

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

November 21, 2017

MINUTES

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Academic Council members present were: Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Kevin Brown for Dan Peterson, Todd Breedlove, Tiernan Fogarty, Brian Fox, Jeff Hayen, Gary Kuleck, LeAnn Maupin, Debbie McCollam, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Paula Russell, Sean St.Clair, Farooq Sultan, Mason Terry for Claudia Torres Garibay, Ken Usher, Erika Veth, and Jack Walker. Laura McKinney and Dawn Taylor joined the meeting remotely. Jamie Kennel was absent.

HIRING REQUEST REVIEW

The Proposed Hiring Form was sent to department chairs to prioritize hiring requests. The Provost's Leadership Team reviewed the requests submitted. Provost Gary Kuleck explained the rationale used in reviewing the documentation. He thanked department chairs for their efforts in planning and envisioning for their respective departments.

What does "Replacements" on the approved/ non-approved faculty position list mean? The term "replacements" entails new, replacements, retirements, tenure denials, withdrawals, etc.

Will departments receive feedback on non-approved positions? Dr. Kuleck stated he would meet with department chairs over the next two weeks regarding non-approved positions.

NON-TENURE TRACK

Ken Usher asked about how to best approach non-tenure track (NTT) faculty currently teaching 12 workload units per term, if the new expectation were to become 15 workload units. Provost Kuleck gave an example of how a department could explain the situation to the faculty member. Dr. Usher stated that there are no guidelines in existence regarding assigning workload as described above. Dr. Kuleck stated that these are points of discussion for departments as well as the ETM and HAS colleges. This discussion can be had with individual NTT faculty as more are hired.

Todd Breedlove asked if the current Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) form appropriately addresses NTT faculty. There was discussion surrounding the review process, which would be the same as that of a regular faculty member. The Faculty Objective Plan defines the expectations, and the APE is the evaluation of the achievement of those things or equivalent items. It was stated that fixed term status is essentially the same as NTT status. Sharon Beaudry stated that one of the Faculty Senate committees is charged with looking at APE's. She was unsure of the committee's progress on this charge.

Dr. Kuleck stated that the 15 workload unit expectation will take place with all new hires, and includes returning NTT faculty. Dr. Kuleck advised Chairs to work with the Deans on NTT hires.

Discussion regarding a potential 3 unit workload release for new hires in order to stay afloat so each has time to prepare curriculum, develop courses, etc.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

There are currently four departments providing third year reviews to faculty members. Dr. Kuleck asked for feedback on how the review process is received by faculty. Mark Neupert stated that his faculty like the format. From the perspective of department chair, the reviews are a useful tool in mentoring junior faculty. Kevin Brown stated that the Communication department provides a narrative as well as a review to assist the newer faculty in assessing how well they are doing; the department also provides senior faculty the opportunity to contribute to the conversation. Dr. Kuleck asked if there is a peer review of teaching. Dr. Brown stated no, but his department is discussing the possibility. Seth Anthony stated that the Commission on College Teaching is also looking at the potential benefit of peer review. Faculty trained at the OTET workshop learned about a set of common principle values that could be utilized in peer review.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Dr. Kuleck encouraged feedback from the department chairs in the form of discussion and strategic planning to figure things out. Dr. Kuleck is considering having departments make presentations at future Academic Council meetings.

Dr. Kuleck will be revising the equipment form and distributing to department chairs soon. Dr. Kuleck would like Chairs to submit a one page summary highlighting the immediate equipment needs and the justification for the equipment. LeAnn Maupin stated, and Brian Fox agreed, that Chairs should submit three year equipment plans in lieu of one year plans.

Discussion regarding new hires, and working on a model in which NTT positions could potentially become permanent.

Advertisements for new hires should be more descriptive in order to attract applicants to Oregon Tech. Dr. Kuleck would encourage Chairs to think creatively and broadly to more effectively market each department. Suzette Yaezenko created a university template to assist in composing a compelling advertisement.

Dr. Kuleck highly recommended more diversity in the creation of search committees. Interdisciplinary faculty should be considered for inclusion.

NEXT STEPS

The next Academic Council meeting will be held December 11th. Equipment requests will be discussed at that meeting. Suzette Yaezenko has also been invited to train Chairs on the new HEROES system.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.