

Minutes

The Faculty Senate met on February 1st 2022, in the Sunset Meeting Room of the College Union (Klamath Falls campus) and via Zoom for Portland-Metro faculty and others attending remotely.

Attendance/Quorum

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the December 7th, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting and the January 18th special session were both approved with no changes.

Reports of the Officers

Report of the President – Terri Torres

- Terri presented to the Board earlier this week.
 - She spoke to the progress Senators and the Provost have made toward reorganizing and repurposing Faculty Senate.
 - Terri asked the Board to have informal meetings with faculty, students, and staff during their Board meetings.
 - She also asked for responses to the presentations that faculty and students make to the Board.
 - She also asked the Board to request progress reports on the NTT faculty promotion policy, the General Education review, and efforts to help the campus community heal.
 - She encouraged the Board to pay attention to the lack of faculty applicants for our open positions and retention of students.
- The final report from AGB Consulting is out. This report was intended to review the governance structure of the Oregon universities.
 - The findings will be discussed at a later date.
- Terri said that there is a conflict between the CBA and current policy regarding Post-Tenure Review. The CBA always trumps current policy.
 - She also said that there is a lot of work going forward to change existing policies that do not mesh with the CBA; however, in the meantime, the CBA has precedence in all cases where there is a conflict.
 - Terri encouraged Senators to bring up to Senate when they find such conflicts so those can be resolved efficiently and effectively.
- Questions?
 - Franny Howes asked if the AGB report has been made widely available.
 - Terri said she had a copy and would make it available to all who wants to see it.
- End of report.

Report of the Vice President – Lindy Stewart

- Academic Council did not meet this month.
- Elections are coming up for a new Senate President.
 - Nominations will open on February 7th, they will be collected on the 14th, and voting will happen shortly after.
- Questions?
 - There were no questions.
- End of report.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – February 1 2022

Reports of the Standing Committees

Faculty Rank Promotion & Tenure (Yuehai Yang)

- Yuehai explained that back in week two of the term, RPT got comments back from Dave Groff, Oregon Tech’s legal counsel, advising them on some revisions that needed to be made to the NTT promotion policy draft before it could be submitted to President’s Council for approval.
 - The main concerns were that the policy needed to be adapted to the new policy document template created by President’s Council and that there should be care taken that no element of the policy conflicts with language in the CBA.
 - Dave Groff was unable to meet with RPT directly, so in response, RPT met with Don McDonnell and Cristina Negoita to discuss potential revisions.
 - The policy was updated (again) as a result and now Yuehai is bringing it to Senate again for consideration.
- Sean Sloan made a motion to approve the new policy draft. This draft can be found on **pages 10-16** of this packet for your reference. This motion was seconded by CJ Riley.
 - Policy discussion:
 - Cecily Heiner asked if there were any specific concerns about the policy, or if the concern that the policy would contradict the CBA was just a general one.
 - Yuehai responded that there are no known contradictions and this concern is just a general one.
 - Cecily also asked if Dave Groff found anything in particular he was concerned about regarding the policy draft.
 - Yuehai said that the policy could be sent back to Dave Groff for another review, and/or it could be sent to OT-AAUP legal council for review, but neither of those things have happened yet.
 - Terri clarified that once the policy is approved by Senate, it will then be reviewed again by Dave Groff before going to President’s Council.
 - Dibyajyoti Deb asked when President’s Council plans to meet next.
 - Terri answered that President’s Council’s schedule is set by the Provost.
 - The policy was approved by a unanimous vote.

Academic Standards (Laurie Yates)

- Academic Standards met in January, and Laurie met directly with SenEx to get some clarity about the five charges the committee has been given.
 - The first two charges will be discussed further during Open Floor session.
 - The third charge deals with student evaluations. Academic Standards met with Kyle Chapman to discuss this charge, since he had led previous Senate work on this issue. They will work on this charge beginning with Kyle’s input and report back on their findings at a later date.
 - The fourth charge dealt with our changed admission standards and how that has effected our students’ ability to be successful (for better or worse). They will continue working on this charge and report back on their findings at a later date.
 - The final charge has to do with the five-year Academic Calendar. In particular, how summer term lengths are determined and what the fall start date should be.
 - Laurie said it’s important to consider all stakeholders’ perspectives on these issues, and so they will be gathering this information.
- Questions?

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – February 1 2022

- There were no questions.
- End of report.

Reports of Special or Ad Hoc Committee

- Currently, there are no Special or Ad Hoc committees.

Unfinished Business

- Terri asked that we revisit the proposed Senate committee structure previously discussed during the January special session. This structure is included on **page 17** of this packet for your reference.
 - CJ motioned for a vote to approve this committee structure. Bobbi Kowash seconded the motion.
 - Discussion:
 - Sean made the point that passing this structural revision does not change any approval authorities, etc., and is instead just a “loose” set of “guidelines.” In essence, Sean asked how the reorganization document matters.
 - Terri responded that this was a meaningful set of changes, and that the value of the changes will become more apparent as we work with them going forward.
 - Deb asked if changes could be made to the structure later if certain things are seen to not work as intended.
 - Terri said yes.
 - I spoke to address Sean’s question from earlier. I said that I see the changed structure as formalizing and normalizing the process of various committees being in conversation with Faculty Senate and reporting during Senate meetings, whereas these committees currently either only communicate directly with the Senate on an ad hoc basis or not at all.
 - Christopher Syrnyk pointed out that, for example, the Honors Program is now included as a body that Senate wants to be in conversation with, and that that is new and signals progress forward.
 - CJ said that SenEx is currently working on a policy to support this structure, which will give us opportunities to get feedback and “evolve” in the future.
 - All Senators approved the vote, except for Kyle Chapman, who voted to oppose.

New Business

Terri Torres

- Terri reported that SenEx has decided to call a Faculty-Administration meeting on February 15th, at 2pm. Our hope is to use this meeting to start a wider conversation about issues facing the university across a varied group of stakeholders (i.e., not just faculty).

Open Floor

Brie Landis

- Brie spoke about their efforts to revise Board Resolution 15-2. This resolution has been included on **pages 18-22** of this packet for your reference.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – February 1 2022

- Brie’s motivation for these revisions has been to strengthen shared governance.
 - They have collaborated on these revisions with Jack Zoucha, and have discussed it with members of the student body. They see bringing the revisions to Faculty Senate for discussion and approval as the next important step in this process. Their hope is that the revisions can be finalized and voted on for approval by Senate by the end of the academic year.
- Brie requested input from any Senators.
 - Randall Paul asked if there were any specific concerns these revisions were meant to address, or if it was more a general update.
 - Brie responded that many of the bodies referenced in the Resolution simply aren’t defined very well, and the interrelationships and responsibilities of each group can be better defined.

Laurie Yates

- The first thing that Laurie is looking for input on is the waitlist policy. She said that the Registrar’s Office is hoping to implement an automated waitlist system, but recognizes that this might not be the ideal solution for some faculty.
- Laurie said that an automated system would improve student equity: everyone gets an equal chance to be added to the class.
- There are also issues with students who know they are near the top of the waitlist, but see themselves getting passed over as other students below them on the list are added at the instructor’s discretion.
- On the other hand, Laurie recognizes that in some cases, faculty need to be able to use their discretion to allow students into a class even if they aren’t at the top of the waitlist (for example, seniors who are looking to graduate soon and need a certain class to finish on time).
 - She opened up the floor for discussion and input from Senators.
 - Christopher spoke to the concern that students have historically been able to “game the system” by signing up for multiple classes to make sure that they get into at least one, while not really intending to ultimately take all of those courses.
 - Laurie said that in a similar vein, the committee is considering whether or not to allow students to register for multiple sections of the same course. Disallowing that might help with this potential “abuse” of the system.
 - Christopher suggested that maybe students could share their registration intentions with their advisors, so we could collect data on what courses are *really* in demand and which ones aren’t.
 - Franny spoke up in favor of an automated waitlist.
 - Maureen Sevigny said that she encourages her students to sign up for multiple classes because it is often the only way for them to ensure that they’ll get at least six credits a term (and thus be eligible for financial aid). She believes that automation would help with this.
 - Kari Lundgren also spoke up in favor of an automated waitlist. She also made the point that we should see students as “gaming” the system, but that they are only responding to a system that doesn’t work for them. She believes that automation would help with this.
 - Jack Zoucha spoke to question how often the “gaming” behavior that Christopher mentioned is really happening. If it is a major issue, he said, perhaps we could limit the number of courses individuals could sign up for if they have a history of abusing the system.
 - Debbie McCollam spoke to say that she’s not sure how you could stop the “gaming” behavior because, again, it is often the only way of using the system that actually works for the students.
 - Sean spoke in support of being able to override an automated system in cases where students need to get into a particular course in order to maintain the effectiveness of established prerequisite chains.
 - Ashton Greer spoke to ask if something she remembered from previous conversations about waitlist was true: that the Registrar could only either make the *whole* process automatic, or they could make it entirely manual. Essentially, she asked if the automatic-with-manual-exceptions option many Senators have spoken in favor of is technologically possible.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – February 1 2022

- Terri said that her understanding from conversations with Wendy Ivie is that we can in fact have both options at once.
- Terri pointed out that it's hard to manage class sizes when students register for multiple courses they might not actually intend to attend.
- Also, Terri asked Maureen to share which courses are creating bottlenecks, based on her experience.
- Laurie restated that we can have the function in the system that allows students to register for multiple sections of the same class either turned on or off. There is no “mixed” option when it comes to that particular functionality.
- The other issue that Laurie wanted to discuss is the length of summer term. Currently, our summer term is eight weeks long. However, some courses are running ten weeks during an eight-week term (essentially, the instructors are giving their students two extra weeks to complete their work, which creates a “nightmare” for the Registrar’s Office).
- Laurie said that Wendy has told her that it’s possible for us to have any length of term we want, from the Registrar’s perspective, and so it would make more sense to have an eight-week term *and* a ten-week term going forward to avoid this problem. We could even offer five-week courses, or two five-week terms over the ten-week length of time.
- Laurie also said that when the eight-week summer courses get unofficially extended to ten weeks, it creates a situation in which students who get Veteran’s housing benefits only get them for eight weeks and their final two weeks in the course aren’t covered.
- She opened up the floor for input and discussion.
 - Lindy asked how the instructors are currently extending their courses for two extra weeks.
 - Laurie said that the instructors in question are simply turning in their grades two weeks late, which creates the problem.
 - Laurie also pointed out that many other Oregon universities have multiple term-length options in the summer, we just have limited options by comparison.
 - Randall asked if changing term lengths in the summer would raise any accreditation issues.
 - Laurie said no; essentially, a five-week course would cover the same material as a ten-week course, it would just do so in a more compressed (i.e., more hours a day) format.
 - Deb also spoke in favor of Laurie’s answer to Randall’s question.
 - Sean asked if we could conceivably “take this to the extreme” and potentially offer a two-week version of some of our courses that would be appealing to industry.
 - Dr. Mott spoke to say that this would certainly be a possibility in the future. She has seen it done at other universities, both over summer and during the break between fall and spring semesters.
 - Laurie said she would take this feedback back to the committee, and Terri thanked her for all of her work.

Jennifer Wilson

- Jennifer was on the agenda next, but was not in attendance, so we skipped ahead to the Report of the Provost.

Report of the Provost – Dr. Joanna Mott

- Dr. Mott thanked everyone for continuing to work with students while they are being affected by the COVID surge.
- Enrollment for winter is down from last winter. We had great retention from fall to winter, however.
- She said that the headcount is a little misleading because we have a lot of dual-credit students for winter, but credit hours paint a more negative picture.
- Changes to the funding model will continue to affect us adversely in the years to come.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – February 1 2022

- Online Education has hired a second course designer to work alongside Carrie Dickson.
- Development of the Academic Master Plan is underway. Dean Peterson is heading up that process.
- Six requests for sabbaticals were received, and those are being reviewed.
- Student Faculty Innovation Grants are being reviewed. There were eleven proposals overall.
- Equipment requests will be going out shortly.
- Questions?
 - Maureen asked about reduced capacity for online courses: are there better options for increasing capacity in those courses than what's been discussed among department chairs before?
 - Dr. Mott suggested that Maureen start by talking to chairs, but if that doesn't help, talk to the Deans directly.
 - Maureen pointed out that the CBA provides room for the Deans and Provost to allow for faculty to teach overload.
 - Dr. Mott agreed, but explained that the idea behind that language is that occasional, necessary exceptions can be made, but that they want to avoid overload becoming a regular thing, so faculty have time to engage in activities outside of teaching.
 - Kari Lundgren pointed out that with online adjunct pay getting reduced, the shortage of capacity for teaching online is only likely to get worse.
 - Dr. Mott pointed out that the online instructors' pay reduction was a result of normalizing the pay rate for online and in-person adjuncts.
 - CJ asked about the alert going out to faculty via TechWeb asking for learning objectives to be entered for their courses.
 - Dr. Mott passed the question to Dr. Afjeh, who passed the question to Dina Battaglia.
 - Dr. Battaglia explained that faculty are expected to submit their learning outcomes for each course at the end of every term, and that that process has been automated through TechWeb to provide faculty with a reminder to enter the outcomes.
 - Bobbi asked for more guidance on how to submit those outcomes.
 - Dr. Battaglia responded that faculty can reach out to her directly for help, or to other members of the Assessment Executive Committee.
 - Bobbi recommended that a video be provided to ease the load on the members of the Assessment Executive group.
 - Janette Isaacson spoke to say that there are already videos available, and to clarify that the only outcomes faculty are expected to report are those that link up with their programs' learning outcomes. Those specific outcomes are the ones that will be audited.
 - Lindy spoke in support of this outcome-collecting tool, but also suggested that more communication about the location and purpose of the videos be sent out to help faculty, and especially adjuncts.
 - Janette agreed, and also offered to meet with faculty individually to help clarify the process.
 - Franny asked why the notification pops up for every course, if not every course needs to be reported on.
 - Janette explained that there's an option in the reporting tool where you can specify that a given course *doesn't* need to be reported on.
 - CJ asked why this assessment needs completed if faculty are already reporting their outcomes within the department. Sean seconded this question.
 - Janette said that department-level assessment should mirror this assessment, and that the outcomes need to be reported in this format, too, for the sake of university-wide accreditation.
 - She also explained that while this might lead to duplication of effort in some cases, the value is that the outcomes-reporting worksheet provides information on equity

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – February 1 2022

issues and allows Assessment Executive to gather data on how to close existing equity gaps, something that department-level reporting doesn't necessarily do.

- Kari asked if there is a potential issue in the worksheet asking each instructor to specify how their outcomes are achieved: adjuncts in particular might struggle being able to do this clearly. Kari's concern is that individuals might all be specifying their own outcomes instead of establishing department or program standards, leading to "chaos."
 - Janette said that multiple instructors have already been filling these forms out, and having conversations to this effect.
- Randall asked if departmental assessment coordinators are being looped into this effort.
 - Janette said yes, they have already received instruction last year and this fall, and those training efforts continue.
- CJ reiterated that he feels as if he has not received any information on this previously, and so it is a new process to him.
 - Janette reiterated that these worksheets have been active for over a year, and the accompanying dashboards have also been available that long.
- Dr. Mott acknowledged that there has been a lot of communication regarding the outcome worksheets and accompanying dashboards, but that there seems to have been a breakdown in communication somewhere along the way. She suggested that future conversations about this happen primarily in departments.
- CJ asked where the videos can be found.
 - Debbie responded that they can be found under TechWeb → Faculty Resources → Equity Gaps Dashboards
 - Janette said that there is also a tile for the Outcomes Worksheet in TechWeb.
- Terri suggested that perhaps having more department-level meetings with the Assessment Executive Committee might help disseminate this information more clearly.
 - Dr. Battaglia agreed with this suggestion and said she would follow up on it.

Report of the President's Council Delegate – Terri Torres

- They have not met. No report.
- There is no current meeting on the calendar. Terri asked if Dr. Mott would speak to when the next meeting might happen.
 - Dr. Mott explained that a meeting will be scheduled when there are policies to review.
 - Terri said there would be a policy to review tomorrow (the newly-passed NTT promotion policy draft).

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

- IFS has not met, but will be meeting again on February 25th.
- Maureen said that HECC and the Transfer Council are meeting next week, so there will be lots of new information at the March Senate meeting.

Report of the Fiscal Operations Advisory Council (FOAC) Representative – Lindy Stewart

- FOAC has not met since the last Senate meeting, so there is no report.

Report of the Administrative Council Delegate – Iona Musgung

- Iona was not present, so no report.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – February 1 2022

Adjournment

Terri adjourned the meeting at 7:22pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Bunting, Secretary

Oregon Tech Policy
OIT-20-046
Academic Appointment, Rank and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track
Instructional Faculty

1. Policy Statement

The purpose of this policy is to provide criteria and procedures for the evaluation and promotion of non-tenure track instructional faculty at the Oregon Institute of Technology. This policy serves to differentiate non-tenure track instructional faculty appointments from the traditional tenure track faculty. This policy defines the responsibilities of non-tenure track instructional faculty and serves to provide guidance to such faculty and their departments in assessing the appropriateness of their activities. Oregon Tech recognizes several faculty categories. Each category is created to be unique to the responsibilities and expectations of faculty.

As a public university, with constraints imposed by external factors, offering innovative and rigorous applied programs in fast evolving fields, the university, department and programs strive to maintain academic quality while supporting an environment that enables the emergence of new programming and the personnel to teach in those areas. This requires hiring policies that preserve a strong academic environment while providing the flexibility to allow development in new areas. The availability of tenure and non-tenure tracks ensures faculty can pursue successful careers while providing for institutional capacity to thrive. Whenever possible, the regular academic instruction of students should be the responsibility of faculty members to whom the institution is willing to make the commitment of tenure. As such, non-tenure faculty hires should be decided upon by department chairs, in consultation with the college Dean.

Non-tenure track instructional faculty should have the same opportunities to participate in governance and in curricular deliberations as tenure track faculty. Since their primary focus is on pedagogy, they will not be expected to participate at the same level as tenure track faculty in professional development or service and any metrics that may be used to monitor their performance should reflect that.

To the extent that there are any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) is applicable.

2. Reason for Policy/Purpose

Promotion between ranks for represented faculty is intended to reward excellence in teaching, along with satisfactory or exemplary performance in professional development and service. In addition, opportunity for promotion and possibility of multi-year contracts is expected to provide employment stability for both the faculty and the university.

3. Applicability/Scope

1 – Academic Appointment, Rank and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty
Draft version date: 02/01/22

This policy applies to all non-tenure track instructional faculty.

4. Definitions

The non-tenure track faculty: faculty who teach full time at Oregon Tech but are not on tenure-track lines

5. Policy

Policy Details

Evaluation Criteria for Promotion

The following criteria will be used to determine the faculty member's level of performance:

- Maintaining high quality teaching
- Continuing professional growth
- Performing service on behalf of the department
- Demonstrating professional integrity and a willingness to cooperate with colleagues

The emphasis 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 departmental service, program and curriculum development, teaching, advising, and/or activities related to professional development. Consequently, the expectations for individual faculty members may change. For the purpose of promotion between Instructor ranks, the fundamental criterion is meeting established expectations and goals within the four criteria listed above. Because a faculty member's Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) is based on meeting objectives established in collaboration with the department chair and agreed upon in the Faculty Objectives Plan (FOP), the APE may guide reviewers in assessing the faculty member's performance as the focus of his/her career evolves.

This policy contains criteria for evaluating faculty in instruction, professional development, and departmental service. The criteria in the following section are included here to guide the evaluation process.

Instruction

Given that this is their primary focus at Oregon Institute of Technology, Instructors will excel in teaching in the following ways:

- Demonstrate knowledge of subject matter
- Develop and revise curriculum to meet departmental and course objectives, as appropriate
- Organize and deliver course materials to stimulate interest and discussion
- Demonstrate growth in instruction
- Employ a variety of assessment tools for evaluation of both teaching effectiveness and student learning
- Maintain student numerical evaluations at a departmentally established level

Professional Development

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

Draft version date: 02/01/22

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

- Participate in conferences, workshops and classes in education and/or discipline
- Hold membership and participate in professional organizations within discipline

Departmental Service

While institutional service is not a requirement of promotion for NTT-Faculty, departmental service is encouraged. Faculty should contribute to the advancement of their department and programs consistent with departmental and personal goals and objectives. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Serve on departmental committees
- Participate in student advising and/or student activities
- Contribute to student recruitment and/or retention
- Participate in special projects (i.e., grants, on-campus presentations and conferences, documentation development, etc.)

Additional criteria for promotion review include professional integrity and a willingness to cooperate with colleagues. The following lists are not exhaustive but rather indicative of conduct that promotion review committees should consider.

Professional Integrity

Candidates shall demonstrate professional integrity in the following ways:

- Maintain high ethical standards
- Deal honestly, fairly, with respect and openly with colleagues and students
- Accept responsibility for their actions and decisions
- Follow through on commitments

Willingness to Cooperate

Candidates shall demonstrate a willingness to cooperate with colleagues in the following ways:

- Accept responsibility for departmental projects that are compatible with and further its mission and long-term goals
- Contribute to a stimulating intellectual environment in the candidate's department
- Abide by departmental decisions
- Follow policies and procedures of the institution

Instructor I to Instructor II

Eligibility Requirements:

Four full years in current rank, master's degree or higher or industry standard certification, as previously defined and documented by the department and approved by the college dean.

Criteria for Promotion:

Demonstrate excellence in teaching.

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

Draft version date: 02/01/22

Demonstrate service by contributing to departmental objectives.

Show evidence of continuing professional development.

Instructor II to Senior Instructor I

Eligibility Requirements:

Four full years in current rank, master's degree or higher.

Criteria for Promotion:

Continue to demonstrate excellence in teaching, commensurate with rank.

Demonstrate service by contributing to departmental objectives.

Show evidence of continuing professional development.

Senior Instructor I to Senior Instructor II

Eligibility Requirements:

Four full years in current rank, master's degree or higher.

Criteria for Promotion:

Continue to demonstrate excellence in teaching, commensurate with rank.

Demonstrate service by contributing to departmental objectives commensurate with rank.

Show evidence of continuing professional development commensurate with rank.

Procedure for Academic Rank Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty

All parties shall abide by the following timeline. However, the provost may modify the timeline if he/she determines a reasonable need to do so.

By the end of week eight of winter term, the department chair shall organize a departmental committee for promotion review of non-tenure track instructors. All full-time department members, including the candidate, the chair, and tenured/non-tenured faculty, shall elect three committee members: two from within the department, and one from outside the department. If available, one member of the committee should be a non-tenure track faculty member. If there are fewer than two department members eligible to serve, additional committee members shall be elected from outside the department.

Faculty ineligible to serve on the Promotion Review Committee include the department chair, adjuncts, and faculty being considered for promotion. Faculty who have relinquished tenure prior to retirement are eligible to serve. When selecting committee members from outside the department, preference should be given to members of other departments in which the candidate

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

Draft version date: 02/01/22

holds a split appointment, and then to faculty most likely to be knowledgeable about the candidate.

Within a week, the department chair shall convene the Promotion Review Committee, which shall select a chair. Each committee member shall sign the statement of ethics document.

Promotion Review Committee's Responsibilities

At its initial meeting, the Promotion Review Committee shall also set a date and location for a meeting to be held during the second or third week of spring term to accept written and verbal comments from students and other interested individuals. A separate comments meeting shall be held for each candidate. The chair of the Promotion Review Committee shall send the time and location information for the comments meeting along with the candidate's name to the Provost's Office by the end of winter term. The Provost's Office is responsible for advertising the comments meeting.

The comments meeting shall be conducted according to the following guidelines:

- The candidate may not attend the meeting, but will have access to comments in the written report of the committee, as noted below
- Only one person giving comments may be in the room with the committee at a given time
- One member of the committee must keep careful notes of the meeting, indicating the name of each speaker and the content of the remarks. The notes must be sufficiently detailed to capture the essence of the testimony

The committee may solicit other information to confirm documentation in the candidate's portfolio or to verify comments gathered during its review. However, no anonymous input may be solicited or accepted, nor can sources be kept confidential. Anyone offering verbal or written information must be informed that the candidate will have access to that information and that source anonymity cannot be preserved. In the case of verbal information, careful notes of the conversation must be kept, including the participants' names.

If the candidate has a split appointment at the time of review, the committee shall solicit information from the appropriate departments in which the candidate has served.

The committee will prepare a separate written report for each candidate. The report must indicate the committee's recommendation, agreed to by a simple majority, and include the names and signatures of committee members and their individual votes. In addition, the committee shall list specific activities where the candidate has met or exceeded the promotion criteria and/or identify specific areas where the candidate has not met the criteria. The committee shall submit the report to the department chair by Friday of the sixth week of spring term, along with the candidate's portfolio, notes taken during the comments meeting, and all documentation accepted and used by the Review Committee in its deliberations. The content of the committee's deliberations are confidential and shall not be divulged by its members.

Department Chair's Responsibilities

The department chair shall notify each candidate, in writing, of the committee's recommendation by the end of the seventh week of spring term.

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

Draft version date: 02/01/22

The department chair shall attach a letter of support/non-support to the committee report and forward the report, the letter, the candidate's portfolio and all documentation to the dean by Friday of the eighth week of spring term.

Dean's Responsibilities

The college dean shall review the recommendation from the committee and the department chair's letter and write a letter of evaluation deciding an outcome. The dean shall decide promotion status in each case, and officially notify, by letter, each faculty member by the end of spring term. The dean shall send all documentation other than the e-portfolio related to the review to the faculty member's evaluative file in the Provost's Office in accordance with the Faculty Records Policy (OIT-22-010) by the end of spring term.

Extended Non-Tenure Track Appointments after Promotion in Rank

To provide for a greater degree of job security than standard non-tenure track appointments, extended non-tenure track appointments may be recommended. Extended non-tenure track appointments are to be proposed only for faculty who have been promoted. Additionally, those appointments can only be made by mutual agreement of the department chair and dean, contingent on stability of funding and departmental needs.

Extended non-tenure track appointments have terms of up to two years and with administrative approval may be extended for one year at the end of each year. This type of appointment thereby leaves the faculty member at the beginning of each year with an appointment having the same length as the prior appointment.

Candidate's Rights

A candidate may request from the chair of the Promotion Review Committee copies of the written documentation collected by the Promotion Review Committee and all notes kept of oral testimony. The candidate must make this request in writing by Monday of the fourth week of spring term. The Promotion Review Committee Chair shall provide the documentation no later than Friday of the fourth week of spring term.

After reviewing testimony given at the comments meeting and all documentation accepted by the Promotion Review Committee, a candidate may request a meeting with the committee to challenge questions of fact. By majority vote, the committee may decide to expunge information from the documentation. This meeting must take place before the committee makes its recommendation and before the fifth week of spring term. Only questions of fact are open to challenge.

The faculty member may respond in writing to the committee report. The response will be attached to the report and sent to the dean through the department chair.

At the conclusion of the review, a candidate may request from the provost, in writing, the Promotion Review Committee's report, the department chair's letter and the dean's decision.

Grievance procedures are governed by Grievance Procedure for Faculty, OIT-21-321.

6. Links to Related Procedures, Forms, or Information

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

Draft version date: 02/01/22

7. Policy Review/Consultation

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

Faculty Senate, President's Council, Office of the Provost

8. Policy Approval

Approved by the President on XXXX XX, 20XX.

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

Senate Committees

- Senate develops charges with input from Provost
- Report to Senate monthly



Academic Affairs Committees

- Provost develops charges with input from Senate
- Senate Representative presents to Senate once per term



University and Academic Committees

- No Charges
- Senate can request annual presentation
- Written Annual Reports to Provost's Office are Shared



Objectives for Updating:

- More clearly define administrative council and asoit
- Clearly define accountability
- Outline/define clear hierarchy of roles (“chain of command”)
 - Are there policies/procedures in place that outline appropriate reporting, communication, resolution of conflict, voting and veto powers, etc? Cite them in this document
- Define/declare enforcement of chain of command
- Define/declare voting rights/veto powers. There appears to be no balance of power between governing bodies
- Break Section 3b into 2 or 3: president should have its own subsection, then officers and senior administrators (do they each need their own section?)

Formatted: List Paragraph, Left, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

RESOLUTION NO. 15-2

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

A RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE AT OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

The Board of Trustees of the Oregon Institute of Technology adopted the following resolutions at a duly held meeting:

Whereas, the establishment of separate, institutional governing boards for each of Oregon’s public universities, including Oregon Institute of Technology (“University” or “Oregon Tech”) is a propound opportunity for the success of students; and

Whereas, the authority of the Oregon Institute of Technology Board of Trustees (“Board”) and President may be informed and improved by the purposeful engagement with the University’s stakeholders – including its faculty, staff, and students; and

Whereas, the concept of shared governance in an academic environment is expected and appreciated; and

Whereas, the Board is much closer to the affairs of the University than previous system-wide governing boards; and

Whereas, a statement affirming the principles of shared governance is a critical step in the success of the University, building trust among University stakeholders and demonstrating a commitment to open deliberation and decision-making;

Now, therefore, the Board resolves as follows:

Section 1

Principles and Values

The Board is committed to shared governance in the academic environment and embraces the following principles and values to guide the efficient governance and administration of the University:

- a. Frank Communication
- b. Open deliberation and decision-making
- c. Consistent reflection upon the University’s mission statement and strategic plan,
- d. Recognition by all University stakeholders of roles and their responsibilities in the efficient governance and administration of the University.
- e. Mutual trust and respect among all University stakeholders.

Deleted: t

The Board is committed to the adherence and upholding of the values discussed herein. Thus, each governing body described below shall be able to concretely demonstrate the implementation of these values, and the Board will be charged with overseeing the evidence of implementation as applicable by law and other Board Policies.

Formatted: Left

Section 2

Definition

Shared governance is defined by appropriately shared responsibility, accountability, and cooperative action among the Board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and, as applicable, their duly constituted representative bodies, intended to foster constructive and collaborative thought and action within the institutional structure in service of the University’s mission. For the purposes of this Resolution, accountability is defined as the collaborative communication and cooperative action between the independent governing bodies herein, with all parties acting for the benefit of the University and to uphold the University’s values and mission statement.

Deleted: e

Section 3

Communication

- a. The Board will, consistent with its Board Policy on Conduct of Public Meetings, reserve specific time for one duly-elected representative from each Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, and ASOIT to address the Board on any matter of concern facing the faculty, staff, or students, respectively.
- b. When appropriate, the Board should include representatives of the faculty, staff, or student body in relevant work retreats by the Board.
- c. The Board expects the University’s President to meet with the duly-elected chair or president of the Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, and ASOIT regularly, but preferably monthly, to ensure open communication and prompt discussion and consideration of matters of concern.
- d. Regular communication between the University President and the duly-elected or appointed leadership of the Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, and ASOIT, as expected by the Board, shall be documented with follow-up communication as necessary to address concerns, resolve conflicts, and foster accountable, productive, and equitable communication. These processes are as outlined in [policy].

Deleted: As

Deleted: may

Section 4

Deleted: 3

Roles, Responsibilities and Representation

a. Board

The Board is vested with the ultimate authority to manage the affairs of the University under Oregon law and applicable Board Policies and actions, including, the Board policy on Delegation of Authority. The Board shall receive and consider input and advice from University stakeholders, as articulated in this resolution, either through the President or directly to the Board through processes and channels established by the Board.

Deleted: ould

The Board, in its Bylaws and Board Policy on Committees, authorizes the creation of ad hoc committees to address specific topics from time to time. As appropriate, representatives of faculty, staff, student body may be asked to participate in these ad hoc committees to provide their expertise and perspective.

b. President, Officers, Administrators

The President, as the University's chief executive officer and president of the faculty, is responsible for directing the affairs of the University, provided the President's actions are consistent with the law, and Policies and actions of the Board, including, the Board Policy on Delegation of Authority. The President, officers, and administrators have as a primary performance of their duties related to teaching, learning, student and institutional support, professional development, scholarly work and research, and community service.

The President has primary responsibility for communicating with and making recommendations to the Board. The Board expects the President, as appropriate, to provide meaningful opportunity for duly-elected or appointed representative of the Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, and ASOIT, to offer input and advice on the President's recommendations. This includes, but is not limited to the President's recommendations concerning the University's budget, tuition and fee schedule, strategic plan, and mission statement.

The President also has primary authority for the approval of University Policies that define the expectations of requirements for University units and functions, as outlined in the Board Policy on Policies. The Board expects duly-elected or appointed representatives of Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, and ASOIT; to participate in the President's Council to offer input and advice on University policies.

Officers and Administrators are [further define and outline here](#)

c. Faculty Senate

Deleted: ¶

The Board reaffirms the faculty's central role in the development and stewardship of the University's academic mission, consistent with Oregon law and the Board policy on Delegation of Authority, and as outlined in the Faculty Constitution and Charter of the Faculty Senate. The faculty, in conjunction with the President and the Provost, is responsible for

- i. academic standards relating to admission to study at the University;
- ii. curriculum, curricular materials, method of instruction, grading, credits, and academic standards of the University; and
- iii. standards of students competence in a discipline.

Deleted: (i)

Deleted: (ii)

Deleted: (iii)

The Board also expects that the faculty will have substantial participation and input into the development of new academic degree programs and significant changes to academic degree programs before they reach the Board for consideration and approval and, as appropriate, transmission to the Higher Education Coordinating Commission for approval.

The Board recognizes the Faculty Senate as the internal representative body to the faculty. To set forth its internal processes for participating in shared governance, the Oregon Tech Faculty Senate is authorized, consistent with law and the Policies and actions of the Board, to formulate a statement of internal governance expressed as a constitution or in another appropriate format. The statement of internal governance must be consistent with applicable law and the Policies and actions of the Board and is subject to approval by the President in his or her role as President of the faculty. The President convenes and presides over the faculty and is authorized to veto any decision of the Faculty Senate. Notwithstanding the President's statutory role as president of the faculty, the faculty's statement of internal governance may provide for a member of the faculty to serve as the Faculty Senate's president or chair. The statement of internal governance may also be amended as provided for in the statement of internal governance statement, but not more often than annually.

d. Administrative Council

The Board recognizes the Administrative Council as the internal representative body of the Oregon Tech unrepresented, unclassified, administrative staff. In order to set forth its internal processes for participating in shared governance, the Administrative Council is authorized, consistent with law and the Policies and action for the Board, to formulate a statement of internal governance expressed as a constitution or in another appropriate format. The statement of internal governance must be consistent with applicable law and the Policies and actions of the Board.

[\[further define and outline here\]](#)

[There will be active, formal staff involvement in Oregon Tech commissions, committees, councils, workgroups, and other governance structures. The Board recognizes the Administrative Council as a key University stakeholder and this shared governance document ensures that the Administrative Council be equitably and adequately represented and considered in University decision-making.](#)

Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic

e. Associated Students of Oregon Institute of Technology

The Board recognizes the ASOIT as the recognized student government. To set forth its internal processes for participating in shared governance, the ASOIT is authorized, consistent with law and the Policies and action for the Board, to formulate a statement of internal governance expressed as a constitution or in another appropriate format. The statement of internal governance must be consistent with applicable law and the Policies and actions of the Board.

[The ASOIT has an institutionalized role allowing input and involvement in decision-making related to, but not limited to the following:](#)

- [i. Academic policies](#)
- [ii. Student codes of conduct](#)
- [iii. Institutional budgeting and planning](#)

Deleted:

Formatted: List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

- iv. [Selection and appointment of administrators, faculty, and staff members](#)
- v. [Tuition, fees, parking and board rates](#)
- vi. [University mission and vision](#)

[There will be active, formal student involvement in Oregon Tech commissions, committees, councils, workgroups, and other governance structures. The Board recognizes the ASOIT as a key University stakeholder and this shared governance document ensures that the ASOIT be equitably and adequately represented and considered in University decision-making.](#)

Section 5

Performance Evaluation

In evaluating the job performance of the President, the Board will consider the President’s commitment to shared governance as described in this Board resolution. [During Comprehensive Review years \(generally every 4-5 years, as defined in the Board Policy on Presidential Evaluation Process\), the Board shall consider reports from key University stakeholders, including but not limited to duly-elected or appointed presidents or chairs of committees, commissions, ASOIT, Faculty Senate, and senior administrators and officers.](#)

Section 6

Approval and Revisions

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon approval by the Board.

[The Board oversees while the University President provides leadership for the University’s adherence to the principles of shared governance. Periodic review of this document with the leadership of the governing boards herein may be necessary to determine the degree to which governing board practices align with University principles, values, and mission statement. Should specific questions or challenges arise concerning adherence to the commitments expressed in this shared governance document, those concerns shall be addressed jointly by the University President and other duly-elected or appointed presidents or chairs of the governing bodies discussed herein.](#)

**Deleted: Section 4¶
Communication¶**
The Board will, consistent with its Board Policy on Conduct of Public Meetings, reserve specific time for one duly-elected representative from each Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, and ASOIT to address the Board on any matter of concern facing the faculty, staff, or students, respectively.¶
As appropriate, the Board may include representatives of the faculty, staff, or student body in relevant work retreats by the Board.¶
The Board expects the University’s President to meet with the duly-elected chair or president of the Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, and ASOIT regularly, but preferably monthly, to ensure open communication and prompt discussion and consideration of matters of concern.¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Deleted: ¶