share ways that they are contributing.
 - Dr. Nagi interrupted to suggest that the faculty focus on getting students to register.
- Yuehai called for a short break after Dr. Nagi's Open Floor session had finished.

Dr. El-Rewini

- After the recess, Yuehai announced that Dr. El-Rewini was going to leave the meeting soon. He asked if anyone had questions for him before he did so.
- Dr. El-Rewini spoke first, and reiterated many of the points he had spoken about earlier regarding faculty positions and hiring.
- Kari then asked how many of the new positions are Visiting positions and how many are renewable.
 - Dr. El-Rewini said that "the majority of them are not Visiting," only a few are visiting or temporary positions. He then estimated that "95%" of the positions are "regular," either instructor or tenure-track.
 - Kari asked if this meant that there is an intentional move toward more long-term positions.
 - Dr. El-Rewini said yes, and explained that we want to create stability, not *only* replace empty positions. Students are sometimes not happy with adjuncts, and it's important to provide them with the best experience we can.
- Vanessa asked how many of the new positions are tenure vs. non-tenure-track.
 - He said that a few are instructors, and a larger amount are tenure-track.
 - Dr. Alp (?) guessed 75% of the positions are tenure-track.
- Vanessa pointed out that in the past, we've had a lot of position hires fall apart during negotiations. She wants to know whether the Provost has any leeway to negotiate at that point to try to attract potential faculty.
 - He responded that he doesn't know if we already do that or not, but he said that we *should*. He also said that within a reasonable range, at least, we should try to negotiate meaningfully without creating inequities between existing faculty and future faculty that are too big.
- Ken Usher recommended that when it comes to the current Natural Science searches, we should try to reel good candidates in quickly before they decide to go somewhere else.
 - Riley recommended a "harassing by email" approach to make sure that searches finish out efficiently.
- Riley then asked the Deans that the position breakdown information be sent to me, so that I can include it in the April Senate packet.
 - For formatting reasons, the position breakdown information provided by the Deans has been included in this packet as a separate document rather than being included in the minutes inline. This document has been included in the packet as **page 27** for your reference.
 - Dr. El-Rewini opined that we should all be on the same page, and that there should be "one version of the truth." There are no positions that are being held back, but it's his job to make sure a position goes to the place that has the most need.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- He also explained that he has yet more positions in mind that he plans to pitch to John Harmon that would be funded under the Strategic Investment Fund.
- Dr. El-Rewini then reiterated that we have thirty-five new positions. He wants to empower the Chairs and Deans to make hiring decisions, as long as we're all on the same page about where we're going.
- Ken asked if the relevant Chairs have already been told about the positions that have been approved but haven't been posted.
 - Dr. El-Rewini said that we are the first to hear about these because they were just finalized. Word will go out more broadly (and to the Chairs) soon.
- Before leaving, Dr. El-Rewini went around the room and made sure he knew everyone's names.

Reports of the Officers

Report of the President – Yuehai Yang

- The full text of Yuehai's report is pasted below. If there were any deviations from the content of the report as it was being delivered (questions, related discussion, etc.), that has been added inline by the Secretary. Any discussion that occurred after the report is included below the pasted report starting with a new top-level bullet:
 - Resolution: Based on our last meeting input from our student representatives, our DEI senate committee, and our concerned faculty. Senate Executives and Kari, as a faculty concerned, have drafted a resolution on recent executive orders. Optional signature was provided an opportunity. Currently it received 65 signatures from students, faculty, and classified staff members. I would like to thank for people who participated in this drafting process and thank you for your support to your affected community members. It is currently with Dr. Nagi and Dr. El-Rewini for their further consideration.
 - Meeting with General Council Groff: AVP McCreary facilitated a conversation between SenEx, Kari, and General Council Dave Groff. The general idea/advice we got from that meeting, Dave could correct me if I misunderstood, is that we should think about how to approach this touchy issue with caution, to make sure it won't cause unintended trouble to some of our students.
 - Meeting with Dr. Nagi on Feb. 27th:
 - All six other public universities are in support of Oregon Tech's DO (Osteopathic) medical school initiative. Oregon Tech recently received a Medical School support fund 300,000\$ and the hope is to raise in total ~150 million \$ in 3-5 years with Sky Lakes and other partners, including 1.5 million as a starting fund in the near future,
 - Dr. Nagi mentioned some courses offered by faculty from different departments are duplicated, so there could be some savings that can be done there, and Dr. El-Rewini is working on this. Following that, I asked Dr. Nagi whether he thinks some of our administrative positions are duplicating/overlapping. He answers that he is not sure.
- Discussion
 - Leah asked why the medical school program is a DO instead of an MD.
 - Ken said that this is pretty normal for the U.S. Graduates from both kinds of programs go into the same residency matches, and they're both eligible for all similar residencies. Broadly speaking, there tends to be a preference for primary care (and therefore DOs). Older, established med schools might focus on MDs, but these days the DO programs grow faster/more. DO programs are more focused toward primary care and would also position us as being less in direct competition against OHSU.
 - Yuehai added that we're potentially getting so much support for this idea because we're in a rural area, and there is so much need around here for more rural medicine practitioners.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

Report of the Vice President – Ashton Greer

- Academic Council hasn't met since last month, so there is no report.
- Discussion
 - There was no discussion.

Reports of the ASOIT Delegates

Report of the Klamath Falls Delegate – Heather Ritter

- President's Council made changes to the Student Evaluation Policy (OIT-21-035). The new version is more detailed, with added definitions. Now, evaluations are conducted every term and across all course formats.
 - There are still concerns about students who have dropped the course after the tuition refund date and therefore can't evaluate their instructor (but should be able to). Currently, ASOIT is working with administration to streamline this process.
- Discussion
 - Kari asked about KF-ASOIT sending out a document about the Senate Resolution On Recent Federal Executive Orders, but Uriel clarified that that was actually PM-ASOIT that wrote and presented an Open Letter, and that their Open Letter can be found on their website.

Report of the Portland-Metro Delegate – Bryce Wilson

- Bryce reported that during the last Parliament meeting, the student body voted on incidental fees. Twenty-plus students showed up. Overall, the vote came down to increasing the fee by \$212. This will give SIB, student clubs, and PM-ASOIT's budget more money to work with.
- They also discussed increasing health fees. PM-ASOIT had agreed on increasing them by 12%. This raised the fees from \$189 to \$212.
- PM-ASOIT is getting ready for the next Parliament meeting this Thursday.
- Last Tuesday, PM-ASOIT held an open forum for the Tuition Recommendation Committee (TRC). There was a great turnout with students and faculty attending. This helped narrow things down to a good set of recommendations.
- The TRC voted today to recommend a 4% tuition increase with the possibility of increasing it to 4.5% if necessary later.
- Health fee increases for both campuses were voted on and approved: a 7% increase for KF (from \$585 to \$626) and the already-mentioned 12% increase for PM.
- PM-ASOIT met with Dean Alp, and she got back to them with some really helpful feedback.
 - He mentioned a few of the issues:
 - Scheduling
 - Outdated teaching materials
 - Lab equipment
 - Dean Alp will be investigating these, but warned that it might take awhile to fix them all.
 - Out of all student concerns, the lab equipment concerns would be the easiest to fix quickly. The hope is to send lab managers from KF to PM regularly to help address problems with lab equipment.
- Tomorrow, PM-ASOIT will be going over the faculty CBA with Beverly McCreary so that they can better understand it.
- Bryce said everyone was very pleased to see the Faculty Senate's Resolution On Recent Federal Executive Orders. It's been posted in all the bathrooms.
- Discussion

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- There was no discussion.

Report of the Administrative Council Delegate – Carl Agrifoglio

- Admin Council met on February 19th. It was an abbreviated meeting.
 - New staff were introduced.
 - This month's department spotlight was on Educational Partnership and Outreach (EPO). Carleen Starr came in and talked about what her department does.
 - Kudos award this month went to Chad Maddox, and all of Facilities' grounds crews.
 - This award was specifically for the grounds crews dealing with all of the snow on the KF campus during the recent snowstorm(s).
- Discussion
 - Matt asked how much work the grounds crews put in during the Snow Week.
 - Carl said that they were on campus all week even though campus was closed, and that they were working overtime. They come in very early!
 - Matt said that we all appreciate the effort and that they did an excellent job.
 - Vanessa shared that the crews also put in a lot of time during that week to clear things out for sporting events.
 - Ken shared that while our own grounds crews did a lot of work, they also contracted with local roofing contractors to clear the snow off of the building roofs.
 - Cristina asked about the EPO report: was there any mention of how many students they support in that program?
 - Carl said yes: he can provide that number but doesn't have it immediately accessible.
 - Cristina asked Carl to forward that number to me so that I could include it in the April Senate packet. (**Secretary's Note:** As of the writing of these minutes, I haven't received this information from Admin Council.)
 - Carl said that he does know that the program had record numbers of high school students enrolled. EPO has also been trying to limit the cost to the university as far as support goes. The idea is that in the future, high school students will have to be more proactive when it comes to getting registered.
 - Cristina explained that that's why she's hoping to get the numbers on how many students the program supports: more students equals more support needed.

Reports of the Standing Committees

Faculty Policy Committee – Ken Usher/Matt Schnackenberg

- Matt reported that FPC is still working on the Faculty Evaluation Policy.
- Since the last Senate meeting, they've gotten feedback from Beverley and the Provost. They hope to have a final draft ready for the Senate to look at by the April Senate meeting.
- Ken then said that among other things, they're making sure that non-policy "attached documents" like the FOP and APE forms match up with the changes being made to the proper policy.
- The committee just met to discuss the process of Indefinite Tenure Review. Ken and Matt had done some previous work on this over the summer, and they recently returned to those initial comments and used them to clean up their previous draft. They brought this to the full committee and got everyone up to speed.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

They'd like to align the Indefinite Tenure Review Policy criteria that evaluate instruction, service, and professional development with the wording in the recently revised Promotion Policy. If the criteria in each of these two policies are meant to be the same, they should read the same. The committee was in favor of this approach.

- The Willingness To Cooperate and Professional Integrity requirements for tenure are being revisited to make sure that what we're asking for there can be meaningfully assessed (for legal reasons). These will be revisited in more detail "on an upcoming date."
- They're looking into changing the tenure and promotion processes so that both of them happen during the same term, because they're already really similar and this could make things more efficient.
 - Matt asked for the Senate's thoughts on this change, which effectively ended the committee's report and began discussion.
- Discussion
 - Matt suggested that in theory making the tenure and promotion processes happen in parallel could make the process take only one term instead of two terms, though he then also suggested that maybe there is an advantage to the process taking two terms.
 - Ken pointed out that tenure review doesn't have college- or university-level faculty evaluation but promotion does. He said that having faculty involved more in both processes would actually be good.
 - Matt spoke in favor of there being more faculty involvement.
 - Ken said, too, that this would minimize a department-level faculty committee's ability to let their bias in favor of (or against) their close colleague dominate the conversation about their fitness for tenure.
 - Christy VanRooyen said that she'd be in support of combining both processes to make the whole thing less work for the candidate but also get them more input from more faculty at the same time.
 - Yuehai asked if we're comfortable with tenure becoming a university-wide decision (as promotion currently is).
 - Matt acknowledged that this is a tough question, with both upsides and downsides. It might make the decision more objective, but it also makes it less of a departmental decision.
 - David Hammond said that he'd be in favor of combining these two processes. Having been on a number of these committees at this point, he sees it as a duplication of work.
 - Matt said that the process as-is feels a little bit like double jeopardy: if you make it through tenure shouldn't you make it through promotion?
 - David pointed out that occasionally this *does* happen (that faculty get tenure but not promotion).
 - Matt said that these edge cases came up during the committee discussion. It doesn't happen very often, but it definitely happens.
 - Ken suggested that sometimes when this happens it might well be the department deciding on tenure based on their close knowledge of the candidate and the college- and university-level committees deciding without that knowledge.
 - I also spoke very briefly in favor of combining the two processes.
 - Christy said that really clearly identifying the criteria within both processes would make it less likely that a "split decision" could be made in the future.
 - Matt said that after the recent revisions of the promotion process, there is a lot more interaction between the different levels of evaluation. This makes the process more iterative throughout its steps.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- Ken said that the promotion process *is* more iterative now, but it also requires much more justification at each step, which is helpful.
 - Beverly added that there's supposed to also be individual assessment at each level. There are multiple "vantage points" throughout the process that take into account what's previously been said, but also put forth their own input.
 - Cristina said that she strongly supports bringing "attachments" (like the ones Matt mentioned previously) into the Faculty Evaluation Policy (like the APE and FOP forms, for example). These changes should be brought in front of the Senate even if they aren't *technically* policy. She pointed out that those forms have been changed before without Senate review to the detriment of the faculty.
 - She then said that she wants to see more data from universities who already combine the tenure and promotion processes to see how that combination actually works. Just because other universities do both together doesn't mean that it works well.
 - Finally, she said that she's encountered faculty who felt that they didn't have a good process to appeal promotion decisions. If we make changes (To the tenure process? To the promotion process?), we should make a more robust appeal process part of those changes.
 - Ken agreed with this third and last concern, but also recognized that not everyone who wants to appeal has a good case. He added that the new promotion process is much more transparent and makes appealing more meaningful and easier than the previous version. There is not a way to stop the appeals process midway in the new version of the policy, even if recommendations wind up going against the candidate. The candidate has an opportunity to respond in writing to any of the previous recommendations at the university-committee level. Ken suggested that those changes (to the appeal process) should perhaps be introduced into the tenure policy/process as well.
 - Vanessa asked about the possibility of streamlining the portfolio requirements for post-tenure review in the future.
 - Ken said that they haven't opened that can of worms yet, and Vanessa asked that it just be considered in the future.

Academic Standards Committee – Christy VanRooyen

- Christy said that the committee currently has no active charges, but she wants to follow up on some things in her report.
- First, she spoke with the Registrar's Office about what happened with the summer term recommendations that the committee made last year. What she learned was that the switch to ten week terms conflicted with some contractual obligations under the CBA: faculty who have extern programs and/or clinical programs were affected in particular, and so it was switched back to eight weeks. If we are interested in changing this, we'll have to "restart that process."
 - Vanessa asked how this was changed back after the Senate approved the original changes last year. Standards was originally given the charge from Dr. Nagi, completed it, and the changes were (supposedly) made. Now it's changed back (to eight weeks) without consultation with the Senate. There wasn't really a good answer provided here.
 - Ken pointed out that we can pass a recommendation, but the President doesn't necessarily have to follow it.
 - Vanessa pointed out that representatives of the Registrar's Office were on the committee that completed the original charge, and so she is confused by the recommendation being rejected.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- Christy responded that she can't speak to how the decision was made to switch back, just that that's the change that was reported.
- Christy next said that she's gotten word that there might be a posthumous degree awarding policy coming soon. It was recommended by Dr. Nagi. Wendy in the Registrar's Office was charged with helping to write that policy. She has already shared a draft with Christy. Eventually, it might come to the Standards Committee in a formal sense, and if so they will bring it to Senate.
- Finally, Christy reported that when Nate Bickford was Dean, he'd asked Standards to look at the graduation requirement for residency (forty-five credits). Nate was particularly concerned with online degree completion programs and how that requirement might make those programs unnecessarily difficult to complete. Christy's been meeting with people who are involved in those programs and will be meeting with Online as well. Once all the relevant data has been collected, the committee will look more into the request.
- Discussion
 - Riley asked if the summer term now has to be the same for everyone, or are there still other options (like the one week or four week options that were discussed last year).
 - Christy said that we still have some flexibility; however, the week-long courses don't play nice with Financial Aid's requirement for a minimum amount of time needed to provide a drop date notice, so that doesn't really work. She then said that the four week option might still be possible. Overall, Wendy is willing to work with people, but there are legal requirements that have to be taken into account (as she mentioned earlier).
 - Cristina echoed the importance of flexibility when it comes to summer term, and pointed out that other schools have certainly dealt with these issues before and found ways to make it work.
 - Vanessa commented that last year, the committee looked a lot at what other universities did. Those universities faced a lot of these same restrictions. She reiterated the idea that the Registrar's Office was flexible and will try to help and make things work.
 - Ken asked Christy if her committee would be considering the financial impact to the university if the degree completion credit requirement was lowered.
 - Christy said that that's part of the data that she's trying to collect. She's also trying to find out how many students actually leave because they don't want to (or can't) fulfill that requirement.
 - Ken responded that we of course want to award degrees (in part because part of our funding formula is dependent on that). Does that incentive also apply to our degree completion students?
 - Christy said that from what she's seen, many of our degree completion students are from out of state, so likely not in most cases.

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

- Chitra reported that she and Jessica looked around at other universities to see what they were doing in response to some of the concerns raised during the last Faculty Senate meeting. She already sent a document to Yuehai and Kari summarizing the results of that work. Ultimately, Chitra used three documents to present her report, which was a summary of the contents of each:
 - A summary of continuing DEI efforts among universities in the pacific northwest as of February. This document has been included in the packet as **page 28** for your reference.
 - An explanation of the committee's arguments for the continued need for DEI initiatives and objectives. This document has been included in the packet as **pages 29-30** for your reference.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- A proposed faculty retention survey built off of the information gathered and discussed during the creation of the previous two documents. This document has been included in the packet as **pages 31-32** for your reference.
 - Because Chitra didn't read from these three documents completely verbatim, I have included them in the packet as separate documents rather than pasting them in the body of the minutes. The page numbers for each document have already been listed above.
- In summary, Chitra reported that “nobody has stopped doing DEI work so far.” She pointed out that we also haven't received any instruction from management regarding their DEI work, so they continue to do that work.
- Chitra recalled Jessica's report during the previous Senate meeting about the University of Michigan's ADVANCE Program. She said that this program was chosen as an example because it coincides with our culture.
- In an effort to improve on faculty retention as it relates to DEI, the committee has been working on a survey that will allow them to collect data (this is the survey indexed above). The committee would like the Senate's feedback on the survey questions, as well as ideas for where the committee should go from here with the survey more generally.
- Yuehai asked if Jessica had anything to add, and Jessica said no.
- Yuehai next asked if there were any questions for Chitra, and there were no questions.
- Yuehai then offered to include the rationale and survey results in the April Senate packet. (**Secretary's Note:** These are the same documents that are indexed above. SenEx has not yet received any results from the survey.)
- Discussion
 - Yuehai introduced Kari here to make a brief announcement about DEI efforts currently taking place on the Klamath Falls campus.
 - Kari brought up the idea of coming up with a way to “work across all levels of the university” toward equity in the name of acting on last month's Senate Resolution On Recent Executive Orders. She has explored a number of possibilities and venues for this, and recently Jennifer Wilson suggested that we could have a subcommittee beneath the DICE Steering Committee to link this effort into the existing university infrastructure. This subcommittee could serve the purposes of resource sharing and information sharing.
 - Vanessa asked if Kari is inviting people who are interested to volunteer to be involved, and Kari said “Yes, maybe.” It's dependent on what the group eventually becomes, but she ultimately encouraged people to speak up if they want to be included.
 - Matt asked if Jennifer is meeting with other DEI people across the state. Kari said that she is “hooked in.”
 - Matt mentioned that it will help to have more resources to help us stay informed since this particular issue is “a moving target” right now.
 - Yuehai clarified that the potential subcommittee that Kari was describing would be a subcommittee under the DICE Steering Committee, and would not be a Senate committee.

Reports of Special or Ad Hoc Committees

Ad Hoc AI Committee — Christy VanRooyen

- Christy reported that the committee has met a few times since the last Senate meeting.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- They've come up with a draft of the policy, and it's gone out to "select groups" already. These groups include: some writing professors from the Communications department, ASOIT (both campuses), and Dave Groff. Once the committee receives feedback from these groups, they intend to present an updated draft to Senate. She estimated that this would happen by early next term.
- Discussion
 - Matt asked if this is a policy or a set of guidelines.
 - Christy said that we really need both, but currently the focus is on generating a policy only. Developing guidelines will hopefully happen in the future and would likely involve more groups and more input; it's a bigger project beyond the scope of what this committee can do alone.
 - She also said that the draft policy is similar to what other universities are currently doing, but lots of other universities are also generating guides or guidelines.

Unfinished Business

- There was no unfinished business.

New Business

- There was no new business.

Report of the Provost – Hesham El-Rewini

- The Provost had already left for the night by this point, so there was no report beyond what he reported about faculty hiring earlier on in the meeting.
- Discussion
 - In place of a report, Yuehai instead asked the Deans if there is anything to add about the faculty hiring process and progress on that front.
 - Dr. Alp said that everything is moving, and she is pleased with the meetings she's had recently with the Provost. She hopes that we'll have thirty-five new faculty soon.
 - Dean Seabert echoed this: they had a great meeting about this last week and are moving ahead on things.
 - Yuehai asked Dr. Alp about eight currently-unposted ETM positions that he's aware of: what's going on there?
 - Dr. Alp said that they're currently working on those position descriptions now, so they aren't posted yet, but they will be soon.
 - Riley asked for a status update on the Construction Management Program.
 - Dr. Alp said that the Director position search failed last year. The search for that position is currently being reopened. It's not posted yet, but it will be soon. Their hope is to get a Director soon, because the program is going to start in the fall. Dr. Alp also clarified that there is staffing to cover the first year of the program.

Report of the President's Council Delegate – Yuehai Yang

- The full text of Yuehai's report is pasted below. If there were any deviations from the content of the report as it was being delivered (questions, related discussion, etc.), that has been added inline by the Secretary. Any discussion that occurred after the report is included below the pasted report starting with a new top-level bullet:

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- 2 interim policies OIT-30-002 Campus speech activity and 01-020 The proscribed conduct policies have been discussed, debated and passed. A few languages have been updated, and a few concerns from faculty have been clarified or validated. I would like to thank SenEx and other faculty, Matt, Ken, Cristina, and others who provided input to these 2 interim policies.
 - The proscribed conduct: Most of the languages in this one are from an old Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR), and UO has adopted these languages too. The only concern is raised by faculty who feel some of the language was targeting student protestors, who might use un-residential areas on campus for residential purposes, for example, encampments. VP Harman confirms that this adopted language is to prevent encampment from happening at Oregon Tech campus.
 - Campus speech: A few update/clarifications -- “Differences and dissenting viewpoints are not only tolerated but welcomed as part of the educational and shared governance processes” was updated. “All buildings and spaces not included in the list above (prohibited areas) are open to speech activities” was not added but confirmed to be true by the General Council and by the PC. The term “content neutral” is confirmed to be the exact same definition by laws (Including first amendment) that is related to free speech AND “content neutrality”.
- Mar. 4th :
 - OIT-21-035 Student Evaluation of Instruction was passed by PC today. One of the main concerns/discussions was raised about whether students should be able to evaluate faculty when they have decided to drop the class. Eventually, the council decided that students who dropped the class should have some venue to express their reason/concern about the faculty’s teaching method, but the student evaluation might NOT be the best venue to do this. Other possible ways should include letting students know that they can approach the department chair/or dean to express their concerns and reason for dropping out (some students apparently don’t know about this), or there can be a quick exit survey question asking the student to provide a brief reason for dropping the course. Student representative in PM campus also expressed their difficulty in reaching out to the chairs/deans remotely from Wilsonville.
 - A 32 year old AIDS policy, oit-30-040, has been rescinded today since the guideline in it is out of date, and the related guideline has already been updated and included the current infectious diseases-related policies.
- Discussion
 - Ken asked if it would be possible to have students who drop a class provide a rationale for why they dropped in addition to giving input on the class and its instructor(s). He then asked where that rationale (and, presumably, the student’s comments on the course and its instructor(s)) would go. He’s not sure what the Registrar would do with that information, and really it should come back to the faculty member and/or their immediate supervisor, but that might be difficult.
 - Linus Yu said that having students give input (and presumably rationale for dropping, too) in this way is possible according to Wendy. However, this raises a concern about a potential privacy issue: if only one student in the course drops, then it would be obvious who the feedback came from. It is important, though, because this would give students a voice where they might not otherwise have one (especially in PM).
 - Ken asked: once this information is collected by the Registrar’s Office, where would it go from there?
 - Linus answered that they don’t quite know yet because of the aforementioned privacy concern, but they’re still talking about it.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- Next, Yuehai asked if Heather (from KF-ASOIT) had any other input or questions, and she said that Ken had already raised most of the students' main concerns.
 - She did suggest that the current Student Evaluation form could be included in the documentation that students fill out when they drop a class, and then that evaluation information could be sent to the Registrar's Office.
 - Linus reiterated that this matter is still at the early discussion stage, so there aren't any concrete details on how this process will work yet.

Report of the IFS Representatives – Cristina Negoita and David Hammond

- The full text of David and Cristina's report is pasted below. If there were any deviations from the content of the report as it was being delivered (questions, related discussion, etc.), that has been added inline by the Secretary. Any discussion that occurred after the report is included below the pasted report starting with a new top-level bullet:
 - IFS held a virtual meeting on Feb 27, 9am to noon.
 - Prior to this meeting, each school's IFS representatives were asked to meet with their respective Government Relations staff, and in particular ask about pending legislative bills that could impact higher ed.
 - Among IFS representatives there was a discussion about HB 3213, which would require more financial disclosures from public university foundations. This bill is generally supported by faculty unions, but not supported by university administrations.
 - Several universities government relations are lobbying in favor of HB 3182 and HB 3183, which would fund student basic needs and support promoting open educational resources. We also briefly discussed HB 2841, which would require 65% of all community college and public university courses to be taught by full-time employees.
 - IFS then heard directly from Katie Fast, from OSU government relations. She described a set of legislative priorities that the Oregon Council of Presidents (OCOP) is lobbying for. These included 1.275B for the public university support fund (a +275M increase from last biennium), 358 M for the "oregon opportunity grant", 7-9 M for Strong Start funding, and 22M for "student basic needs" in HB 3182 and HB 3183. OCOP is also lobbying in support of HB 3011 and HB 3129, which would fund early childhood education degree programs and behavioral health workforce development, respectively. Katie Fast shared the sense that the legislature may want to adopt a conservative budget overall, especially in light of the uncertainty at the federal level, and as to whether potential Medicare cuts at the federal level would stress the Oregon state budget.
 - IFS heard from Scott Vignas, the chief diversity officer at OSU. He shared that his team is "surfing the wave of news" from the federal government. His office is encouraging researchers not to "anticipatorily comply" with executive orders. There was a discussion of impacts due to executive orders changing the allowed indirect costs for federal research grants, which has a large and disproportional effect on OHSU, UO and OSU, with more limited impacts on other public universities that do not receive as much federal research grant funding.
 - IFS discussed amending its bylaws so that the vice president, when elected, would also be the "president elect" and assume the role of president the following year. IFS formed three workgroups : a legislative agenda response group, a sanctuary campuses group, and a "toolkit" group charged with writing down processes and documentation for how IFS carries out business and interacts with the HECC.
 - IFS did not take time for verbal campus updates, however campus updates were collected prior to the meeting on a shared document, and are summarized below:

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

- EOU :
 - There is a proposal to move the withdrawal deadline from week 7 to week 10. EOU is reviewing its OPM (online program manager) contract, to decide whether or not to continue with the current contract.
- OHSU :
 - The school is struggling to deal with effects of many federal executive orders, including issues with NIH funding. OHSU has activated its incident command center to handle these issues. The merger with legacy is proceeding as planned. Crisis support signage promoting awareness of the 988 crisis number is being placed around campus as part of an ongoing suicide prevention initiative.
- OIT :
 - Faculty union and University have begun bargaining. New provost Heshan El-Rewini has begun working at OIT. OIT is still searching for a HAS dean. We have an interim dean : Denise Seabert. KF campus missed an entire week of school due to snow. There is a push to reduce DFWI rates, coming from administration. ASOIT students have written an open letter to the OIT president, expressing concerns over actions of president Trump on the OIT student body. Faculty senate has also begun drafting a letter of support for faculty, students, and staff relative to president Trump's new executive orders. OIT revenue for 2024-2025 is 4M higher than originally budgeted.
- OSU:
 - Faculty union has submitted paperwork to move to mediation. The negotiations have been ongoing for over a year. An interim Provost, Belinda Batten, was announced and will begin in April. The search process has started and expecting to have final candidates to interview in May. All units/colleges are being asked to consider a 3%, 5%, and 7% budget reduction.
- PSU:
 - The PSU faculty union has declared impasse and is moving steadily toward a strike. There have been layoffs of 17 faculty members with 13 active grievances regarding layoffs and notice of layoffs. The PSU faculty senate passed a resolution of no confidence in the program revitalization process.
- (SOU, UO and WOU did not submit campus updates)
- Cristina shared that the U of O Faculty Senate is organizing a “teach-in” tomorrow on the sanctuary laws in Oregon. She also said that there’s almost four hundred bills flying around the state legislature, so it’s hard to track anything currently.
- Discussion
 - There was no discussion.

Report of the FOAC Representative – Ashton Greer

- Ashton said that FOAC hasn’t met since the last Senate meeting. There is a meeting coming up on March 19th, which will include the VPs of all of the divisions.
- Discussion
 - There was no discussion.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – March 4, 2025

Open Floor

Linus Yu

- Linus encouraged everyone to give feedback on the Academic Standing Policy language changes. Everyone has been emailed the Q&A along with the updated language for their reference.
- CPC is going to update the curriculum change process. They're looking to simplify the process, specifically by reducing the number of forms needed for different changes. Currently, the budget for certain changes has to be approved at a very early stage. Now, they want to change things so that the approval to proceed comes first, and after the changes are approved, only then would faculty worry about working through any budgetary issues. Linus encouraged faculty to reach out with feedback about these in-process changes.
- Discussion
 - There was no discussion.

Yuehai Yang

- Thanked everyone for coming and staying throughout this long meeting, which is the last one of this term. He appreciates everyone's work this term. We will next meet in the spring term, on April 6th. **(Secretary's Note:** This was incorrect; the April meeting was originally scheduled for April 1st and has since been moved to April 8th.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:16pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Bunting, Secretary



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

THE ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY

February 14, 2025

Dear Colleague:

Discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin is illegal and morally reprehensible. Accordingly, I write to clarify and reaffirm the nondiscrimination obligations of schools and other entities that receive federal financial assistance from the United States Department of Education (Department).¹ This letter explains and reiterates existing legal requirements under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,² the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution, and other relevant authorities.³

In recent years, American educational institutions have discriminated against students on the basis of race, including white and Asian students, many of whom come from disadvantaged backgrounds and low-income families. These institutions' embrace of pervasive and repugnant race-based preferences and other forms of racial discrimination have emanated throughout every facet of academia. For example, colleges, universities, and K-12 schools have routinely used race as a factor in admissions, financial aid, hiring, training, and other institutional programming. In a shameful echo of a darker period in this country's history, many American schools and universities even encourage segregation by race at graduation ceremonies and in dormitories and other facilities.

¹ Throughout this letter, "school" is used generally to refer to preschool, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educational institutions that receive federal financial assistance from the Department.

² Title VI provides that: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, *et seq.*; 34 C.F.R. § 100, *et seq.*

³ This document provides significant guidance under the Office of Management and Budget's Final Bulletin for Agency Good Guidance Practices, 72 Fed. Reg. 3432 (Jan. 25, 2007). This guidance does not have the force and effect of law and does not bind the public or create new legal standards. This document is designed to provide clarity to the public regarding existing legal requirements under Title VI, the Equal Protection Clause, and other federal civil rights and constitutional law principles. If you are interested in commenting on this guidance, please email your comment to OCR@ed.gov or write to the following address: Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. For further information about the Department's guidance processes, please visit the Department's webpage [here](https://www.ed.gov/ocr).

Educational institutions have toxically indoctrinated students with the false premise that the United States is built upon “systemic and structural racism” and advanced discriminatory policies and practices. Proponents of these discriminatory practices have attempted to further justify them—particularly during the last four years—under the banner of “diversity, equity, and inclusion” (“DEI”), smuggling racial stereotypes and explicit race-consciousness into everyday training, programming, and discipline.

But under any banner, discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin is, has been, and will continue to be illegal.

The Supreme Court’s 2023 decision in *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*⁴ (*SFFA*), which clarified that the use of racial preferences in college admissions is unlawful, sets forth a framework for evaluating the use of race by state actors and entities covered by Title VI. The Court explained that “[c]lassifying and assigning students based on their race” is lawful only if it satisfies “strict scrutiny,” which means that any use of race must be narrowly tailored—that is, “necessary”—to achieve a compelling interest.⁵ To date, the Supreme Court has recognized only two interests as compelling in the context of race-based action: (1) “remediating specific, identified instances of past discrimination that violated the Constitution or a statute”; and (2) “avoiding imminent and serious risks to human safety in prisons, such as a race riot.”⁶ Nebulous concepts like racial balancing and diversity are not compelling interests. As the Court explained in *SFFA*, “an individual’s race may never be used against him” and “may not operate as a stereotype” in governmental decision-making.⁷

Although *SFFA* addressed admissions decisions, the Supreme Court’s holding applies more broadly. At its core, the test is simple: If an educational institution treats a person of one race differently than it treats another person because of that person’s race, the educational institution violates the law. Federal law thus prohibits covered entities from using race in decisions pertaining to admissions, hiring, promotion, compensation, financial aid, scholarships, prizes, administrative support, discipline, housing, graduation ceremonies, and all other aspects of student, academic, and campus life. Put simply, educational institutions may neither separate or segregate students based on race, nor distribute benefits or burdens based on race.

Although some programs may appear neutral on their face, a closer look reveals that they are, in fact, motivated by racial considerations.⁸ And race-based decision-making, no matter the form, remains impermissible. For example, a school may not use students’ personal essays, writing samples, participation in extracurriculars, or other cues as a

⁴ *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harvard Coll.*, 600 U.S. 181 (2023).

⁵ *Id.* at 207.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Id.* at 218.

⁸ *Village of Arlington Heights v. Metro. Hous. Dev. Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252, 265 (1977).

means of determining or predicting a student's race and favoring or disfavoring such students.⁹

Relying on non-racial information as a proxy for race, and making decisions based on that information, violates the law. That is true whether the proxies are used to grant preferences on an individual basis or a systematic one. It would, for instance, be unlawful for an educational institution to eliminate standardized testing to achieve a desired racial balance or to increase racial diversity.

Other programs discriminate in less direct, but equally insidious, ways. DEI programs, for example, frequently preference certain racial groups and teach students that certain racial groups bear unique moral burdens that others do not. Such programs stigmatize students who belong to particular racial groups based on crude racial stereotypes. Consequently, they deny students the ability to participate fully in the life of a school.

The Department will no longer tolerate the overt and covert racial discrimination that has become widespread in this Nation's educational institutions. The law is clear: treating students differently on the basis of race to achieve nebulous goals such as diversity, racial balancing, social justice, or equity is illegal under controlling Supreme Court precedent.

All students are entitled to a school environment free from discrimination. The Department is committed to ensuring those principles are a reality.

This letter provides notice of the Department's existing interpretation of federal law. Additional legal guidance will follow in due course. The Department will vigorously enforce the law on equal terms as to all preschool, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educational institutions, as well as state educational agencies, that receive financial assistance.

The Department intends to take appropriate measures to assess compliance with the applicable statutes and regulations based on the understanding embodied in this letter beginning no later than 14 days from today's date, including antidiscrimination requirements that are a condition of receiving federal funding.

All educational institutions are advised to: (1) ensure that their policies and actions comply with existing civil rights law; (2) cease all efforts to circumvent prohibitions on the use of race by relying on proxies or other indirect means to accomplish such ends; and (3) cease all reliance on third-party contractors, clearinghouses, or aggregators that are being used by institutions in an effort to circumvent prohibited uses of race.

⁹ *Students for Fair Admissions*, 600 U.S. at 230 (“[U]niversities may not simply establish through application essays or other means the regime we hold unlawful today.”).

Institutions that fail to comply with federal civil rights law may, consistent with applicable law, face potential loss of federal funding.

Anyone who believes that a covered entity has unlawfully discriminated may file a complaint with OCR. Information about filing a complaint with OCR, including a link to the online complaint form, is available [here](#).

Thank you in advance for your commitment to providing our Nation's students with an educational environment that is free of race, color, or national origin discrimination.

Sincerely,

/s/

Craig Trainor
Acting Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
United States Department of Education

Hello,

Dr. Nagi asked me to follow up with you on our number of PELL grant recipients. For the current year, we have a little over 1,000 students. When we look at numbers, we look at matriculated degree-seeking students; we exclude non-admits, etc.

Please let me know if you have other questions.

2023	926	disbursed	\$4,625,835
2022	932		\$4,316,442
2021	1053		\$4,516,170

Tracey

HAS

Total Position No.	College Position No.	Dept./Area	Position Type	Status	Campus
1	1	ABA	Asst. Prof.	Finalizing offer	KF
2	2	Chem	Asst. Prof.		KF
3	3	COMM	Asst. Prof.	Accepted	KF
4	4	COMM	Visiting Ins.	Accepted	KF
5	5	DPT	Asst. Prof.	Accepted	KF
6	6	DPT	Asst. Prof.		KF
7	7	EMS	Asst. Prof.	Accepted	PM
8	8	EMS	Chair		KF
9	9	MATH	Chair		KF
10	10	MFT	Visiting	Interviewing	KF
11	11	MFT	Asst. Prof.		KF
12	12	MIT	Instructor	Failed	KF
13	13	MIT	Instructor/Asst. Prof.		KF
14	14	MIT	Chair		KF
15	15	MIT	Instructor/Asst. Prof.		KF
16	16	MIT	Instructor/Asst. Prof.		KF
17	17	Psych	Asst. Prof.		KF
18	18	Psych	Asst. Prof.		KF
19	19	Resp. Care	Asst. Prof.	Accepted	PM
Total Position No.	College Position No.	Dept./Area	Position Type	Status	Campus
20	1	ACG	Asst. Prof. (surveying)		KF
21	2	ACG	Asst. Prof.		AC
22	3	CSET	Instructor	Accepted	
23	4	CSET	Asst./Assoc.		
24	5	EERE	Asst. Prof.		PM
25	6	EERE	Asst. Prof.		KF
26	7	EERE	Asst. Prof.		KF
27	8	MGT	Visiting Ins.	Accepted	
28	9	MGT	Associate Prof.	Accepted	
29	10	MGT	Instructor (IT)	Accepted	PM
30	11	MGT	Associate Prof. (cyber se	Interviews on goi	KF
31	12	MGT	Chair		KF
32	13	MGT	Director Construction Mgmt.		KF
33	14	MGT	Instructor (IT)		KF
34	15	MMET	Chair	Accepted	
35	16	MMET	Associate Prof.	Accepted	
36	17	MMET	Asst./Assoc.		

ETM

As of February 2025, institutions of higher education in the Pacific Northwest continue to prioritize Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiatives, underscoring their commitment to fostering inclusive and equitable campus environments.

In Oregon, universities have reaffirmed their dedication to DEI programs despite external pressures to reduce such initiatives. Officials from the state's three largest universities (**Oregon State, Portland State, University of Oregon**) have stated they have no plans to alter or discontinue their DEI efforts, which encompass managing cultural centers, ensuring diversity in hiring, and developing training to promote inclusiveness. [axios.com](https://www.axios.com)

Portland State University's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences houses several academic programs focusing on the study of race, ethnicity, indigeneity, language, religion, gender, and sexuality, reflecting its commitment to DEI. pdx.edu

Lewis & Clark College aims to create an institutional culture of belonging, where all community members can fully participate, teach, lead, grow, and critically engage in a dynamic global world. lclark.edu

The **University of Washington**'s College of Engineering is actively implementing a multi-year DEI strategic plan. In the 2024-2025 academic year, the college is deploying the Community Conversations initiative across academic departments and administrative units. Additionally, they continue to provide training on topics such as microaggressions, anti-racism, gender identity, conflict resolution, and discourse engagement, while expanding the adoption of an integrated DEI structure within departments. enr.washington.edu

The Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW) comprises over twenty departments dedicated to supporting diverse student populations. Among these are nine diversity commissions focusing on various identity-based groups, including the American Indian Student Commission, Asian Student Commission, Black Student Commission, Student Disability Commission, Queer Student Commission, Middle Eastern Student Commission, Latine Student Commission, Pacific Islander Student Commission, and Gender Equity Commission. These commissions plan events and programming tailored to their respective constituencies, fostering an inclusive campus environment. en.wikipedia.org

At **Pacific University**, the College of Business has been recognized for its leadership in diversity and inclusion within higher education. The university remains committed to promoting equal opportunity by eliminating all forms of discrimination through robust compliance practices and initiatives that embrace global perspectives among faculty, staff, and students. pacificu.edu

Rationale: The need for DEI initiatives and objectives

Accreditation standards from organizations like the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) increasingly emphasize diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) as part of institutional quality assurance and mission fulfillment.

1. Higher Learning Commission (HLC):

- HLC integrates DEI into its criteria, especially under its Mission and Integrity components. Institutions are expected to demonstrate how their mission aligns with fostering an inclusive, diverse community and how they serve the public good in a multicultural and globally connected society. HLC's Peer Corps Diversity Initiative also works to ensure its reviewers reflect the diversity of the populations served by member institutions

[Higher Learning Commission](#)

[Insight Into Diversity](#)

2. Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE):

- The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) is a global institutional accreditor recognized by the United States Secretary of Education since 1952. As an accreditor and member of the regulatory triad, MSCHE assures students and the public of the educational quality for its over 500 institutions of higher education. The Commission's accreditation process ensures institutional accountability, self-appraisal, improvement, and innovation through peer review and the rigorous application of standards within the context of institutional mission.
- MSCHE has explicitly embedded DEI as a guiding principle across all its accreditation standards. Institutions are encouraged to assess and address DEI in areas such as mission goals, student demographics, curriculum, and resource allocation. MSCHE requires institutions to reflect on disparities, use disaggregated data to identify gaps, and develop strategies to enhance equity and inclusion efforts

[MSCHE](#)

3. Other Developments in Accreditation Standards:

- Some regional accreditors like the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) have developed robust DEI requirements. These standards focus on closing achievement gaps, promoting equity, and using data-driven approaches to improve educational outcomes for diverse populations

[Insight Into Diversity](#)

Overall, while standards vary among accrediting bodies, there is a growing trend toward integrating DEI into accreditation processes. These requirements often motivate institutions to establish or enhance DEI committees and initiatives to meet these evolving standards.

Northwest Commission on College and Universities (NWCCU)

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) has integrated Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) into its accreditation standards and organizational practices to promote equitable student success and institutional effectiveness.

Accreditation Standards:

- **Standard One – Student Success, and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness:** Institutions must demonstrate a commitment to student success for all students, focusing on equity and closing achievement gaps. This includes setting meaningful goals and indicators to define mission fulfillment and improve effectiveness, with an emphasis on underrepresented and first-generation college students.

Organizational Commitment:

- **Ethics and DEI Statement:** Adopted in June 2022, this statement underscores NWCCU's dedication to the highest ethical standards and the promotion of DEI within the organization and among member institutions. It emphasizes integrity, respect, and the establishment of a diverse workforce reflective of its membership.

Initiatives and Programs:

- **Data Equity Fellowship:** This program bridges data and equity roles, focusing on collaboration across institutional departments to advance equity goals. Fellows work on projects aimed at improving equitable outcomes, guided by national experts in data equity and DEI.
- **Quality Culture Project:** NWCCU promotes inclusive leadership models as best practices to support DEI in higher education. This approach encourages open communication and collaborative decision-making to address equity gaps and foster transformative evaluation.

Through these standards and initiatives, NWCCU aims to ensure that member institutions not only comply with accreditation requirements but also actively contribute to creating inclusive and equitable educational environments.

Faculty Retention Survey Questions

Institutional Commitment to DEI

1. Does the institution demonstrate a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion?
2. Do you believe the leadership actively promotes DEI initiatives?
3. Have you received adequate information about the institution's DEI policies and programs?
4. Do you feel that the institution takes concerns about diversity and inclusion seriously?
5. Does the institution provide training or workshops on diversity, equity, and inclusion?

Comment Question: Do you believe DEI training would be beneficial for our university community?

Hiring and Promotion Practices

6. Do you believe hiring practices at the institution support diversity and equal opportunity?
7. Have you observed fair and unbiased practices in faculty promotion, sabbatical and tenure decisions?
8. Are faculty search committees trained to recognize and address implicit bias?
9. Do you believe the institution actively works to recruit faculty from underrepresented backgrounds?

Comment Question: How well do you know your university community and colleagues' DEI backgrounds?

Workplace Culture & Inclusion

11. Do you feel respected and valued as a faculty member regardless of your background?
12. Have you ever felt excluded or discriminated against at the institution?
13. Are diverse perspectives encouraged and respected in faculty meetings and decision-making?
14. Do you feel comfortable discussing DEI-related issues with colleagues and administration?

Comment Question: Have you witnessed or experienced any form of discrimination or bias in the workplace?

Equitable Support & Resources

16. Do all faculty members, regardless of background, have equal access to institutional resources (e.g., research funding, mentorship, and professional development)?
17. Do you feel that policies regarding workload distribution are applied equitably?
18. Are accommodations available and accessible for faculty with disabilities or special needs?

19. Do you believe the institution takes meaningful steps to address any reported DEI concerns?

20. Comment Question: Do faculty members from different racial, ethnic, gender, and cultural backgrounds receive equal respect and recognition?