Minutes

The Faculty Senate met on June 6th 2023, 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 in attendance except for Cecily Heiner.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the May 2nd 2023 Faculty Senate meeting and the May 16th Faculty Senate Special Meeting were both approved with no changes.

Reports of the Officers
Report of the President – Terri Torres

- Terri began by reporting that the stay survey has been completed, and she hopes it can be piloted with faculty next year.
- She reported to the Board of Trustees about:
  - The new promotion policy that passed through Faculty Senate during last month's Special Meeting.
  - The work that the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations is doing.
  - SenEx and the Provost working together to draft charges for next year's committees.
  - The need for strong leadership to enable us to continue moving forward successfully.
- The recommendation from Senate on the academic calendar from earlier in the year is still with Dr. Naganathan. Terri said she will continue to ask about this until progress is made.
- The new promotion policy is currently with David Groff, who has at most thirty days to review it for any legal issues.
  - Terri added that the Provost wants HR to get a chance to review the policy in addition to the usual President's Council review, which might lead to the policy not being approved until the fall.
- SenEx met with the Provost today. Among the topics discussed were:
  - Who stands in for the Provost if she has to take leave? Dr. Afjeh will be standing in for the Provost if/when necessary.
  - How can FOAC be reoriented toward valuing shared governance? The Provost recommended that SenEx talk to John Harman about this.
  - How will the various expectations for "new" and "old" tenure-track faculty be communicated in the future? There will be new charges for the appropriate committees in the fall to make these expectations more explicit.
  - Is there a reasonable way to include more students in research projects? The Provost suggested that maybe we could create new courses that are oriented specifically toward getting them involved in research. Such courses could be included in the General Education curriculum.
- Terri closed by expressing her appreciation for the Senators and the work the group has done throughout the year, despite the many difficulties we've faced collectively.
  - Terri will still be Senate President next year, and she listed some of the items she intends to have the Senate start work on in the fall:
    - Emeritus Policy
    - Dead Week Policy
    - Post-Tenure Policy
    - Tenure Policy
    - Artificial Intelligence

- ▪ Faculty Evaluations
- ▪ Faculty portions of the Academic Master Plan
  - o She encouraged anyone with other ideas for future charges to send them to her.
- Questions?
  - o Maureen Sevigny suggested that we should be looking into General Education revision as well as credit for prior learning, to dovetail with the work that's currently being done statewide on common course numbering.
- End of report.

Report of the Vice President – Yuehai Yang

- Yuehai began by thanking everyone who participated in the Senate election process. Sixty-one faculty participated overall. We have five new HAS Senators, one new ETM Senator, and one new At-Large Senator.
- Academic Council met earlier today, but Yuehai was unable to provide a formal report on this meeting due to his teaching schedule. As per his informal notes:
  - o Dr. Mott was unable to attend the meeting, so Dean Peterson hosted the meeting. The meeting was conducted in Q&A format.
  - o The first item covered was summer contracts: if you need a summer contract, instructional or otherwise, you should let your department chair know ASAP.
  - o Changing many of our three-credit courses to four-credit courses to be in line with the statewide common course numbering effort is going to throw off many of our current credit counts and upset programs' curriculum maps. The list of effected courses is ready, and Yuehai expects a committee or committees to be charged with addressing these changes in the fall.
    - ▪ Dean Peterson mentioned that General Education should be included in this conversation as well: specifically, GEAC, CPC, and the chairs of General Education-oriented departments.
    - ▪ Course credit counts *and* titles will be changed.
  - o Search updates:
    - ▪ The Sponsored Projects and Grant Administration search is "not going very well." There are only two applicants, and they are not very qualified. The Provost has agreed to raise the salary as a result.
    - ▪ The Dean of Online and Global Engagement search is completed, and there is a new hire in this position: Dr. Black.
    - ▪ The Dean of ETM search will start formally at the beginning of the fall, with some preparatory work being done over the summer.
  - o Yuehai also gave an update on Simple Syllabus. He reported that there will be a "soft launch" of Simple Syllabus in the fall. Department chairs will have a lot of approval work to do, approving each faculty member's syllabi. Yuehai stressed that this is a one-time process, and after approving a syllabus, the chair will only have to approve again if changes are made in the future.
  - o Many chairs expressed the desire to have Academic Council meetings be more Q&A-oriented in the future, rather than being treated as an information dump from the administration to the chairs/faculty. Chairs would like to be able to set the agenda for the meetings, rather than being given an agenda from the administration. Chairs are frustrated that Academic Council meetings are frequently cancelled because there are "no agenda items" when they have not been consulted beforehand about whether *they* have agenda items or not.
- Questions?
  - o Randall Paul clarified that some of the courses that have had title changes due to the common course numbering initiative have a "z" in their title now to signify that they have been through this process.
    - ▪ Based on a question from Yuehai, Randall explained further that the "z" was decided upon by the Registrar's Office.

- o Matt Schnackenberg asked about chair approval within Simple Syllabus: will the chair have to re-approve each syllabus every time even minor changes are made (i.e. like due dates for a particular assignment)?
    - ▪ Andria Fultz spoke to clarify as a faculty member who served on the Simple Syllabus committee: the committee recommended that such small changes *not* have to be approved each time, but she suspects that this and other details will have to be ironed out as we start using the platform in the fall.
        - • Terri asked Andria what is encompassed by Simple Syllabus. Andria said "everything": schedule, grading scale, list of assignments, learning outcomes, and so on.
            - o Terri pointed out that that isn't what was presented to Faculty Senate originally or what we approved, and Andria agreed, explaining that she was one of few faculty members on the committee and things have changed since that presentation.
            - o Sean Sloan asked when Senate would vote to approve the use of this more…"robust" version of Simple Syllabus. Terri said that she would try to find out more.
  - o Matt brought up a thought regarding the change from three-credit to four-credit classes due to common course numbering: that shifting these credits around may lead, ultimately, to a decrease in the overall number of credits our General Education program requires from Communications, or, even more broadly, a decrease in General Education credits overall at the university. He recommended that GEAC look into credit loss (if any) in General Education as a result of this effort.
      - ▪ Yuehai also spoke in approval of the idea of having this looked at during the fall term.
      - ▪ Randall asked where credit loss is happening (or may happen): Matt and Vicki both explained that this is becoming a problem in Communications specifically.
      - ▪ Vanessa Bennett asked when this is supposed to be implemented programmatically.
          - • There was some confusion at this point in the discussion about whether the point of discussion was programs having their credit counts lowered to one-hundred-eighty or General Education courses changing their credit counts.
              - o Broadly, it was discussed that there is no university-wide deadline for rolling out the one-hundred-eighty credit limit to all programs. Some have already been "streamlined" while others haven't. The credit counts changing on individual courses are happening as the work is completed at the state level.
                  - ▪ Amidst a number of concerns from individuals, Terri expressed her agreement that both of these conversations should be clarified sooner rather than later. However, she also said that "others" disagree, and want to wait to address these concerns in a systemic way until after the statewide effort toward common course numbering is completed.
                      - • Vicki Crooks suggested that four-year Oregon universities (like ours) could have stronger voices at the state level when it comes to the common course numbering effort. She said that in her experience the community colleges have lobbied for their interests much more effectively than we have thus far, leading us to have to make changes that aren't easily made.
- • End of report.

Report of the ASOIT Delegates – Thomas Long and Billy Kimmel

- Billy's (PM President) Report:
  - This month, Billy's report was given by an alternate, Nawaf Al-Wahaibi.
    - Nawaf reported that throughout this year, Portland-Metro's ASOIT has focused on three major projects:
      - The Town Hall meeting on January 24th, which allowed students and leadership to get into communication with one another.
      - The Course Modality Survey was carried out during the month of February. A summary of the survey results are available on the ASOIT website.
      - The "dinner and dialogue" event that was held on May 30th on the Portland-Metro campus. The goals identified and developed during this event will be addressed between now and June of 2025. Issues discussed included:
        - A lack of faculty presence on campus.
        - A lack of access to faculty for students.
        - The College of ETM cannot meet students' needs in terms of course offerings.
        - A decreasing number of students on campus and in class (in person).
        - The current course scheduling framework is not user-friendly.
        - Some courses aren't offered as described in curriculum maps for many majors/programs.
          - Nawaf said that a summary of this discussion and the solutions that were suggested during this event will be made available by June 30th.
  - Questions?
    - There were no questions.
  - End of report.
- Thomas's (KF Representative) Report:
  - Thomas announced that next year's ASOIT officers have been selected: he will be serving ASOIT as the Student Engagement Officer.
  - Thomas also passed out the full results of the survey regarding the current Dead Week Policy that he first introduced during last month's meeting. For the sake of brevity in the minutes, I won't transcribe all of the findings here. I will record any questions or discussion of the findings in the report below.
  - Questions?
    - Terri reiterated that she hopes to have a charge related to revising the Dead Week Policy done for fall term. She intends to have student representation as part of the process.
    - Kamal Gandhi pointed out that some of the options provided to students in the main survey question are actually not allowed (i.e., we wouldn't be allowed to implement them, even if faculty also supported those options). Thomas acknowledged this and said some of the options were the result of brainstorming within ASOIT.
  - End of report.

Report of the Administrative Council Delegate – Kelly Sullivan

- Kelly reported that Administrative Council met most recently in May.
  - During that meeting, there were two people presented as Administrator Emeritus. These two have since been confirmed by the President:
    - Dr. Erin Foley

- - - Kelly Caleb
    - o New staff members were also introduced:
      - Jon Elias (Director of Marketing and Communications, OMIC)
      - Sara Gibson (OMIC Academy Coordinator)
      - Trent LaMont (Associate Manufacturing Researcher, OMIC)
    - o The Kudos Award winner for May was Kim Faks, on the Portland-Metro campus.
    - o There were also elections this month. Sarah Henderson-Wong was reelected to her position. Don Stockton was elected to the only open position.
    - o Kelly reported that all other work that the Administrative Council is working on is continuing.
  - Questions?
    - o There were no questions.
  - End of report.

Reports of Academic Committees

Note: Since the Academic Committees' reports are intended to occur quarterly and all four committees reported last month, there was only a report from CCT this month.

General Education Advisory Council – Randall Paul

- Randall reported that GEAC has not met since the last Senate meeting. They have spoken on Zoom, however.
  - o They have been charged with looking into an issue with scheduling courses, and currently this effort is underway, with the Registrar's Office hiring a student worker to look into how well course schedules do (and don't) cooperate with curriculum maps. Randall hopes to have more information on this effort in the future.
    - Randall suggested that this conversation about scheduling be rolled into the larger conversation/charges coming next year about changing credit counts and common course numbering.
  - o There was also a discussion about whether GEAC would allow a certain Professional Writing course to be counted as a way to fulfill the Communications General Education requirement. Randall clarified that this conversation was necessary because the Communications department has an existing rationale for what does (and doesn't) count as a General Education class and that the decision about what to include (and leave out) shouldn't be based on course prefix alone.
    - He argued that we should have a broader conversation about how courses are chosen to be counted toward General Education requirements: it shouldn't be decided based solely on course prefix, as we've often done in the past.
- Questions?
  - o There were no questions.
- End of report.

Reports of the Standing Committees

Faculty Rank Promotion & Tenure – Matt Schnackenberg

- RPT has completed their charges for the year, so there was no report.

Academic Standards – Vanessa Bennett

- Academic Standards has also completed their charges for the year, so there was no report.

Faculty Senate DEI – Chitra Venugopal

- Chitra began by sharing a document that showed data regarding how and when sabbaticals have been granted over the last three years, but pointed out that the data were limited.
  - Chitra clarified further that the DEI Committee has been trying to get access to documents that would allow them to investigate any inequities in many other facets of our faculty's experience, but that this is the only one they currently have access to.
  - Chitra said that this document needs to be improved to address elements of DEI in sabbatical awards: gender and race, rank, years of service, budgeting, seniority/level of applicants, tenured or not, sabbatical approved or not, reason for approval or not, number of times candidate has applied for sabbatical.
  - The committee has identified questions and sub-questions to gather better information. They have looked for a rubric supporting sabbatical consideration but haven't found one. The committee anticipates producing one as part of this work to ultimately support faculty recruiting and retention by having a clear sabbatical application and award process.
- Questions?
  - Terri had questions but will reserve for after this meeting.
- End of report.

Reports of Special or Ad Hoc Committee

Student Evaluations Ad Hoc Committee – Vicki Crooks

- Vicki referenced the overview of the second report from last meeting and the report in the packet. Final recommendations of the committee are included in the packet as well.
- Terri requested a brief summary
- Vicki presented three recommendations:
  - 1) Discontinue student evaluation of faculty immediately, given the problems associated with them.
  - 2) Develop alternatives to student numerical evaluations, such as the peer evaluation process developed here at Oregon Tech. Samples of non-numerical evaluations used at U of O and other institutions.
  - 3) Evaluate teaching with a multi-pronged approach. The committee anticipates other approaches that are detailed in the report, like teaching portfolios and comprehensive reviews. Perhaps a more comprehensive assessment of student experience, rather than course by course.
  - It's imperative that processes moving forward have the support of administration. Processes should be considered in the context of faculty workload.
- Ben Bunting added details
  - The committees challenge was that student numerical evaluations aren't equitable and need to be discontinued (recommendation 1) and that leads to what should replace them (recommendations 2 and 3). Ben asked for comments and questions. Ben wants Senate's opinion on 2b and 3b, that call for a body to manage how this is done in the future. Who should be included in such a body to ensure good representation?
  - David Hammond responded that it's probably worth having the current evaluation rather than no evaluation. He thinks including peer evaluation can have a lot of benefits that develop a culture of faculty sitting in on each other's classes. He has taught for 10 years without any observation or peer input.
  - Ben responded that this does indeed build community and could be very positive, but it is more work for faculty. The recommendations attempt to capture this.
  - Vicki seconded this sentiment.
  - Yuehai Yang talked about sitting in on colleagues classes when he first started just to see how others taught. He was surprised to learn that this was a novel experience for those faculty he observed. He

asked if there are ways to improve teaching and learning and asked Sujin Lee to speak to his experience at University of Southern California where he taught for 10 years.

o Sujin noted the gender and race disparities in SNEs that drove the discussion there. The institution's response was to support faculty in improving their teaching. Some faculty did not want peer evaluation of their classes. Because different departments had a different style they were tasked with developing their own rubric.

o Sean Sloan disagreed with recommendation 1, said 2 would be an error, and for 3 we have some things in progress. He suggested that peer evaluation of a single class would not address the instructor's plan for a whole course. Eliminating the student from this process is not the right way to address teaching. Because student's are half of our clients along with industry.

o Terri asked Vicki to address Sean's question about students' ability to assess teaching. Vicki said this was a feature of their first report: students do not have the expertise to judge pedagogy or a faculty member's knowledge of the discipline. Students would often like things to be easier. A lot of evidence points to teachers making classes easier as a way to improve scores. We also often have a low response rate to evaluation surveys. Other issues: time of day, gender, entertainment, food in the cafeteria, aesthetics of the room, importance to major, math vs speech. All of these things impact scores. Information about a lawsuit and reliability of SNEs was also part of this first report.

o Yuehai agrees that students should have a say and a way to express their satisfaction about a course.

o Sean said the Oregon Legislature requires a way for students to numerically evaluate a course.

o Terri: Sean, what was your second concern? Sean: the issue that peer evaluation can't capture instructor plans for a whole course.

o Vicki spoke to options to use peer evaluation that include assessment of more than a single course.

o Randall: It sounds like your recommendation would be multi-pronged. Vicki: yes.

o Ben: there are many people who have been doing this on an ad hoc basis over the years.

o Sujin: USC also continued to use the numerical evaluations but with a scale up to 4.

o Vicki: There are schools that use SNEs to inform but not to justify personnel decisions, to promote or to fire.

o Deb: So to pick up on Randall's comments, would you have peer evaluation be a part of it? Vicki: no we are recommending those be discontinued, but there are other student evaluation methods we list in the appendix. Peer evaluations could begin fall term.

o Deb: Could one recommendation be that faculty could be given choices, like numerical or non-numerical evaluations. But your recommendation is to abolish the SNEs. Vicki: I am a yes/and person, but we believe these evaluations are flawed and should be discontinued.

o David: I've been on a lot of tenure and promotion committees and see a lot of these. They aren't helpful if you're trying to compare a 3.9 to 4.1 for different faculty, but anomalously low scores like a 2 for a particular person does help identify an issue. I glance at numerical scores to see if there's a bigger problem, but the student comments are very helpful to understand a faculty member's work better.

o Vicki: if you get positive student comments that can be great, but it's also common to get comments about appearance, weight, clothes, or negative comments. When U of O started their non-numerical approach, negative comments were reduced from around 20% to near 5%. It's not worth subjecting people to negative or mean-spirited comments.

o Sean: But can't we ask the right questions about good teaching: did you get your money's worth out of this course, to what extent did the professor understand/portray the material, to what extent was the professor able to answer student questions. Quantifying things is definitely possible.

o Terri: As a statistician, bad data is bad data and a volunteer survey is prone to bad data. We are not going to solve this entire problem tonight.

o Ben: We are trying to get Senate's support for moving this forward. We want a vote on 2b and 3b specifically, so we can form groups in the fall to work more on this.

- o Maureen Sevigny: This sets people up to be in a position to be in bad situations. I had a chair who didn't agree with what I was trying and was sending negative emails to the Dean. So, in small programs, peer review can be very difficult. It may not be a level playing field.
- o Ben: I understand given I'm the only person who teaches in my area, but the recommendations don't say peer review exclusively.
- o Matt: I see a lot of value in two committees. What about trying some pilots of different approaches? I'm concerned about getting rid of SNEs immediately.
- o Terri, so we have a motion on the floor…Ben: I want to vote on 2b and 3b.
- o Matt: I don't see a recommendation that includes piloting.
- o Terri reiterated the charge: The committee should be charged with the detailed development of a model. The committee should include representation from Faculty Senate, CCT, the Office of Academic Excellence. And Matt, you want to add "the model should be piloted." That is the motion now?
- o Do we have a second? Riley.
- o Ben: do you mean for 2b and 3b? Yes, okay. I would agree with that.
- o Terri: The provost recommended including some chairs.
- o Sean: You mention "a model" or "such a model?" Discussion…Ben: I would say it needs to take into account what was developed by this group. Vicki: that is a concern of mine, that this is one more report that doesn't do anything or say anything but something might happen down the road. I don't want this to go the way "oh maybe later something will happen." We thought this was significant enough to spend the time we spent to tell everyone how problematic numerical evaluations are. I think it's worth having some flexibility in the wording around 2 or 3, but I want to say strongly again that the numerical evaluations that we use are flawed.
- o Terri: I want to point out that this is the same conclusion by this committee as we got from a previous committee.
- o Ken: It sounds like there's an amendment to the motion to strike "such" in two places. It seems like you should stand by your recommendation and just plan on your motion not passing unanimously so you maintain momentum for this effort.
- o Ben: Yes, but I'm looking at these and might have written these better. But because we have had a lot of conversations and research, we want to have something in the wording so this trajectory is followed next year. Bobbi: I see "such" as meaning taking into consideration the recommendations you've come across.
- o Vicki: Responding to Maureen, we're suggesting some kind of peer evaluation, not a specific type.
- o Terri: So the motion is that a committee should be charged in Fall 2023 with the detailed development of such a model. The committee should include representation from Faculty Senate, CCT, the Office of Academic Excellence and should include a pilot.
- o All in favor: majority. All opposed: Sean Sloan and Jintai Wang. Motion passes and Senex will work with academic administration to form the committee.
- o Matt: This last year on our APEs we were asked to collect some student comments and reflect upon them. Where did that come from? Terri: Dr. Mott. Yuehai: We have been doing both APEs and SNEs, but they have never been combined before. Whether that continues or not is not our decision.
- o Terri: I would like to encourage you too, if you haven't already, to read the reports from this committee. In the end if you read these and feel strongly one way, then so be it, but I feel the evidence is there to support their conclusions.
- End of report.

Unfinished Business

- Changes to Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws
    - Ashton: last meeting we presented changes to the charter and bylaws to be transparent. Any program with six or more faculty is entitled to at least one faculty senator for each 15 faculty. We changed that to eight to decrease the number of faculty required. There was at least one instance in the version we presented last month left the number six in some places and not others. So, we changed the number to eight everywhere, so that's the minimum number required to have representation. We talked to Andie Fultz who spoke to representation in Portland-Metro. We talked about how to incorporate that into the bylaws with a statement like PM will always have a representative. We realize we have something already in the bylaws that indicates that any OIT program location with that minimum of eight faculty is entitled to representation. We haven't necessarily been doing that when we administer elections due to added logistics and because we feel PM is adequately represented. We want to renew our commitment to that when we hold elections. I would like to make a motion to approve the bylaw charter revisions. Matt: second. All in favor: unanimous.

New Business

- There was no new business.

Report of the Provost – Dr. Joanna Mott

- Terri reported in Dr. Mott's stead: The Provost supplied the pizza! She said she is sorry she could not attend. I wish everyone a wonderful summer. Next year she would like to focus on the Academic Master Plan goals. Abdy, anything to add? (no response)
- Terri: I have an update from Dean Peterson. The members of the College of HAS have done some great work this year and I can't tell you how appreciate of their efforts I am. We accomplished items in each college. We had a focus on students and a focus on faculty. Improved communication and strived for excellence this year. The one effort that needs to be done that we didn't work on this year is a College Strategic Plan. I discussed accomplishments and challenges with chairs who will submit reports as part of the AMP to the Provost and Dean. He intends to work on this during convocation. Abdy are you back? (no response)
- Sean: is there a difference between the academic master plan and a five-year plan?
- Terri: I'm not sure. We now have strategic plans for the university and colleges. Departments will do them too and they all build on each other.
- End of report.

Report of the President's Council Delegate – Terri Torres

- President's Council has not met, but we are scheduled to meet next week but I doubt there will be a policy on the agenda.
- End of report.

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

- Maureen: I will do the report. David completed a written report that we will have Ben put into the record. 15 or more years ago the IFS representative would prepare a report each meeting. I did not do that, but David suggested we might want to do this moving forward.
- Maureen reported that IFS met on May 19th. Maureen attended via Zoom and David attended in person. It was nice to have that option. The biggest issue that came up, with major transfer maps, proposals come

forward that need approval by the transfer council. The council usually nitpicks but ultimately approves. There will be an issue of authority if the transfer council does not reach agreement. HECC may need to step in at this point. Ben Cannon of HECC spoke in the meeting and got fairly upset. Faculty emphasized that this is a faculty/curriculum issue and that HECC should not have a say. Ben Cannon said that faculty could have upper division but that these are lower division courses. This was quite a show stopper given the way it was presented. IFS drafted a memo to send up to HECC. This is something for faculty to stay vigilant about. The notion that faculty own the curriculum should be sacrosanct. Others should not run roughshod over this. David got to talk with others offline.

- Legislative issues: revenue forecast was much higher than expected. In talking with Kimberly Coops, our legislative activity liaison, she thought that there was more funding in general support for universities but perhaps additional funding for the TRUs and PSU. But, nothing is running through the legislature because some senators are not showing up to have a quorum. This will be required for budget passage. The governor might call these senators into session just to get this done.

- Searches and new Oregon university presidents are coming on board.

- There will be two IFS meetings per term, which will start to bring meetings up to pre-COVID levels. There used to be lots of chatter by email between meetings and hopefully this will continue to develop in the future.

- The legislature says there needs to be common course numbering, but they can't dictate courses or content. That needs to be faculty, so stand up and stay vigilant.

- Maureen turned it over to David Hammond to add anything regarding the written report. David: we had a number of administrators join those discussions regarding the transfer map. The provosts and PSU and SOU and the president of OSU was discussing this with the HECC. We also heard from SOU's VP for government relations about positive feeling about budget and higher than reported revenue. There's also a senate bill which could potentially allow community colleges to offer a nursing degree. She flagged this as something the 4-year colleges should be aware of.

- Terri: Ryan Madden will continue Maureen's term through December. I am looking at my phone and Abdy would like to say something but he has lost his connection. I will let you know when I hear.

- End of report.

Report of the Fiscal Operations Advisory Council (FOAC) Representative – Yuehai Yang

- FOAC met May 17th and provided a budget update. Maureen and David offered some of this. I will summarize the rest:
  - There is a tuition revenue and enrollment decline at OIT. Tuition revenue dropped almost $2M in the last 2 years. In fall 2021 enrollment was down 9.8% and in fall 2022 enrollment dropped 5.9%. So, that caused some stress in our budget. Public universities proposed a 17% increase for 2023-2025 to the legislature; 8.7% for inflationary adjustment and the remainder to improve the overall share of the cost of education funded by the state and to support essential student wraparound services. Oregon ranked almost at the bottom among all states for funding for public higher education per student. State funding dropped from 75% to 30% of universities' revenue on average over 30 years. So, to deal with our budget deficit we need an 18.5% tuition increase, which is not going to happen obviously. From the governors discussion they approved a 5.6% increase of state funding for public higher ed. With that the tuition recommendation committee was 5%. The president proposed a 4.9% increase and the board approved it. With all this financial stress, the outlook is that we will try to strategically invest in some areas: Math learning lab, bridge program funding, AVP for Strategic Enrollment Management and Retention, Assistant Director of Admissions, Director of Career

> Services, Dean of Students, Associate Director of Environmental Health and Safety, Associate Dean of HAS, Dean of Online and Global Engagement.
>   o Ken: What was that about an Associate Dean of HAS? Is there a search ongoing or are they carving out a budget for next year? Yuehai: Since the faculty search committee members will be unavailable until fall, we are hiring a faculty search firm. Beverly: There is a position that has been approved, but the position has not been listed.

- End of report.

Open Floor

Matt Schnackenberg

- Matt asked about end of year academic committee reports to the Provost and if Senate has access to those. Seems like a shared governance thing. Terri: No, but I will ask.

Abdy Afjeh

- Terri gave Dr. Afjeh time to speak as Interim ETM Dean. Dr. Afjeh: Thank you to everyone for participating with New Wings to help provide good advice to our students and assist our recruiting staff. Our goals for next year:
   o Hire a new Dean for ETM.
   o Oregon Tech is a great institution. It is a different institution…I've heard in Oregon we do things differently and I have learned that. It's unique that faculty work so closely with students at Oregon Tech. I've heard about research experiences with undergraduate students; the students get close attention and they develop confidence that they can work independently from a faculty member. I got an email from one of our faculty that our student SAE Baja team was ranked 10th at their competition, which is wonderful because the competition is more challenging. I appreciate all that you do.

Terri Torres

- Kamal made the recommendation. FOPs should be done before everyone leaves for summer.
- Ken: Is the merit form also supposed to be done? By the chair and signed by faculty? Beverly: my two cents that with the advent of the CBA the merit pool is established by the APEs. I think they'll be used but we're not there yet. The merit form is not mentioned in the CBA. Ken: the form gives chairs a little more opportunity as it is a 0 to 6 scale rather than a 0 to 3 scale. Terri: it would have been nice to know about this. Everyone just make sure to do your FOPs.

Riley Richards

- My question is for Abdy. The minutes of the last meeting have you talking about a process for IRB. Is there an update there?
- Abdy: The IRB process has not changed. We still work with the same company and Brenda Campbell is the liaison. You submit your forms as outlined on the webpage and the company turns it around in 2-3 weeks. We also require students and faculty to go through the CITI training, which has caused delays for some. There have also been delays when Brenda is not available. We're working to make sure the process is always available but it has not changed.

Billy Kimmel

- I want to share a little bit more about the tuition recommendation process since we heard about that earlier. I want to talk about the lack of information during that process. So, that 4.9% vote, I learned more about that after the vote. The board talked about a budgeted $3.9M savings from payroll expenses, I believe. When we were voting on the 4.9% tuition increase, that was on the assumption that we also had this $1.3M in budget

cuts. But we didn't know about the $3.9M savings from payroll. So, I just think that's relevant information. Maybe it has to do with the timing and when that information becomes available to the office of finance, but I think it's relevant. Also, thank you for engaging with ASOIT throughout this year. Terri: Thank you and thank you for your comments.

Terri Torres

- Welcome to our new Faculty Senate senators. Not all of the meetings are this long and not all have pizza.

Thomas Arce

- I have two announcements
  - With my hat as interim director of career services. As Yuehai shared about strategic investments, we will have a search this summer for a full-time director. Part of that position is to create industry partnerships. We do have a employer relations position, that's Anna Fowler, but the director will lead the career services department. They will be at the Portland-Metro campus but will work with faculty and staff on both campuses. The idea is to create industry partnerships so that industry and Oregon Tech can create more educational opportunities and there's a full-time individual to devote to that. I wanted to share that this year there's a career services team: Anna Fowler, Desiree Wooten, and myself. Many career fairs this year. We have 15 career fairs next year. We look to faculty as a partner in that. We know you're connected to industry and we rely on you to help bring employers to those fairs. We are planning more specific career fairs, starting with Civil Engineering and Geomatics.
  - My second hat is as director of student involvement and belonging and talking about new student orientation. I joined you last June to talk about changes we've made to new student orientation. We know many of you participated in the excitement of this past September with Deans Peterson and Keyser dueling it out. We're trying to promote a college identity. We know they already have a department identity. Dates will be September 25 and 26 this year. We'll let you know how you can be involved. In PM the orientation will look a little different. We will do one but students will choose evening 9.25 or the morning of 9.26.

Terri Torres

- We just looked up, there is a merit policy. If it isn't going to be followed then we want to discuss it. I have talked to Dr. Nagi about this merit policy and he did express to me that he wanted to keep this policy. I think we should talk about this soon.
- Ben: It hasn't been updated since 2009 so that might be good to look at.
- Sean: Do you remember the last year it was funded? Laughter.
- Beverly: The issue is still going to be the intersection with the CBA.
- Ken: I don't have the final answer with that but I would be happy to meet with whomever because I helped to write that policy.

Adjournment

Terri adjourned the meeting at 8:23pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Bunting and CJ Riley, Secretaries

Report from IFS meeting, May 19 2023

The IFS had a significant discussion of the Transfer Council's work on developing Major Transfer Maps (MTM's), and how the HECC is interpreting its authority (under SB 233) to develop Oregon Administrative Rules that may potentially force the public universities to comply with accepting transfer credit under MTM's, if the Transfer council fails to reach consensus. IFS heard from the provosts of PSU (Susan Jeffords) and SOU (Susan Walsh), and the president of SOU (Rick Bailey) regarding their concerns with the HECC on this matter. IFS later met virtually with Ben Cannon from the HECC, and shared concerns that the stated plans of the HECC may result in erosion of faculty control over curriculum at our institutions, and potentially result in problems with accreditation. Following our meeting with Ben Cannon, the IFS decided to draft a formal letter more carefully describing our concerns.

IFS heard from Jeanne Stallman, (SOU Associate VP for government & corporate relations) regarding the current legislative session. She was optimistic about funding levels for the next biennium, given current positive state revenue predictions. She mentioned SB 523, which would allow some community colleges to offer a nursing degree. She also mentioned that the current walkout of several state legislators was creating uncertainty as to how much regular legislative business would be accomplished this year.

IFS heard updates from each of the constituent campuses, summarized as follows:

OHSU : The president's contract was recently renewed, some faculty feel the renewal process was rushed and not transparent. OHSU overall is struggling with pay equity issues.

WOU : There is a new executive director for HR and a new provost. WOU finished its NW Accreditation visit, the final report will come out in summer.

PSU : The school is hiring a new president. There has been discussion about feasibility of having non tenure-track faculty serve as department chairs. Some departments are involved in program reduction, with in particular the college of education asked to cut its budget by 10%. The PSU faculty senate is feeling swamped all the time.

OSU : The school is in the home stretch of finishing a new strategic plan. There is a relatively new president, who is generally well liked by faculty. General education reform was passed last year, currently the school is in the middle of implementing it, which is a lot of work.

EOU : There is a new president. Recent searches for a dean of business and dean of library science have failed. Overall faculty/admin relations have improved from recent years. Many faculty and staff are relocating office space due to renovations on a major campus building.

SOU : New freshman enrollment is up, while transfer enrollment has decreased. SOU will be starting a search for a new provost. The school's finances have stabilized after recent large cuts to faculty and staff. While the majority of position cuts were implemented with early retirement and voluntary turnover (with few direct layoffs), the faculty and staff are currently very lean. High housing costs in Ashland are making it harder to recruit and retain staff.

UO: There is a new president. The school anticipates likely searching for a new provost soon. There has been a change to the graduation ceremonies, with a return to more decentralized graduations following last year when there was a more centralized graduation. There was backlash against the centralized graduation, resulting in this return to decentralized graduation. UO is updating its course approval process.

IFS set its meeting schedule for the 2023-2024 academic year:
oct 6 2023 - in person, at OSU
nov 9 2023 - virtual meeting
jan 26 2024 - virtual meeting
feb 23 2024 - in person, at WOU
april 19 2024 - in person, at EOU
may 17 2024 - virtual meeting

CHARTER OF THE FACULTY SENATE
OF OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

PREAMBLE

The Faculty exercises its power to initiate action to promote faculty welfare, including but not limited to recommending policy and providing advice, through its representative body, the Faculty Senate in cooperation with the Faculty Bargaining Unit, Oregon Tech AAUP. It has the responsibility, on behalf of the Faculty, of considering proposed changes in the policies of the institute and may suggest such changes on its own initiative. It has the sole responsibility, on behalf of the Faculty, of recommending policy changes to the president of the institute for consideration. "Policy," under this Charter, means a general rule for the conduct of the institute that affects:

    (a) The purposes or goals of the institute;
    (b) The nature and scope of its program; or
    (c) Its standards of teaching, research, and scholarship.

It has the responsibility of considering all proposed policy changes which affect the general welfare of the Faculty. The Senate, furthermore, may consider and recommend specific means of insuring the continuance of academic freedom at this institute.

Article I: **COMPOSITION OF THE SENATE**

Section 1:   **Qualifications and Eligibility:**

    A.   The electorate will be those full-time faculty members of Oregon Institute of Technology as defined in Article III of The Constitution of the Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty.

    B.   Only those full-time faculty members who are not members of the Academic Council are eligible for election to the Senate except that the Academic Council may elect one of its members to the Senate. This senator will have full voting rights but will not hold any office. The admission to the Senate of this one senators is contingent upon the reciprocal admission of the Senate president to the President's Council and the Senate vice-president to the Academic Council.

Section 2:   **Membership:**

    A.   The Senate shall be composed of the senate president elected at large, five senators elected at large and senators elected from each of the faculty groups listed in the Senate Bylaws, Article I, Section 2; each faculty group listed in that section is authorized to elect one senator for every fifteen fulltime faculty members or major fraction thereof.

B.   The term of office of the senate president shall be two years; the terms of office of the five senators elected at large shall be three years; the terms of office of senators elected by faculty groups shall be for two years.

Section 3:   **Election Procedure:** Election of the senate president shall be conducted by the Elections Committee not later than the first two weeks of February. Other senate elections shall be conducted by the Elections Committee not later than the first two weeks of May. Elections for all senators shall be by secret ballot. Elections shall be conducted in two stages: a nomination and an election, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Senate Bylaws, Article Il, Section 1.

Section 4:   **Alternates:** Each senator other than the senate president will designate an alternate from his or her elective group who will be expected to attend those meetings which the elected senator is unable to attend. If a senator is unable to complete the term of office, the alternate will automatically be designated as senator and will serve until the next regular election. If the senate president is unable to complete the term of office, a special election shall be held in a timely fashion in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Senate Bylaws.

Section 5:   **Responsibilities:** Members of the Faculty Senate are the uninstructed representatives of their constituents. It shall be the responsibility of the members to seek the opinions of their constituents, but having done so, the members of the Faculty Senate shall feel free to make decisions and vote on matters according to their own reasoned judgment.

Article II: **ORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE**

Section 1:   **Officers:** The officers of the Senate other than the president shall be elected by the Senate membership at a special meeting at the end of the academic year and shall include, but not be restricted to: a vice-president and a secretary. The officers shall perform those duties set forth in the Bylaws.

Section 2:   **Term of Office:** The terms of office of Senate officers other than the president shall be for one year. In the event of a vacancy in the office of the president of the Senate, the vice-president shall assume that office until a special election is held. In the event of a vacancy in any other office, a replacement will be elected at the next Senate meeting.

Section 3:   **Recall:** A senator may be recalled at any time. To initiate the recall of a senator, a petition signed by twenty-five percent of the Faculty that they represent must be delivered to the chair of the Senate Elections Committee.

Upon validation of said petition, the chair of the Elections Committee will immediately conduct a recall vote among the petitioning faculty group. A simple majority is required for recall.

Section 4:   **Standing Committees:** The Senate shall have, but not be limited to, the following committees:

A. **Executive Committee:** The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the Senate and two members elected from the Senate. The term of office shall be for one year.

B. **Elections Committee:** The role of the Elections Committee will be fulfilled by the Executive Committee. The committee will call all elections required under the Charter, notify the individuals elected as senators, notify the president of the Senate of election results and inform the Faculty of election results.

C. **Faculty Appeals Committee:** The Faculty Appeals Committee shall be composed of three tenured faculty members who shall designate an alternate. The term of office shall be for two years. No officers of the Senate shall be eligible. When the committee considers a case, any member of the committee involved in any way in the case shall disqualify himself and shall be replaced by an alternate who has had no previous connection with the matter to be considered. The committee shall elect its own chair. The committee shall conduct all hearings on matters of conflict between members of the Faculty. It shall also be the responsibility of the committee to reduce friction and forestall conflict among faculty members by investigating sources or potential sources of such friction and conflict which are referred to the attention of the committee and by recommending appropriate action to concerned individuals or groups. Voting members shall include faculty from at least two OIT program locations.

D. **Faculty Policy Committee**: This committee shall have at least five tenured faculty members and three non-tenured faculty members appointed by the Senate president. One of the committee members shall be selected from the Promotion Advisory Committee (PAC). The term of office shall be for two years. This committee shall formulate policy on matters of concern to the Faculty, for approval by the Faculty. The duties of the committee include, but are not limited to: considering those matters which affect the welfare of the Faculty; considering issues involving relationships between administration and faculty; developing policies related to rank, promotion and tenure; and monitoring and providing resources to the various tenure and promotion committees. Voting members shall include faculty from at least two OIT program locations.

E. **Academic Standards Committee:** This committee shall have at least five faculty members: three tenured, two non-tenured or non-tenure track members who have been at Oregon Tech for at least five years, appointed by the Senate president. One committee member shall be a member of the

Curriculum Planning Commission (CPC). One committee member shall be a member of Graduate Council. Any department may have no more than one member on the committee. The term of office shall be for two years. The committee shall initiate discussion, disseminate information, and review and recommend policies relating to academic quality and standards. The committee shall regularly communicate with the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC) and Assessment Committee to ensure coordination of effort. Voting members shall include faculty from at least two OIT program locations.

F. **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI):** This committee shall be comprised of three members of the Faculty. The term of office shall be for two years. One of the committee members shall serve as representative in the DICE Steering Committee. The committee shall initiate discussion, disseminate information, and review and recommend policies relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Voting members shall include faculty from at least two OIT program locations.

G. **Committees, ad hoc:** The Senate president, with the approval of the Senate shall appoint members of ad hoc committees. Such committees, which may include faculty members which are not senators, shall report in the same manner as the standing committees.

H. **Subcommittees:** Standing and ad hoc committees may designate necessary subcommittees, subject to Senate approval.

Section 5: **Meetings:** During the academic year, the Senate shall meet on the first Tuesday of each month. The secretary of the Senate shall make such provisions as are necessary to ensure that voting shall be by members of the Senate only. At the discretion of the president of the Senate, a special meeting may be called. A meeting may be canceled by the president when it is determined by the Executive Committee that there is not sufficient business to warrant holding a meeting.

Section 6: **Campus Facilities:** In carrying out its function as a recognized institute organization, the Senate will have the use of the campus facilities for its meetings, and such secretarial help and supplies as are necessary for proper and efficient dispatch of its duties.

Section 7: **Quorum:** Two-thirds of the Senate membership shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. All policy recommendations of the Senate shall be by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting.

Section 8:   **Authority and Responsibility:** The Senate recognizes that it is subject to the limitations and restrictions stated in the Oregon Institute of Technology Board of Trustee Policy.

Section 9:   **Bylaws and Rules:** The Senate may adopt such bylaws and rules as it deems necessary for its actions.

Article III: **COMMUNICATIONS**

Section 1:   **Agenda:**

   A. The president of the Faculty Senate shall be responsible for publishing the agenda for each Faculty Senate meeting at least one week prior to the regular meeting. Deviations from the published agenda will be permitted only by a majority vote of the senators present

   B. Any member of the Faculty may petition and secure consideration by the Faculty Senate of any appropriate matter by submitting a written request to the Senate president before the publication of the agenda.

   C. Another method of obtaining a hearing is the submission of an initiative petition, signed by at least ten percent of the Faculty, to the president of the Senate. This petition will insure that the item submitted will be placed on the agenda of the next regular Faculty Senate meeting.

Section 2:   **Minutes:** Minutes of meetings shall be taken in sufficient detail to permit adequate understanding of Faculty Senate actions by interested faculty members who are not present. The minutes shall be published as soon as practicable following each meeting and be made available to all faculty members.

Section 3:   **Recommendations to the President:** A recommendation or other formal communication of the Faculty Senate shall, upon its adoption by the Senate, forthwith be put into writing with a record of the vote, signed by the president or vice-president of the Senate, and transmitted to the president of Oregon Institute of Technology.

Article IV: **REVIEW OF SENATE ACTION BY THE FACULTY**

Section 1:   **Procedures for Petition:** To rescind any action of the Faculty Senate, a petition signed by 25 percent of full-time faculty members must be presented to the Senate president.

Section 2:   **Procedure for Referendum:** Upon validation of said petition by the

Executive Committee, the Senate president shall conduct a referendum vote of eligible faculty. A two thirds majority is required to rescind.

Article V: **REFERRAL OF ISSUES TO THE FACULTY**

Those issues which the Senate decides are of special concern to the Faculty shall be referred to the Faculty for referendum vote. A simple majority of eligible faculty members responding is required for approval.

Article VI: **AMENDMENTS**

Section 1: **Proposal:** An amendment to this Charter may be proposed by either (a) two thirds of the members of the Faculty Senate; or (b) an initiative petition signed by 20 percent of the entire Faculty and presented to the president of the Faculty Senate.

Section 2: **Appraisal of Amendments:** Consideration of the proposed amendment shall be given at the next regular meeting of the Senate which follows the first reading of that proposal. Approval by two-thirds of the senators voting on the issue is necessary before the amendment is sent to the Faculty for vote by mail ballots. The proposed amendment may, on second reading, be amended on the floor of the Senate, but the proposal, as amended, must be referred to a committee for clearance on clarity of language or possible conflict with other sections of the Charter. A majority of valid votes cast on the mail ballot shall constitute an effective vote.

Section 3: **Approval:** All amendments so approved shall become part of this Charter when approved by the president of Oregon Institute of Technology.

This is to certify my concurrence with the *Charter of the Faculty Senate* of Oregon Institute of Technology as amended.

_____
President
Oregon Institute of Technology

_____
Faculty Senate President
Oregon Institute of Technology

Date: _____

BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SEN ATE
OF OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Article I: **MEMBERSHIP OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

Section I: **Membership** — The membership shall be as follows:

A. **Six senators at large.** One At-Large Position is designated as senate president. The senate president must be tenured at the time of election, and must have served for at least two years on faculty senate at the time of election. One At-Large Position will be designated as the senate representative to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and will be elected to a three-year term to run concurrently with the IFS term of office. Election of this At-Large Position will be held one month before the beginning of the next IFS term of service and will otherwise be conducted following normal election procedures.

B. **Senators elected by the faculty groups.** Each faculty group as listed in Article I, Section 2 of the Bylaws, is entitled to elect one senator for every fifteen full-time faculty members (or major fraction thereof) within that faculty group. Any faculty group with less than fifteen full-time faculty members is entitled to elect one senator. If the teaching assignment of a full-time faculty member requires that they be a part of more than one faculty group, then they will be considered a member of that faculty group in which they devote the majority of their teaching time.

C. **One senator from the Academic Council.** One senator will be elected from and by the Academic Council under the provisions stated in the Charter of the Faculty Senate, Article I, Section 1 B.

D. **One senator *ex officio* from the Administrative Council.** The representative from the Administrative Council will be designated by members of that group. Any member of the Administrative Council may fill this position at a given meeting. Because of the *ex officio* nature of this position, the Administrative Council representative will not be counted for quorum call and will not vote.

E. **One senator *ex officio* from the President's Council.** Any member of the President's Council may fill this position at a given meeting. Because of the *ex officio* nature of this position, the President's Council representative will not be counted for quorum call and will not vote.

F. **Two senators *ex officio* from ASOIT:** The presidents of Klamath Falls ASOIT and Portland-Metro ASOIT or other representatives shall be *ex officio* members of the OIT Faculty Senate. Because of the *ex officio* nature of these positions, the representatives will not be counted for quorum call and will not vote.

Section 2: **Faculty Groups Authorized to Elect Senators:**
- College of Engineering, Technology and Management
- College of Health, Arts and Sciences
- Library Faculty

Any OIT program location with eight or more faculty in one of the above groups shall be entitled to at least one senator from that group for each fifteen faculty or major fraction thereof from that location. In the event there are no faculty willing or able to fill positions from a particular location, those positions will be filled by faculty elected from another location. All senators, although elected under a specific faculty group, are chosen to afford a special means of communication of ideas throughout the OIT community. All senators will act as prescribed in the Charter of the Faculty Senate, Article I, Section 5.

Article II: **NOMINATION AND ELECTION PROCEDURES**

Section 1:   **Selection and Election of Senators:**

A.   During the week of the first Monday in February, the Elections Committee shall conduct an election for senate president, by secret ballot. Two weeks or more prior to the first Monday in May, the Elections Committee shall conduct an election of senators, by secret ballot, for those positions for which there is a pending vacancy. Prior to calling for elections, the chair of the Elections Committee shall secure a certified list of faculty who, as of February 1 for the presidential election or April 1 for election of senators, are qualified voters according to Article I, Section 1, of the Charter.

B.   Prior to the first Monday in February, the Elections Committee will notify faculty if there is a pending vacancy in the Faculty Senate President position, and shall call for nominations. Prior to the Monday of the week prior to the first Monday in May, the Elections Committee will notify faculty of any pending vacancies in other Senate positions, and shall call for nominations.

C.   Any qualified voter may file a nomination with the Elections Committee, which shall then determine the eligibility of the nominees as defined by the Charter and the Bylaws. Nominees are candidates for all of those positions for which there is a pending vacancy in their own group or, if nominated for senator at large, are candidates for all open senator at large positions. Persons who are nominated for both faculty group positions and senator at-large positions shall choose which position to stand for. Such nominees must notify the Elections Committee of their choice by noon on Friday prior to elections week. Otherwise the determination of positions shall be made by the Elections Committee. Nominees will provide a statement of 200-500 words describing their qualifications for office and their policy goals by noon on Friday prior to elections week.

D.   Elections shall be by secure electronic ballot. Nominee statements by each candidate will be distributed with the ballot. The position of the names of nominees on the ballots shall be determined by lot. Each voter may vote for as many nominees as there are pending open positions.

E.   At least three members of the Election Committee shall validate the election results and deliver them to the president of the Senate. Members of the Elections Committee who are candidates for election are not eligible to participate in election validation. Ballots with more names chosen than there are open positions shall be declared void.

F.   The nominee(s) receiving the most votes by group and location, as noted above, are elected. In case of a tie vote for the last available position(s), the winner(s) shall be determined by a runoff election between the tied candidates. In the case of a senate president election, if no candidate receives a majority, the winner shall be determined by a runoff election between the two candidates who received the most votes. Any runoff shall be conducted during the week following the general election and shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined for the general election.

G.   The president of the Faculty Senate shall notify the faculty of the results of all elections.

H.   The president of the Faculty Senate shall call for an organizational meeting of the new Senate immediately following the last scheduled meeting of spring term. The first order of business after the call to order shall be the seating of the newly elected senators.

Section 2:   **Attendance and Participation:**

A.   All meetings of the Senate shall be open to all members of the electorate. Visitors shall participate in discussion only upon invitation by the president of the Senate.

B.   The Senate may resolve itself into executive session (senators or their alternates only) upon a two-thirds vote. All votes on such matters as discussed in executive session shall be taken in open meetings.

C.   Regular attendance at meetings of the Senate is expected of all members or their alternates. If a Senate position is unattended at three regular Senate meetings during the academic year, that position shall be declared vacant and open.

D.   Alternates will be selected and will attend senate meetings according to the following procedure:

1.   Each senator other than the senate president will designate an alternate from his or her elective group, subject to confirmation by the senate president. If a senator is unable to complete the term of office, then the alternate will automatically be designated as senator, who will in turn appoint an alternate, subject to confirmation by the senate president. Alternates will serve as senators until the next regular election. If the senate president is unable to complete their term of office, the vice-president will serve until a special election is held to elect a replacement. A special election must be held within one month of the vice-president assuming the duties of president.

2.   The alternate shall have full voting privileges in the absence of the duly elected senator.

3.   At no time shall an alternate serve as an alternate for more than one senator.

Section 3:   **Selection and Election of Senate Officers:**

    A.   The election of Senate Officers other than senate president will be held at the organizational meeting of the new Senate immediately after the seating of the newly elected senators.

    B.   The Executive Committee shall serve in the capacity of a nominating committee for offices of the Senate. In selecting candidates for office, the Executive Committee will consider the diverse interests of faculty, including geographical location, and strive to reflect that diversity in their nominations. Opportunity shall be given for nominations from the floor during the last two meetings of the year.

    C.   Voting shall be by secret ballot by all members of the Senate. In selecting candidates for office, Senators will consider the diverse interests of faculty, including geographical location, and strive to reflect that diversity in their voting. The vice president shall prepare the ballots and shall count and tally all the ballots. Election shall be by majority vote.

    D.   The elected officers shall begin their terms immediately upon being apprised of the results of the elections.

    E.   Senators may not be officers unless they have served one academic year on the Senate. Service as an alternate senator is not included.

Section 4:   **Terms of Office:**

    A.   The terms of officers and all senators shall begin at the organizational meeting.

    B.   Senate officers may serve any number of consecutive terms provided they are nominated annually and are elected to that office by the senate.

Article III: **OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES**

Section 1:   **Duties of the President of the Senate** — The president of the Senate shall:

    A.   Preside at all meetings of the Faculty Senate.

    B.   Be responsible for publishing the agenda of the meetings of the Senate.

    C.   Call regular or special meetings of the Senate.

    D.   Appoint, with the approval of the Senate, all standing committees of the Senate.

    E.   Perform such other duties as are specified in the Charter and Bylaws, or as may evolve through actions of the Senate.

Section 2:   **Duties of the Vice President** — The vice president shall:

    A.   Serve as assistant to the president in all duties of the president; in the absence of the president, preside at the meetings and at that time assume all responsibilities of the office.

    B.   Serve as chairman of the elections Committee.

Section 3:   **Duties of the Secretary** — The secretary shall:

    A.   Cause to be recorded, collected, preserved, and duplicated the minutes of all meetings of the Faculty, the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee.

B.   Cause distribution of the minutes of Faculty and Faculty Senate meetings to the electorate.

C.   Maintain the valid list of membership of the Faculty Senate, and duly authorized alternates, at each meeting.

D.   Maintain an accurate listing of the electorate.

E.   Perform such other duties as may be assigned by the president.

Article IV: **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
Section 1:   **Membership:**

A.   The membership of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the officers of the Senate and two members elected from the Senate.

B.   Election shall be in the same manner and at the same time as the election of officers of the Senate. In selecting candidates for office, Senators will consider the diverse interests of faculty, including geographical location, and strive to reflect that diversity in their voting.

C.   The terms of office will be one year, other than senate president, which will be two years.

D.   A simple majority shall constitute a quorum.

Section 2:   **Duties** — The duties of the Executive Committee shall consist of:

A.   Supervising the affairs of the Faculty Senate between regular meeting dates.

B.   Serving as an advisory body to the president at such times as the president requests, when the nature of a situation calls for urgent consideration of faculty viewpoint, and during the absence of the Faculty at vacation periods.

C.   Determining the agenda of regular meetings of the Faculty Senate by meeting with the president, or in some manner acceptable to the majority of the group, at least one week in advance of a Senate meeting.

D.   Reviewing a petition in accordance with Article IV, Section 1, of the Charter, advising the Senate of its actions by report, and placing it on the agenda.

E.   Performing such other duties as are specified in these Bylaws, or as may be assigned to it by the Senate.

F.   The Faculty Senate shall have the right to review and approve or rescind any action of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Article V: **MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

Section 1:   **Regular meetings, as authorized in the Senate Charter, shall be:**

A.   Held on the first Tuesday of each month during the academic year subject to the provisions in Article II, Section 5, of the Charter.

B.   Supplemented by special meetings, as hereinafter provided.

C.   Conducted in accordance with the published agenda. Deviations from the published agenda shall be made according to the Charter, Article III, Section 1.

Section 2:   **Special meetings of the Faculty Senate shall be:**

A.   Additional meetings and called special meetings.

B.   Additional meetings as may be agreed upon and the date, time, and purpose established by assent of a regular constituted quorum of the Faculty Senate.

C.   Called meetings which shall be convened by the president of the Senate when:

    1.   A request stating the purpose of the meeting is submitted in writing signed by one-third of the Senate members or 20 percent of the entire faculty.

    2.   Deemed necessary by the president.

D.   Conducted with respect to the business for which the meeting was called. New or additional business not germane to the stated purpose of the meeting may not be introduced.

Article VI: **ORDER OF BUSINESS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE**

Section 1:   **At regular meetings of the Senate, business shall be conducted as follows:**

1.   Call to order

2.   Call of the roll

3.   Determination of a quorum

4.   Approval of the minutes

5.   Reports of officers

6.   Report of the ASOIT Delegate

7.   Report of the Administrative Council Delegates

8.   Reports of academic committees (quarterly)

9.   Reports of standing committees

10.   Reports of special or ad hoc committees

11.   Unfinished business

12.   New business

13.   Report of the Provost

14.   Report of the President's Council Delegate

15.   Report of the IFS representative

16.   Report of the Fiscal Operations Advisory Council

17.   Open Floor

18.   Adjournment

Section 2:   **At any special meeting of the Senate, business shall be conducted as follows:**

A.   Call to order

B.   Call of the roll

C.   Consideration of the stated business for which the meeting was called

D.   Adjournment

Section 3:   The rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order, Revised, shall govern the Senate in all cases for which they may be invoked by the president.

Section 4:   Participation in discussion at Senate meetings shall be of an informal forum nature except at those times when a specific motion is presented for action by the Senate, wherein rules of procedure as herein described relative to motions and voting shall prevail.

Section 5:   The president shall determine the method of vote in accordance with the Charter, Article II, Section 7, and the results will be recorded in the minutes in accordance with the Charter, Article III, Section 2. However, a roll call vote must be taken at the request of any senator.

Section 6:   **Committee Charges and/or Actions:**

A.   To charge a standing committee of the Faculty Senate (Charter of Faculty Senate, Article II, Section 4) requires a majority vote of either the:

1.   Faculty Senate, or the

2.   Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

B.   In addition to the above (Article VI, Section 6A), matters may be brought to the standing committee's attention, but not necessarily for action, by:

1.   The president of the Faculty Senate.

2.   Any two (2) members of the standing committee.

C.   Standing committee meetings are called by:

1.   The chair of the committee. If the chair is absent, declines, or neglects to call a meeting, the committee can meet at the call of:

a.   Any two (2) members of the committee providing notification is sent to all members of the committee.

b.   Action in committee meetings can occur only when a quorum (majority) is present.

Article VII: **INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATION**

Section 1:   **Representatives** — Two full-time faculty will be elected to represent the Oregon Institute of Technology at the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate. One representative will be an Oregon Institute of Technology senator-at-large. The second representative is not required to be a member of the Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate.

Section 2:   **Election**

    A.   The two IFS representatives are to serve staggered terms of three years.

    B.   The OIT senator-at-large will be elected as outlined in Article 1, Section 1, of these Bylaws. The Faculty Senate will conduct the election for the second representative. The election is to be held at least one month prior to the expiration of the current IFS term.

    C.   Eligible faculty shall be tenured and otherwise as defined in Article 1, Section 1B, of the Charter of the Faculty Senate of Oregon Institute of Technology.

    D.   Selection of alternates for the IFS senator or representative shall be in accordance with the eligibility noted above.

Article VIII: **REVIEW OF SENATE ACTION BY THE FACULTY**

Section 1:   **Procedure for Petition** — To rescind any action of the Faculty Senate, a petition signed by 25 percent of full time faculty members must be presented to the Senate president.

Section 2:   **Procedure for Referendum** — Upon validation of said petition by the Executive Committee, the Senate president shall conduct a referendum vote of eligible faculty. A two-thirds majority is required to rescind.

Article IX: **AMENDMENT**

Section 1:   These Bylaws may be amended by the Senate at any regular meeting. Passage of the amendment shall require a two-thirds vote of the total Senate membership.

Section 2:   A proposed amendment may be presented to the Senate by any one of its members. It shall be presented in written form.

Article X: **REGULAR REVIEW OF FACULTY CONSTITUTION, AND FACULTY SENATE CHARTER AND BYLAWS**

Section 1:   Faculty Senate will conduct regular reviews of the Faculty Constitution, Faculty Senate Charter, and Faculty Senate Bylaws. The senate president will appoint an ad hoc committee, which will review the documents and recommend if changes are needed.

Section 2:   A review of the Faculty Constitution, Faculty Senate Charter, and Faculty Senate Bylaws will take place no later than the 2025-26 academic year.

_____   _____

Faculty Senate President   Date

Previous revisions: 11/06/2007; 02/05/2013; 05/05/2015; 04/04/2017; 06/06/2023