

Minutes

The Faculty Senate met April 6, 2021, via Zoom, due to COVID-19 social distancing requirements.

Attendance/Quorum

President Don McDonnell called the meeting to order at 6:01pm. All Senators or alternates were present except Jherime Kellermann.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes for March 2 2021 Faculty Senate meeting were not available to approve, due to a technical issue with that session's Zoom recording. However, minutes for the March 11 and March 16 special session meetings were available, and were both approved with no changes.

Reports of the Officers

Report of the President – Don McDonnell

- Don thanked all of the faculty for their support during this difficult time.
- He reported the results of the vote of no confidence against President Naganathan.
 - 159 faculty voted out of 173. This was a 92% participation rate.
 - Of these 159 votes, 147 (92%) supported the vote of no confidence.
 - He also shared a few of the written-in comments that faculty included with their votes:
 - “This has been a hard decision that I took seriously.”
 - “While I appreciate Dr. Nagi’s vision for Oregon Tech, he is not an effective leader.”
 - “This is an unfortunate, but necessary step.”
 - “It’s the right thing to do. Seems like a really bad time to do it.”
- Don will be giving a report to the Board on Thursday afternoon at 2:35pm.
- President’s Council will be meeting on 4/29.
- Faculty Senate elections are coming up. There will be an email going out at the beginning of May seeking nominations.
- Don will be starting to address standing committees soon. He will be reaching out to department chairs and committee chairs.
 - If you’re interested in being on a particular committee, email Don to let him know of your interest.
- Questions?
 - Addie asked about the previously-discussed matter of including COVID-related language in our APEs for this year: are there any updates on this?
 - Don recommended that the faculty individually include the statement previously passed by Senate in their APEs before submitting them.
 - To clarify, Dr. Mott stated that faculty are not to include their spring ’20 evaluation numbers in their APEs *at all*.
 - Yasha Rohwer suggested that Paul Titus send out a reminder about the spring ’20 scores and the COVID statement.
 - Lindy Stewart asked if we are allowed to include the spring ’20 scores if we want to.
 - Dr. Mott said that the spring scores should not be included regardless of how good or bad they are.
 - Vanessa Bennett thanked Don and SenEx for their work over the last few weeks.
- End of report.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – April 6 2021

Report of the Vice President – Christopher Syrnyk

- Christopher began by asking if the nomination email for new Senators is going to go out on 5/3.
 - Don responded that this would be finalized later, but that this was “about the right time.”
- Christopher expressed appreciation for the other members of SenEx, and, as his term is ending at the end of the year, he solicited Senators for input on whether he should run for Senate again or not.
- End of report.

Report of the ASOIT Delegate – Mason Wichmann

- Mason Wichmann said that he will also be giving a report to the Board of Trustees on Thursday.
- ASOIT is sending three student representatives to the negotiations between OT-AAUP and Oregon Tech.
- Questions?
 - Ryan Brown shared his appreciation for Mason’s efforts to get students involved in the negotiations.
- End of report.

Reports of the Standing Committees

Faculty Rank Promotion & Tenure (RPT) – Monica Breedlove

- Monica Breedlove began by moving that the Senate approve the NTT promotion policy (OIT-20-046). I seconded this motion.
 - Seth Anthony asked if passing this policy through Senate is allowed during the current negotiations.
 - Monica responded that because Oregon Tech is currently refusing to bargain the permissive subject of promotion, passing this policy through Senate is the *only* way it can become part of our policies and procedures.
 - Terri Torres offered a friendly amendment: that the salary increase for promotion and rank section of the policy be cut, because salary for faculty *is* something that’s being negotiated, and including it in a policy we pass through Senate *would be* violating the rules around what can and can’t happen outside of negotiations.
 - Monica explained that the salary portion we left in this draft of the policy to counteract Oregon Tech negotiators’ suggested contract offer, which says that faculty would only receive raises based on merit.
 - Sean Sloan added that if we remove the salary section from this policy, we would need to remove that section from all other parallel policies that are currently on the books.
 - Lindy argued for including the salary section in the policy because we don’t yet have a contract, and this would serve as a placeholder until we do.
 - Monica asked Terri if removing the specified amount of the raise would fix the problem.
 - Terri said that all compensation will be negotiated, so it is potentially problematic to discuss it in this policy as well.
 - Lindy made the point that if we leave the language out, we might be hanging faculty who would go up for promotion this year out to dry.
 - Andria Fultz also expressed concern that leaving the salary language in the policy might give it a “sticking point” that would actually hold up its approval.
 - Yasha asked if the language in the policy matters, since, ultimately, the contract language will “trump” this policy language.
 - Mark Clark warned that passing this policy with the salary language as-is might prompt claims of outside dealing from the Oregon Tech negotiating team.
 - Lindy asked how passing this policy through Senate now is different from our current desire to hold on to our existing workload guidelines until after the contract is finalized.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – April 6 2021

- Terri responded that the value of passing this particular policy is that it would acknowledge NTT faculty as a group, but that the salary language in particular is problematic due to it being a mandatory subject of bargaining.
 - Monica suggested leaving in guidelines around salary increases, but removing the specific numbers.
 - Ryan argued that “leaving vagaries” in the policy is a bad idea.
- Sean stated that passing this policy would be useful in the sense that if the negotiations end with an agreement to stick to “the status quo,” then this policy would “become the contract.” As such, he thinks that it should parallel the existing promotion policies and quantify what a promotion is (i.e., how much of a salary increase comes with a promotion).
- Christy VanRooyen expressed appreciation that this policy is recognizing that NTT faculty exist and deserve a pathway to promotion.
- Seth asked why we *need* to pass this now as opposed to doing so after the contract is finalized.
- Mark reiterated that he is extremely uncomfortable leaving salary information in the policy, because it may disrupt the negotiations.
- Lindy spoke to support Seth’s previous comment: why do we need to pass this policy today?
- Andria explained that because the Oregon Tech negotiating team doesn’t want to recognize NTT faculty as needing a path to promotion, passing this policy would help establish a precedent and allow us to advocate more meaningfully on their behalf in the future.
- Lindy asked if it would be appropriate to table this for the time being.
 - Monica argued that this policy needs to be passed now, and not delayed again.
- Mark pointed out that Lindy’s motion to table needs to be voted on right away.
 - Slobodan seconded the motion.
 - The motion to table failed.
- Ryan asked if the OT-AAUP negotiating team was currently discussing NTT promotion.
 - Monica answered, seconding Terri’s earlier comment about needing to pass this policy to get this issue on the radar, so to speak.
 - Ryan asked if OT-AAUP could push harder to get this issue brought to the bargaining table.
 - Monica answered that she’s heard that the path forward is to pass it here first.
- Monica reminded everyone that this policy (or an earlier draft of it, at least) has already been passed once by Senate, years ago.
- Terri reiterated that her motion was only to strike the salary section of the policy, and that she isn’t questioning the need to pass the policy more generally. She urged the Senate to pass this policy (with the amendment) and get it to President’s Council.
 - Yasha seconded the motion.
- Mark reminded everyone that we should *only* be discussing Terri’s amendment at this point.
- Paula makes the point that there’s a possibility that even if we do pass some version of this policy, it will die at President’s Council like it did before.
- Joe Reid spoke to clarify: the Oregon Tech negotiating team’s final offer does not include numbers on if or how NTT faculty should receive promotion-based raises, but OT-AAUP’s final offer does. Oregon Tech has to bargain over salary and compensation, but they *do not* have to bargain over promotion processes. Therefore, those processes need to be defined via Faculty Senate.
 - Cristina seconded Joe’s point, and emphasized the difference between mandatory and permissive subjects of bargaining.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – April 6 2021

- Lindy agreed with Cristina, but expressed reservations about striking the salary section of the policy. She is concerned that Senate’s leaving out specific salary numbers and that this might backfire down the road.
 - To this concern, Cristina pointed out that Senate can always revisit this policy later, and make edits as necessary (once negotiations are over).
- Ryan asked what happens to the policy once it’s passed through Senate.
 - Don clarified that it next goes to President’s Council.
- We voted on Terri’s amendment.
 - The amendment passed.
- Terri asked the Deans and Provost if they have any particular concerns about this policy before we vote on it.
 - Dr. Mott explained that her and the Deans are not yet prepared to talk about his policy.
 - After some further discussion, Monica clarified that this policy has been under discussion since 2014, was passed by Senate in June of 2017, and was then ignored by President’s Council afterward.
- Seth asked if the administration has been consulted on this most recent version of the policy.
 - Monica responded that RPT had many questions about the policy for HR, but the head of HR did not answer those questions, referring Dean Peterson to RPT instead. Monica said the Dean never contacted her to follow up. Monica then spoke with Don to follow up, and Don suggested the course of action that Monica and RPT are currently pursuing.
- Cristina asked Dr. Mott when the administration might be able to consider this policy in the future.
 - Dr. Mott reiterated that this is not the time or place to discuss this policy. She suggested that the issue will either be fixed via negotiations, or “after negotiations.”
- Lindy asked if we would be able to bring this policy back through Senate after the contract is agreed upon.
 - Cristina responded that it all depends on what ends up in the contract and what doesn’t. There is no way to answer this question for sure right now.
 - Joe seconded this, and explained again that *only* OT-AAUP can bargain salaries specifically.
- Monica reiterated again that in her opinion we need to pass this policy *now*.
 - Cristina seconded this.
 - Mike Gilinsky agreed as well: we need to pass this policy so that salary for NTT faculty can potentially be negotiated before the contract is signed and finalized.
 - Terri urged us to pass the policy now and “trust in the system.”
- Terri called for the question.
 - Terri’s call was seconded by Yasha.
 - The call for the question passed.
 - We voted on the policy as amended with Terri’s amendment.
 - The policy passed as amended, and will be passed on to President’s Council. The final version of the policy is included in this packet, on **pages 11-18**.
- End of report.

Faculty Welfare – Yasha Rohwer

- Welfare has completed all their charges, so there is no report.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – April 6 2021

Academic Standards – Addie Clark

- Academic Standards is in the process of scheduling their next meeting, so there is no report.

Faculty Compensation (FCC) – Sean Sloan

- No report.

Reports of Special or Ad Hoc Committee

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

Unfinished Business

- There was no unfinished business.

New Business

Don McDonnell

- Don explained that Mark Clark has been replaced as IFS representative by Seth Anthony. He thanked Mark for his work.
- As Mark is coming off of SenEx, we need to fill an open SenEx slot. Don asked for nominations.
 - Slobodan nominated Chitra Venugopal.
 - Lindy nominated Terri Torres.
- Don asked for suggestions on how to conduct a ballot since we cannot do a secret ballot through Zoom.
 - Mark suggested that we conduct the election outside the meeting, over an electronic format that can keep participants anonymous.

Open Floor

Paula Russell

- Paula spoke on behalf of the university's department chairs.
 - She said that the department chairs have drafted a letter of support for Senate's call for the vote of no confidence in President Naganathan. This letter will be presented to the Board of Trustees.
 - Mark asked what the chairs' votes were (in favor/against the contents of the letter).
 - Paula did not have exact numbers, but urged further dialogue between the chairs and other involved parties.

Joe Reid

- Joe spoke to urge Senate to make an effort to thank the Klamath Tribes for providing vaccinations for so many of our faculty.
 - Yasha made a motion on behalf of Joe, and Addie Clark seconded.
 - Mark suggested that the motion be amended to charge SenEx with drafting a letter of thanks to the Tribes. This suggestion was accepted.
 - The vote passed.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – April 6 2021

Cristina Negoita

- Cristina said that some of her constituents have expressed concerns about recent changes to Testing Services on the Portland-Metro campus. She asked if anyone else had other concerns, or further information.
 - Andria offered to speak with Cristina about this outside of the meeting.

Kevin Pintong

- Kevin commented that on the ERB's website was are listed as "Oregon Tech Community College."

Report of the Provost – Dr. Joanna Mott

- Dr. Mott thanked Lindy, Seth, and Don for sending a letter to Senator Dembrow regarding the common course numbering (CCN) and transfer legislation.
 - She also spoke on the importance of staying informed on this legislation because it is going to deeply effect how our courses work.
- Dr. Mott also mentioned the FSSE survey, for which an email went out to all faculty today. It's important that we fill this out so we can gain meaningful data on how to better serve our students.
- Meetings have been happening to try to determine what to spend the new ARP (COVID relief) money and state support money on.
 - Dr. Mott recommends that you email her if you have any recommendations.
- Summer creativity grants RFP went out yesterday.
- She urges anyone seeking new equipment to move quickly on those requests.
- Send suggestions for virtual Commencement to Wendy Ivie.
- Convocation planning is getting started.
 - Convocation itself will start on 9/16 and end the next Wednesday. There will be no travel required for Portland-Metro faculty; a group will come up to that campus for Convocation.
- Work continues on the budget; FOAC will be meeting on Friday to discuss further.
- Klamath county has gone back to the "high" risk level for COVID.
 - This means we currently don't need to change our class sizes.
- The AVPs for Faculty Relations and Academic Excellence are both at the offer stage.
- Questions?
 - Addie asked to clarify if the "no travel" plan for Convocation also applies to the other branch campuses.
 - Dr. Mott said yes.
 - Addie also asked if the sessions will be recorded for those who can't attend synchronously.
 - Dr. Mott again said yes.
 - Terri asked where faculty (and others) who are currently in Boivin will be moving to within the next two months.
 - Dr. Mott said that information about this should go out to everyone before the end of the week.
 - Terri also asked if those who move out of Boivin temporarily will be returning once the renovations are over, or if some moves will be permanent.
 - Dr. Mott said that there might be changes, if advantageous moves are able to be made during the renovation stage, so there's no clear answer to this question yet.
 - Christopher mentioned SB 233: he is happy to pass questions and/or feedback on the bill on to the Oregon Writing and English Advisory Committee, of which he is a member.
 - Addie expressed concern about the storage plan for chemistry materials that are being moved due to the Boivin renovation: some of these materials need to be stored in particular ways for safety reasons.
 - Dr. Mott recommended that Addie bring this up with her chair and Dean. She also said she could talk with Addie further herself outside of this meeting.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – April 6 2021

- Joe Reid expressed some concern about how the CCN bill will effect course outcomes for our math classes.
 - Dr. Mott encouraged Joe (and others) to continue to pay attention to this bill, because work will have to begin soon on adjusting our courses to fit the new requirements.
- End of report.

Report of the President’s Council Delegate – Don McDonnell

- President’s Council has not met, so there is no report.

Report of the Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF) Representative – Mark Clark

- No report.

Report of the Inter-institutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Representative – Lindy Stewart

- Lindy started by thanking Mark for his past work with IFS, and welcoming Seth Anthony as an IFS representative.
- Lindy said the main conversations lately at IFS have dealt with SB 233.
 - Lindy thanked Dr. Mott for her help in getting a letter out to Senator Dembrow about this bill.
 - It is Lindy’s understanding that the CCNs will apply to most if not all 100- and 200-level courses.
 - The letter advocated for including faculty’s voice in this and related decisions, “because it is a matter of academic freedom.”
 - The letter asked that subject-area subcommittees containing faculty be created to make decisions at the subject level.
 - The letter also asked for more transparency in the decision-making process overall.
 - Because of a short timeline, the letter was voted on and approved by SenEx only.
 - The letter is included in this packet, on **pages 19-20**.
 - There was a second amendment to the bill, which Lindy and Seth provided feedback on over the previous weekend.
 - HECC will determine which courses will be subject to the CCN according to this new amendment.
 - Lindy turned the report over to Seth at this point.
- Seth reiterated that faculty should be “in the driver’s seat” when it comes to these decisions, because we are the ones who know the material and who provide the material.
 - Currently, the bill states that the work of aligning outcomes would pushed out to faculty, and then returned to the statewide transfer council to be finalized.
- Seth said that we have in the past leaned toward urging transparency in the process rather than compliance, which leads to a more nuanced approach, but also more complex outcomes in regard to course transfer.
 - This is the approach the letter advocates for.
- Seth said that this bill potentially has more teeth than the previous bill, and that that should concern us.
 - He also said that on this front, HECC is more of an ally than an enemy.
- Senator Dembrow will be at Friday’s IFS meeting, so if anyone has examples of their concerns, they should forward them to Lindy and/or Seth.
- Questions?
 - Maureen asked if there will be oversight over faculty decisions like there was during the building of transfer maps previously.

Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – April 6 2021

- Seth said that in the current version of the bill, the transfer council provides this oversight. Seth sees many of the same issues with this bill that we've faced in the past.
- End of report.

Report of the Fiscal Operations Advisory Council (FOAC) Representative – Christopher Syrnyk

- Christopher said that FOAC will be meeting on 4/9.
- End of report.

Report of the Administrative Council Delegate – Brenda Campbell

- Brenda says that Admin Council has been busy.
- They have worked with HR to hold an employee appreciation event. Eighty-six employees participated.
- Brenda also shared a collage of Oregon Tech employees who participated in Employee Appreciation Day by submitting a photo of themselves sharing their first year working at Oregon Tech.
- Last term, thirty-two people participated in the “Owl Leaders are Readers” program. This term, the group is reading *Think Again* by Adam Grant.
- Admin Council elections will be happening soon, to fill vacancies created at the end of the year.
- Unclassified staff continue to be concerned about the atmosphere on campus and the impact it's having on the students.
- End of report.
- **Note:** After Brenda's report, Shiloh Castelli, a student at the Portland-Metro campus, spoke to student efforts to disseminate “more accurate” information on current campus events than what has been communicated broadly by senior administration. Many students have questions, and Shiloh and other students are organizing to support the student population and answer their questions.

Adjournment

Don McDonnell adjourned the meeting at 7:58pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Bunting, Secretary

Charge 1: Review the current waitlist policy and make recommendations.

- At present, courses can have waitlists added to them at the request of an instructor.
- Faculty are expected to “manage” this waitlist, which can be an additional burden for faculty, especially in the “off contract” summer months.
- Banner has a setting that would allow for “automatic waitlists”.
 - **Pros:**
 - Follows traditional definition of waitlist
 - Students receive notification they can register and set time frame they must move in before moving to next on list.
 - Faculty no longer have to monitor and manually move students
 - Students can no longer “jump line” when seats open
 - It is better “customer service” for the students
 - **Cons:**
 - It’s all or nothing – if we turn it on every class with have a waitlist unless faculty **opt out**
 - Faculty have been opposed to this in the past, preferring to manage their own waitlists
- **It is the recommendation of the committee that:**
 - The Registrar’s Office **turn on** automatic waitlists with 10 student spots per course and a 48 hour window for students to register when it is their turn.

Charge 4: Evaluate the student add/drop procedure timeline and make recommendations.

- At present, students can add or drop in the first two weeks of the term.
 - During the second week they need an advisor AND instructor signature to **add**.
 - During the second week they need an advisor signature to **drop**.
- It is sometimes hard for students to get in touch with advisors, especially in COVID times when they can’t come by the office.
 - Registrar allows this approval to be an email, which can help.
- Registrar is currently working on the Course Substitution form being an etrieve document.
- **It is the recommendation of the committee that:**
 - The Registrar’s Office move the Add/Drop form to an online document as well to help eliminate need for tracking down signatures.
 - The timeline for the add/drop period should NOT be changed.

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Academic Appointment, Rank and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty
OIT-20-046

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.

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

Promotion between ranks is intended to:

- Reward excellence in teaching, along with satisfactory or exemplary performance in other areas.
- Provide additional stability through the possibility of an earlier notice of annual appointment, along with the possibility of multi-year contracts.

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 concentration 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

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

- Maintain student numerical evaluations at a departmentally established level

Professional Development

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:

- Model high ethical standards as defined by the candidate's profession
- Deal honestly, fairly and openly with colleagues and students
- Respect others
- Accept responsibility for actions and decisions, and their consequences
- 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

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

- 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. However, instructors who complete the master's before serving four full years in rank will be eligible to apply for promotion the following April if they meet all other criteria.

Criteria for Promotion:

- Demonstrate excellence in teaching.
- 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:

At least 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.

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

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 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

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

- 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.

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

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

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 mandated by OARs 580-021-0050 and 580-021-0055 are located in the Policy and Procedures portion of the Human Resources section of the Oregon Tech website.

Recommended by:

Faculty Senate – April 6th, 2021 (Revised from policy approved by Faculty Senate Jun 6, 2017)
President's Council –

Approved:

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

Date:

March 25, 2021

Senator Michael Dembrow, Chair
Senate Education Committee
900 Court Street NE
Salem, 97301

RE: Senate Bill 233 (2021)

Dear Senator Dembrow and Members of the Committee,

Faculty at Oregon Tech are strong supporters of smooth student transfer from Oregon community colleges to our institution. We understand that transferability can impact student affordability. Improving transfer student completion and retention while minimizing time to degree is a state-level goal that must be prioritized and incentivized accordingly.

In particular, we understand and support the general goal of aligning courses in terms of numbering and, more importantly, in terms of learning outcomes by creating a common course numbering (CCN) system for all public institutions of higher education in Oregon. It is imperative though that any CCN system would only apply to a set of 100- and 200-level courses that are offered at the majority of institutions, as the distinctiveness of each university and degree program lies in the upper-division courses taken at each college.

We believe that a CCN system can be implemented while maintaining the academic autonomy of the colleges and universities affected only if faculty share in the design and implementation of that CCN system. Furthermore, it should be those who are qualified to teach the relevant content of the pertinent disciplines to determine and define outcomes and numbering.

Based on that understanding, in subsequent amendments to Senate Bill 233 we would like to see a stronger and clearer role for faculty and better definition of the role of the Transfer Council *vis a vis* the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

In particular, we would ask that additional amendments clarify that the Transfer Council will establish subject-area subcommittees of faculty and that it is faculty who will analyze and assess learning outcomes for alignment. We are, after all, the only ones with the expertise to make judgments that maintain educational quality and align course outcomes and are the ones who must implement these common learning outcomes in our classrooms. It would be sensible for the Transfer Council to identify faculty subcommittees of this type with composition balanced among public university faculty, community college faculty, and, where appropriate, high school dual credit faculty.

Because faculty will inform and participate on the Transfer Council, the HECC should not have authority to decide whether to follow recommendations from the Transfer Council as is reflected

in SB233-1 amendments (see Section 5(1)(a) and Section 5 (1)(d). If faculty are appropriately charged with assuring educational quality, there is no need for a CCN system to be established via incursions into university governing board authorities (see Section 1, “Notwithstanding ORS 352.087(1)(q) or any other provision of law”). The subcommittees would inform the Transfer Council of CCN designation decisions, and the Transfer Council would communicate those decisions to the institutions for implementation. We believe that robust transparency in who is and who is not operating with these standards will incentivize compliance – colleges and faculty understand the risk of losing potential transfer students if public transfer comparisons call them out. But final decision-making authority on curricula should remain solidly within each institution and with its faculty.

We are always at your disposal to discuss further and appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Oregon Tech Faculty Senate Executives

Don McDonnell
Christopher Syrnyk
Ben Bunting
Lindy Stewart