

## Minutes

The Faculty Senate met on May 7<sup>th</sup> 2024, 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 Devon Stokes, Aaron Hill, and MJ Jurca.

## Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the April 2024 Faculty Senate meetings were approved without changes.

Ashton Greer made a motion to move Dr. Nagi's Q&A to the next item on the agenda, the Report of the Provost to after the Report of the Vice President, and the Artificial Intelligence Report to after the report of the Provost. Seconded and approved.

## New business

### Question and Answer with Dr. Nagi

Dr. Nagi provided a list of announcements:

- HECC recently visited campus
  - Thanks to John Harman & staff, faculty in Semon Hall, Dean Alp, students & others for helping with visit
  - 2 HECC projects were submitted for funding:
    - LRC Project – expansion to support student resources
    - Semon Hall - expansion
    - \$70-80 million for both projects.
    - It's going to be very difficult to get two projects, but we are hopeful that we can get at least one.
- 23-24 budget
  - Departments & colleges helped to bring it under control after concerns that we would go \$1M beyond what board had approved as deficit. We are trending in the right direction.
  - Reports due in June.
  - 24-25 budget work underway.
- Recent trip to Washington, DC, lobbying for projects
  - Ran into a former student while there.
  - Asking for 7 million for various projects in federal budget, including pollinator project, AIRE research (cannot ask for money in this cycle), \$1M for Dr. Kellerman, manufacturing projects, and others.
- Catalyze Klamath recently took place
  - Thank you to those involved in organizing
- Tech (Technology, Engineering, Climate, & Health) Village being promoted at Portland Metro – A living, learning immersive community that provides housing options for students, faculty & staff.
  - Preliminary stage, getting players involved and getting support statewide
- Campus Security – installing cameras around campus to promote safety

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

- John Harman: We have had an increase in Capital Improvement Renewal (CIR) money. Have been working with Doug Tripp, Tony Richie, others, scoping out security cameras for exterior of buildings and in hallways (not classrooms or restrooms, where privacy is expected). Will be a good deterrent and record of events.
- Terri: There are concerns about parking lots. Will there be cameras in the lots?
- John: They might not be around large lot on hill, but will be around other lots. Installation should begin early summer.
- Nagi: A team came in during to look at safety as a whole on campus, interviewed people around campus, and they will make recommendations.
- Transitions in Leadership:
  - OMEC - Greg Campbell is transitioning from 6-yr Director role due to family matters. Interim from industry who has been volunteering as chair of Board of Governors. Currently have about 36 companies that are members of OMIC.
  - Tony Ritchie (who has been here ~20 yrs) selected as new CIO, as of May 1<sup>st</sup>
- Sustainability Funding
  - In last legislative cycle, Governor allocated \$15M for 4 smaller universities, post-pandemic & \$10M to Portland state.
  - Process has been difficult. A lot of our faculty provided ideas for projects, and now it's going in a different direction.
  - Dr. Nagi is going to Salem tomorrow to make case for funding. Already got \$1M in first round. Now asking for \$2.3M. Cannot be used for operations, must be things for long term sustainability.
  - They want to see initiatives in 3 buckets: resizing organization & cutting budgets, shared services established at some level, new initiatives supporting revenue growth (like coursedog scheduling software).
- President's Forum May 28<sup>th</sup> in Klamath Falls
  - Based on feedback, we are going to send video link only to outside campuses, encourage folks to come in person if here.
- Launching a new capital campaign for OIT.
  - First regular capital campaign at OIT. We did one for DOW Center. Ken & foundation think there is potential for \$35m of fundraising over 5 years. We will launch in July. Many faculty and staff have been asked to provide their priorities.

The floor was then opened up for questions:

Kamal: In your time here, is there an accomplishment that you are most proud of?

- Dr. Nagi: I don't look back and say "What is it that I have done?" We have created more awareness of Oregon Tech. In 2018, Market research indicated 50% of Oregonians didn't know we had 4-year university. That is changing, we are getting more recognition, and it's not one person's doing. Capital improvements – \$160M of infrastructure improvements over 6 or 7 years. Faculty doing research projects. Making the institution more known, and we have a new strategic plan to do that.

Deb – Can you elaborate on the capital campaign? Is \$35M the goal? It seems like a lot of money to generate - have we done that in the past?

- Dr. Nagi: This is the first capital campaign. Dow was capital project because we couldn't get money from the state at the time, so we raised a lot of the money ourselves.
- Ken: We have been working with CCS Campaign Consulting, whose readiness/feasibility study included personal interviews/conversations with about 50 individuals. The study indicated fundable ideas that align with 4 pillars of our strategic plan. They look at donor database information, and present results to

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

foundation. Foundation usually does 2-3 million per year so they will be doubling it. We do already have \$2 million intent to pledge, that we haven't counted towards the \$35M. Requests that fundable projects be brought to foundation so that they can look to add them to the campaign plan, even a couple of years down the road, as the campaign will last 5 years. Offers to provide info by email.

- Matt: I would assume that capital campaign would just be for building, but you mention programs.
- Ken: This is a *comprehensive* capital campaign, which includes things beyond brick & mortar.

Sean: Question from Charles Riley – It sounds like some new contracts have a requirement to submit national grants. Not sure where this is coming from. This is also happening on top of folks teaching a full workload in already-overloaded departments. Could you address how these people should fulfill that requirement? What's the consequence for not fulfilling it?

- Dr. Nagi: I'm a proponent of it and worked with the provost to get that into contracts. It's not in everyone's contract. It depends on the research nature of the departments. Faculty should be able to get release time. It's not for all faculty, some departments are teaching-focused, some are research-focused. In some cases, Dr. Mott provides startup for equipment, and release time has been provided in some cases.
- Sean: The problem with release time is that someone has to teach those courses, and the idea of release time isn't always a reality.
- Dr. Nagi: I respectfully disagree, having been a chair and a dean for a while, but there are always ways to do that differently, and maybe Dr. Mott can speak to that.
- Dr. Mott: All TT faculty last year were asked what start up funds they needed in order to be successful in first 2 years. That ranges from Communications who don't need more than a computer to Life Science who needs a lab, but needs are expressed in offer period. New faculty should be getting 0.25 time release in the first year, automatically. Chairs can either find adjuncts or combine sections or offer classes in a later term so that release time can be offered if needed. Deans are meeting with new faculty to discuss how they can be prepared. The new faculty who have had that requirement have submitted or are in the process of submitting a proposal. Dr. Afjeh has databases with lists of grants that are available. If needed, he has found consulting help for complicated grants.
- Nagi: The requirement is just to submit, not to win a grant. If they win, that is great.
- Vanessa: You said that people getting hired in disciplines where research is feasible are having that embedded in their contracts? For all TT faculty is it expected?
- Dr. Mott: There is an expectation for applied research for TT faculty, it may look different in different fields. IT could be pedagogy, collaborative with another department, etc. There is *some* expectation, but it may look different in every department.

Riley: Sustainability funds – first bucket was trimming of the budget. Do you have a list that's going in that bucket?

- Dr Nagi: Initially we were asked to develop a lot of projects to be evaluated by HECC. Legislature was going to release money based on what HECC has received from us. Unfortunately the short session ended without the legislature making a decision, and now the e-board has to release the money. The 5 presidents met with Ben Cannon, and now we have this new approach. One challenge is enrollment. We are trying to provide a framework, and we don't know what the expectations will be, but the board is deciding in late May. If they release the money, HECC wants to own the process and tell us what the criteria will be. We are hoping we don't have to specify specific x, y, and z budget details and can keep those details within the university.

Kamal: in the last year or two, there has been a lot of discussion in the legislature about the dissolution of the Oregon university system. Can you think of things that our board has accomplished that wouldn't have been accomplished as a University of Oregon umbrella?

- Nagi: The board sets the direction. We do the accomplishments. We didn't get attention for infrastructure improvements while we were in the system, and campus was really dated. We couldn't have done OMIC. We

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

are able to do more now. I strongly believe because we have independent boards we are able to push agendas further.

Ken Usher: Follow up about sustainability funds. Trying to wrap head around cost cutting – are we having to demonstrate that we're cutting costs to receive funding? Or can we receive money to help with ongoing costs?

- Nagi: Nothing has been decided – it is a framework we are putting forward to legislature, who has the ability to say yes or no in partnership in HECC. When you go to shared services, one big challenge is that IT Costs are prohibitive. They've gone up 23% in the last year. We need to look at big cost impactors. They might say that we only have to show solutions in 2 of 3 buckets, not all of them. Cybersecurity and insurance costs are also going up (insurance 1.2M annually), so we are trying to see where we can get the best impact.
- Ken Usher: would it be possible to put RE power generation as a priority that would lower costs down the road? Irrespective of the sustainability money, what is happening with the geothermal and solar array?
- Nagi: They probably won't allow us to use this money for RE-type projects. We got \$18M last year for the geothermal heating fix. In the next 3 years, that project will take place. In power & electricity generation, that project never took off, so we are looking at how best to bring that power plant online.
- John Harman: With our focus on geothermal and renewable, we have capacity to generate another 30-35% of power. The problem is that the large plant on top of hill has been idle, and it needs investment to get running. We pretty much exhausted partnership with previous partner because they didn't want to be invested in renewable power long-term, and wanted us to invest most of the money to get the plant running. We do have opportunity to invest in more of a shared risk model, so we are exploring that, and there is an entity a few states over. The small geo plant is generating less than capacity because it is old and worn out. Could decrease scale and work with 1 partner on both plants, but we need a partner who will invest jointly with us as it would take about \$2.5M to refurbish the large plant.
- Nagi: We are planning to keep trying for federal initiatives. Senator Merkley is interested in seeing us be off the grid.

Terri: A resolution was presented to the board on shared governance, workload guidelines, changes in procedures. Board has asked that you respond. Would you like to respond now?

- Nagi: I thought it was an omnibus resolution – it included shared governance, workload guidelines. Once you have a union, both sides are obligated to follow the CBA. The CBA is very clear about what the provost has to do with the workload guidelines. Deadlines have been extended by mutual agreement to May 15<sup>th</sup> for the committee to get their report to the provost, and May 24<sup>th</sup> for the provost to give her notification to the union. While I respect feedback from past practice, we have to follow the contract. There are processes that will be awkward, and both sides will grow over time. The provost is simply following the CBA, and Dr. McCreary is helping to implement that. In terms of shared governance in general, there are a lot of opportunities to communicate with the provost.

David Hammond: Talked about Tech Village – could you describe the vision for the project? Current state? Timeline?

- Nagi: We don't have the capacity to build another residence hall, and it's hard to predict students at PM. We also don't have the debt capacity. Want to create a mixed housing workforce center. I spoke with Governor Kotek who responded positively and immediately wrote a check to Oregon Tech. She also asked prospectus with some numbers. The idea is going to our mission in terms of applied learning and workforce development. It's an immersive living learning community, to bring teachers & trainees together. It's a solution at the nexus of the problems. Last year, we hired a faculty from Florida who could not find a place to live and went back, so how can we create temporary housing for faculty and students? It will create childcare integrated in the space. Developers want about \$67 million for the project and are willing to build today, but housing will become unaffordable. We are trying to understand federal tax credits, etc. We need a business plan - it can't come from our general budget, so it is a complex conversation, but has received positive

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

response. Upscaling & rescaling people who want to educate themselves and get to a better place in life. It is not a residence hall, it is just different.

Cristina: You mentioned that you haven't yet decided on a final budget for 24-25, but you have to propose one for the next board meeting? What do you anticipate in this budget, that you would save or need in terms of legal cost for faculty negotiations that are starting in the fall?

- Nagi: Yes. Call me an optimist, but we haven't parked a big number there. It's a 2<sup>nd</sup> contract. Those are the places where shared services are helpful, but it's much cheaper through USSE. Hoping that it won't be as long, we didn't increase the number allocated to legal. We may have to use shared services. Now, we pay just over \$250M for treasury funds and labor negotiation. (We used to pay \$1M when it was a full blown shared service). It could get reconstituted as a result of sustainability conversations.

Cristina Negoita: Faculty are seriously concerned about faculty retention and how it impacts student retention. What can you see doing to improve faculty retention? To make OIT the place we hope it is as far as attracting and sustaining faculty who want to work here?

- Nagi: For faculty retention, a lot of responses lie in the departments. In the system level, we can give more opportunities for faculty to be successful. As a teaching institution, we try to work well with families and dual career situations. We have Gaylyn's Health & Wellness initiative. There are reasons that faculty leave that we can and can't address. Faculty want to get vested in more ways than just teaching. Investing in my own lab meant that I wasn't going to just get up and leave. Year-long scheduling has been beneficial for students and hopefully beneficial for faculty too.
- Dr. Mott: It's a complicated issue. A lot of things contribute to faculty retention, but we're not losing as many as we were. I agree with Dr. Nagi that some of this does lie within the department. The things that people like at work are the department and the community. I barely knew the president or the provost, it was all about my department. If a new faculty member comes in and is just exposed to negative comments/remarks/morale, they're not going to stay. We are open to suggestions. We have HR initiatives, well-being center, salary (as a CBA issue) was looked at through equity study. We try to help spouses, it's not a one size fits all. Several have left because of medical issues that couldn't be addressed in Klamath Falls.
- Sandi: Still working on compiling stay survey results for all classifications. Going to send to Dr Nagi. Overall theme is more open, collaborative communication and that departments are very siloed and tend to not want to cross-collaborate.
- Dr. Mott: We have been trying to get chairs to collaborate more and break down silos.
- Andi: We do come to work because we want to see our peers. But, we are a small college & my peers aren't just my college but my administrators. We are missing that relationship with our admin. We are small enough that we can build those relationships. Don't think that it's just departments, this is a university wide thing and we should all feel that. Positivity or negativity is not just in the department's hands.
- Dr. Mott: agreed

Dr Nagi – Please come to President's Forum on the 28th

Ken Fincher – We have the upcoming Gala @ Growler Guys on the 18th. Some chairs/tables were donated back to the university. If anybody is interested in attending for free, you are invited. Email [ken.fincher@oit.edu](mailto:ken.fincher@oit.edu) with your plus one.

### Reports of the Officers

#### Report of the President – Terri Torres

- Thank you for attending board meet & greet. It was successful and well attended. I will encourage that at future board meetings.

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

- Met with Dr. Nagi. Talk about resolution and old policies. If we get a list of old policies, he's willing to evaluate and toss the ones we don't use any longer.
- Asked for chair training, again.
- There is a new AVPAE coming on – Linus Yu. He will be here July. Discussed some tasks for him to start working on: program review, accreditation, CCT workshops, assessment & accreditations. Asked to add looking at student evaluations to list, as well as gen-ed review.
- Presented to board - Asked for communication, rationale behind decisions, and shared governance.
- Announcements from online department: New version of Studio will automatically do closed captions for videos. Minimal requirements for online teaching went out to department chairs. Rachel Hanan is working on a recommendation for best practices for online teaching and has met with CCT & OLAC. She is interested in faculty input, so reach out to her.
- Canvas shells for faculty on May 20<sup>th</sup> for summer and June 3<sup>rd</sup> for fall.
- Committee survey from Provost's Office will be open until Friday, so please sign up for committees you'd like to serve on.
- June is pizza month, supplied by the Provost!

End of report.

Questions:

Matt Schnack: Dr. Nagi is willing to toss policies that aren't used? Who decides which policies?

Dr. Mott/Terri: There would be a process.

### Report of the VP – Deb

Faculty Senate senator elections were held early April. Thank you all for voting. The candidates were notified about the results. Congratulations to the new senators and senators who have been reelected for another term.

### Academic Council Report

Academic Council met on April 9, 2024. There was no old business. Several new businesses were discussed. Among them,

#### 1. Assessment Updates

##### 2022-23 Report:

1. Feedback available on Canvas. Emails coming by the end of April.
2. 6 of 8 master's programs received
3. 16 of 27 bachelor's programs received

##### 2023-24 Report

1. Due October 31<sup>st</sup>
2. Person assigned to complete assessment report, whether a chair or other department member, should consider attending Program Coordinator Basic Training on April 24 and sign up for the 2023-24 Canvas shell. Responsible for disseminating data to department, assigning roles and gathering data, writing and submitting report
3. Assessment coordinator, if not a department chair, may not have access to all necessary information; chairs should provide as appropriate
4. Requests to add faculty department members to dashboards, send to [Farooq.Sultan@oit.edu](mailto:Farooq.Sultan@oit.edu) for Provost Mott's approval

##### Next Steps

1. Chairs should meet with respective department members to discuss report and roles, interpretation, and planning
2. Surveys should be given

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

- a. NSSE – encourage students to take
  - b. FSSE – encourage faculty to take
  - c. Senior Exit Survey - data from this survey helps program assessment; consider including as part of senior capstone courses at end of the program, to encourage participation and gain broader perspectives
  - d. Assessment team working with Career Services to determine best avenue to get highest response rate on senior post-graduation plans, for marketing purposes
  - e. There is discussion regarding addition of senior exit survey to application for degree; assessment team working with Registrar to accomplish this
2. Research and Support - One of the chairs asked about the university plan to support faculty for research. In that regard, the provost mentioned that
    - a. SPGA provides various levels of support. Database on SPGA website about federal and state grants; including some foundation grants
    - b. No grant writer in SPGA; limited support from external sources for some proposals
    - c. There were some discussions regarding funding sources, course reassignment request for research purposes
    - d. Positions for SPGA director and Business Manager posted
    - e. Federal funding initiatives & faculty with good ideas should reach out to Dr. Afjeh
  3. Third Year Review of Departmental Faculty
    - a. No standardized process, review, or policy in place
    - b. Deans to discuss with faculty in college meetings, then determine next steps
  4. IdeaFest
    - a. Librarians will be reaching out to senior project instructors to try and get into their classes to discuss posters
    - b. Deans inform senior project instructors of such
    - c. Suggestion to make poster presentation part of course grade
  5. Enrollment
    - a. Suggestion for enrollment presentation by AVP Stringer for May meeting

Few announcements were made:

1. ETM department chair training led by Dr. Alp to begin soon
2. AVP Academic Excellence search has concluded and Dr. Linus Yu was hired in the position. He will start from July.
3. Dean of HAS search committee formed; first meeting April 17
4. Associate Dean of HAS search - no candidate selection yet; information forthcoming

End of report.

### Report of the Provost

Follow up from earlier conversation - The CSU system in CA are moving to a common gen ed core. I made a general comment that a lot of things that happen in California gradually migrate north into Oregon.

- Assessment reports – we have to get all departments to produce assessment reports. It is required for our accreditation. Deans will be tasked with talking with chairs and checking on which departments are missing.
- Hiring – 10 position descriptions in inbox, 3 more for hiring, 2 more for posting. Candidates on campus for interviews. About 14 positions for ETM and 15 for HAS in various stages. Some positions may be able to do a 1 year (not longer) Visiting Professor position.
- Associate Dean of HAS - hired Michelle Buttina – tenured in medical lab science, from West Virginia University.

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

- Search underway for new dean for HAS. It might be posted by now. Committee has been formed. Christy and Terri are on it. There are reps from every HAS department. Nate Bickford is Interim Dean effective June 17<sup>th</sup> but has started transitioning.
- Enrollment for fall - freshman deposits are up. Transfer deposits up in KF down in PM. Who knows what will happen between now and September. Should be up a little bit if it keeps trending.
- Money coming in from legislature – several different buckets that we have received, all with different constraints. Still trying to retrieve information.
- Programs –
  - MS in Natural Resources & Biomedical Sciences approved through HECC and ready for Fall. I believe they are through NW.
  - Statewide council votes on the BS in Construction Management tomorrow, then it would go through HECC and NW.
  - 11 online certs ready to be offered in the fall. Looking for funding for marketing.
  - Starting slowly to look at expanding respiratory care to offer at PM as well as KF. OHSU wants to do it, so we want to do with them.
  - ETM – Geomatics is being renamed to Geomatics & Applied Computing or vice versa. Center for Applied Computing will live here. Short term consultant helping develop center, identify director, etc. Still have legislative funding.
- Thank you for work on full year schedule. It was a lot of work but the students are really appreciative.
- Cleaned out catalog and took out classes not offered in last 3 years. Hidden/Removed.
- PM task force – An ASOIT forum was held at PM last term, and two things came up – scheduling & conflicts with gen ed courses. MLS & EMS cohorts were fine, but CSET, MMET, EERE had lots of overlaps and gaps. Dean Alp has been leading a task force and they have modified the schedule with good feedback.
- Equipment requests – if you got a request, please make sure you do your ordering ASAP. Money has to be spent this year and there won't be much carry forward.
- Summer Creativity Grant Proposals are in process. Glitch in forming committee, but it is formed now. Should be done quickly.
- Budget – templates have been done for colleges for academic affairs. Plea for reinstating funds where we could. Putting back into templates as appropriate. Next year will be tough, and we don't know about the year after. Will depend on enrollment and retention.

### Questions:

Ken: respiratory care. Can that be done without program here collapsing?

Provost Mott: students here are from Southern Oregon so we won't lose them.

Ken: For OHSU partnership, when might the soonest be for us to expect students to be in that? How much of that would be on our campus in Wilsonville versus OHSU?

Provost Mott: We are at very preliminary stage. OHSU put in to do Respiratory Care program, so we are trying to do it with them. Their provost was open to it and we are starting to have those conversations but no decisions yet.

Ken: Isn't everything old is new again with OHSU starting a bachelors program? OHSU decided to divest from undergrad programs?

Provost Mott: That's why they're willing to let us do it. They provide clinical sites.

Ken: Has there been thought as to making respiratory care program here a partnership with OHSU in a way that's beneficial to us?

Provost Mott: good question. We have 2 positions that we're advertising for, and a 3<sup>rd</sup> pending this program.

Sean Sloan: 58% of OIT classes are 20 or less. If we're going forward with maintaining faculty headcounts the same or decreasing, and also giving faculty quarter release time, how are we going to teach same amount of students with same resources? Is goal to increase class sizes?

Provost: Not the goal, but we may have to at some times. But we also have 20% fewer students so we need less sections. If we grow we can bring in more faculty.



## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

Sean – I'm teaching 2 classes of 40 and students are not liking it.

Provost – Talk to Natural Sciences who are teaching class sizes of 50 and 60.

Sean – Are we chasing those students away? Is that creating a shortfall in student enrollment?

Provost – Doubtful. We're not doing something drastic like 300 person classes. We're not a small private school charging 70-80k per year who can offer those tiny classes. We can look at frequency of offerings, maybe some could be taught less.

Sean – With new renovations in buildings, are we going to have lecture halls with greater capacity? We don't have as many spaces with capacity above 40.

Provost - We had a larger room put in Boivin. The auditorium can work. There is the DOW E237 auditorium where A&P is taught. We're not making big big classrooms because we don't want to teach classes of 100.

David Hammond: could you provide clarity about applied computing & why it's now in geomatics. In particular, we have heard about applied computing for last year and a half but never had any clarity about who's doing what.

Provost Mott: originated from bill a couple of years ago that included \$3M for center for excellence in applied computing. Looking at it as an overarching applied computing that can include a lot of things. One task of new director will have vision for what we're going to use it for and what areas of applied computing we'll look to develop.

Randall Paul: There's a task for Wilsonville on scheduling? Are there thoughts about trying to harmonize scheduling in KF between gen-ed and programmatic classes?

Provost Mott – Coursedog will help with that, gen-ed is a bit more developed in KF. Maybe in the fall we can look at it. It will need to be looked at more in depth.

Cristina: You have to give a budget with a 5% decrease? Can you tell us how?

Provost Mott: We're given some constraints that we were asked not to do. Primary cuts were in not filling empty faculty positions. Cut equipment funds a little bit.

Cristina: talked about OHSU – still partnering for nursing, right?

Provost Mott: yes

Cristina: They're also partnering with COCC in Bend for nursing. Were you involved?

Provost Mott: It's been ongoing for a while. Cascades wanted nursing and didn't want to do it through OHSU. There was a lot of pushback and then political pressure. OHSU felt it was the expedient way to do it.

Ken – OHSU nursing partnership here is quite different from partnerships with EMS and MLS programs. Mainly OHSU rents space, no combined degrees, no combined faculty. We teach lower division nursing requirements. Is OSU Cascades a similar model?

Provost Mott: Not sure.

Cristina: On applied computing initiative, there are \$5M on the table and it seems like Math and CSET should be involved in some way.

Provost: I agree, and Dean Alp will bring them in

Sean Sloan: Can I add Mechanical?

Matt Schnackenberg: Our department had a position not refilled. In my experience, I'd expect if we'd hired that position, we'd have gen-ed classes full of students which would pay for position and bring money. Do we have a way to better judge student demand?

Provost Mott: Coursedog will help. Tough decisions had to be made.

Matt S.: would be great to track better in the future.

Terri: Under impression that there might be more funds coming to academic side. Thinking of opening more faculty positions?

Provost: HECC could give more money, but as of right now there is a small-ish pot of strategic investment money. VPs put in request for what we wanted to put back into the budget. Dr. Nagi will make final

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

decisions. Request for SEM, Academic Affairs (3 faculty, global engagement), 6 DPT, resp care, dental hygiene.

Terri: Legislative \$ - does that include semiconductor workforce and educator equity?

Provost: ABA, semiconductor, Kingsley field, Jherime Kellerman, not sure about educator equity. We've had success in getting federal money so reach out to Dr. Afjeh if you have an idea.

### Report of ASOIT Rep

No ASOIT delegate present. No report.

### Reports of the Standing Committees

#### Academic Standards – Vanessa Bennett – Ad-hoc Committee on Generative AI Policy

The subcommittee charge was to draft a revision to the academic integrity policy addressing generative AI use. The team has reached a cordial impasse and wanted to review their work with Senate. Kristen Whitman gave a presentation on Generative AI (see attached presentation slides) and presented two potential revisions to existing plagiarism policy:

Draft 1 – Edits existing language for cheating/plagiarism. Essentially permits use of AI unless specifically prohibited.

Draft 2 – Add a new “unauthorized AI Use” item. Essentially prohibits use of AI unless specifically permitted.

Discussion:

Terri: I want to hear from Matt as a writing faculty.

Matt Schnackenberg: On the Oregon Writing and English Advisory Committee, we say that one of the best ways to approach it is to focus on process over product, which is a good way to approach writing generally. There seems to be an overfocus on writing/speech. AI can do calculus, bridge design, physics, chemistry, programming, etc. So it's a bigger issue.

Randall: There's no way to use a clear line between spell checker, grammar checker, tone, sentence construction, etc... I don't see how draft 2 can work.

Matt Schnackenberg: As a writing teacher, my main concern is plagiarism. Going back to typical rules of plagiarism, if you're writing entire paragraphs using AI, it's concerning. Grammarly and other processing programs offering advice on how to complete a sentence aren't as much of a concern.

Andi: A lot of programs (like Grammarly) have built in AI tools that suggest things. Also, it's important that we look at what is the disadvantage of not having students know how to use this software before they go into the workforce? When will they know if it's ok versus not?

Randall: There's a blurry line between “write this for me” or spell check. What if you write a sentence and then the AI rewrites it? And then on and on and on? Have you written that or is that AI?

Matt: If you're doing it as a chunk, how much are you really doing or learning? I would like to bring it more into the classroom. When I'm writing an email, outlook will suggest ways to make your text 'concise'. In some case, it loses nuance and it always sounds the same way. I would like to critically look at suggestions.

Cecily: I'm thinking about trying allowing students to google/chatgpt things in textbook but not in assignments.

Content terms vs assignment terms/

Vicki: It makes sense to make permission broader rather than narrower because we'll never make it sufficiently precise. Permission unless prohibited, but, declare it in a finished product.

Kristin: So, Draft 1 is good but the plagiarism element needs to be edited.

Cristina: Having them declare use teaches them ethics. I favor draft 2, but we need to come back to this discussion in 2-3 years and how the technology evolves and how we use it. Math has had to do this for a long time because they have been able to use Wolfram Alpha for a long time. We should teach them how to use these things rather than act like they don't exist.

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

David Hammond: this might be more of an example for a syllabus statement – in numerical methods, python coding is involved. Every single problem could be found on stackoverflow, etc. As guidance, I told them they could look at other examples, but said that every single character must be typed by your own fingers. At that point, it seemed like an appropriate way to settle.

Sean Sloan: I don't like default being "phone any friend you want unless explicitly prohibited". Default should be the opposite. Students thought they could all turn in the same lab because that's what they do in physics.

Christy: We need to spell out what we mean by "declare" use. I worry that it can be ambiguous. Maybe they have to list it as a citation, etc. I agree that I'd rather forbid it and then permit it rather than the opposite. In many professions it's being highly encouraged to be used, for instance copying R code to run data analysis. This will become more complicated, and we need to be real about the fact that it's going to be used in professional context.

Matt S: I Agree. We need to teach AI in our classes. It's a bigger issue than Academic Integrity Policy. We need more CCT discussions and OTET presentations. What is allowable or not? I favor 2<sup>nd</sup> draft. I'm afraid if we say 'do whatever you want unless we prohibit it' it will become a game of whackamole. I would rather encourage professors to integrate into class and then give opportunities.

Bobbi: I have two kids in college at OSU. In engineering, they have to cite it. In bio resources, some faculty say they can't use it, others say they can use it but have to cite it.

Vicki: I don't want to be the AI police. If something is prohibited, then our job is to hunt it out, find it, eliminate it. That could get beyond us.

Terri: Vanessa and Kristin, did you get enough input?

Vanessa: There's not a huge majority rule. We were kind of stuck in committee. We have as a committee discussed all of these things. Props to committee. Do we take this and go back?

Matt: I like a straw poll for draft 1 vs draft 2. In both drafts, AI should be cited

Ken: In draft 1, will state in syllabus that its prohibited unless for specific uses. And I can work with that in either draft.

A straw poll was taken:

Draft 1 – 4 (Ashton, Cecily, Randall, Chitra)

Draft 2 – Everyone else (vast majority)

Vanessa – you can email Kristin or anyone else on the committee with more feedback.

### Faculty Policy Committee – Ken Usher & Matt Schnackenberg

FPC has been working on revising the Promotion Policy for Library Faculty, OIT 20-04-01. Today, they have a complete draft of the policy, which is included in the packet. Matt & Ken thank the librarians for their work, especially Alla Powers.

The committee tried to model as much as possible on instructional policy that was just finished, to make parallel.

Highlights of the revisions presented are as follows:

- On page 41, 2<sup>nd</sup> page of policy – because they're librarians there's not a separate category for instruction. They have 'librarianship' which defines work they do for the library and how that's evaluated
- On page 42, motion from assistant to associate to full professor... last 3 bullets include librarianship
- On page 41, external review... they bring in external reviewers to help in evaluation and pg. 41 defines this
- Section 5.4, pg. 45 gives overview of how external review works
- Bullets on pg. 46 – things to watch for regarding conflicts of interest for external reviewer. The policy had previously mentioned conflicts of interest but it wasn't enumerated what those could be
- Pg 48, timeline – university librarian acts kind of like a department chair and kind of like a dean, guide process and then take on a bigger role. Tried to keep as close to dean role as possible in between first edition and now, it's become evident that univ. librarian is hired as an administrative role, not directly as a faculty role

## **Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024**

and is more like a dean than a department chair. Did leave in 5.3E – process about promotion, even though it may not ever happen)

- Pg 49 table – added with timeline; policy is complex and covers 2 terms. No tenure but external review lengthens process. This was a separate document before (we have a history of auxiliary documents that become hard to find).

Ken moved to approve OIT 20-04-01  
Seconded by Randall.

Discussion:

Ken: Beverly & Provost have reviewed policy, it has their approval

Christy: are all librarians in support?

Alla: yes, all of them

Vote – Unanimous yes – passes.

Matt: We are beginning to talk about tenure policy

### **Ad-hoc Committee on Student Course Evaluations – Vicki Crooks**

No report.

### **Academic Standards – Vanessa Bennett**

Thank you Kristin for putting AI presentation together.

We met last week and reviewed final exam policy and dead week policy. We have approved those as a committee but will bring to senate next month.

Still working on summer term charge. Kevin brown is working on focus groups re: summer term with student feedback. Kamal & Kevin are working on a dual survey (for faculty & students). Even if you don't teach in summer, we want a comprehensive idea of preferences for teaching during the summer. It should be out next week. We hope to have a recommendation by the end of next meeting.

End of Report. Questions?

Sean Sloan: is there a way to convey dead week policy to new faculty?

Vanessa: no, that's part of the problem. There's a gap in teaching training and educating new faculty and where to find policies. New faculty don't get educated on that and it's a lot of trial and error. Committee discussed that maybe policy doesn't need to be changed, but instead how we implement it. We put some language and purpose for the policies that will hopefully give better idea of purpose of finals and dead week. Also discussed that it needs to be stated in convocation or elsewhere.

Cecily: I met with Beverly and we talked about new faculty training, did discuss trying to introduce these policies in NFT.

Ken: If we go through new faculty training, introducing policies is probably going to go above people's heads. Thank you for adding purpose statements, that is helpful.

Terri: purpose might encourage all to follow policies.

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

### DEI Committee – Chitra Venugopal

Jamie Kennel and Chitra Venugopal gave a presentation about committee goals and challenges. They shared some data that they have obtained from other institutions as well as Oregon Tech. Some of the major challenges that we face are that DEI is not a university priority, administrators are spread too thin, and our DEI leaders are not on the leadership team. The full set of slides can be found in the packet.

End of report. Any questions?

Christy: Where did student graduation #s come from for percentages? Want to be able to report to constituents how that data was collected.

Jamie: OIT numbers came from institutional research (Faruq) cohorts. 6 year graduation rates came from 2016 - the study produced was in 2022.

### Emeritus Faculty – Cristina Negoita

5 faculty were eligible for emeritus, 4 submitted materials.

The committee is recommending Jack Walker, Steven Schultz, Richard Bailey, Sandra Bailey. Sought comments from faculty & community at large and received them for every single person.

The committee did not recommend Pat Schaeffer, as he did not submit materials.

Voted on the 4 candidates:

Results:

Jack Walker: 22 yes, 0 no

Richard Bailey: 21 yes, 0 no

Sandra Bailey: 22 yes, 0 no

Steven Schultz: 21 yes, 0 no

### Unfinished business

- Resolution on Shared Governance, Workload Guidelines, and Changes to Procedures
  - Terri: we heard a response from Dr. Nagi earlier. I will push a bit. The chair of the board said that Dr. Nagi & Provost Mott should respond.
  - Kamal: Let him know that's not what the Senate Bill says.
  - Terri: Yes, I will.
  - Sean Sloan: We're asking for a written response, right?
  - Terri: Yes, I would like a written response.
  - Ken Usher: He claimed that the CBA was prohibiting us from doing specific things. I'd like to hear a specific answer to, "Does the CBA specifically prevent us from bringing proposed changes to workload guidelines to academic council for discussion before formal notices of changes?"
  - Terri: it does not.
  - Ken: I'd like to hear him acknowledge that.
  - Sean Sloan: Ask him where in the CBA it says, "we can't do this".
  - Kamal: We've pointed that out in union meetings.
  - Terri: I will work harder on that to try to get an answer. I was told that we'd get an answer tonight and it was sub-par.

### Report of the President's Council Delegate – Terri Torres

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

Have not met – no report.

### Report of the IFS Representative – Cristina Negoita and David Hammond

Cristina: I added notes to the packet, if anyone really wants to look at it and get in the weeds. We met virtually on April 19<sup>th</sup>. The meeting had been planned for EOU but not enough could attend. EOU VP finance presented overall student success and completion model used currently to distribute/allocate money across the universities. Link provided in meeting notes. Interest was to compare EOU as piece of overall budget.

We had a short meeting from the interim provost @ EOU. They are looking for a new provost. Had conversations on common credit numbering. This time, statewide provost council was also asked about variance, and their recommendation to HECC was different from IFS's. So IFS chair wanted to bring it up again for discussion to make language more congruent. He'll put forward language that they had to begin with.

There was a legislative update from the government relations person at western. They talked about visits to Salem tomorrow to advocate for money from emergency board.

We received updates from all universities including OHSU.

David:

- OHSU mentioned that they're extending BS in nursing to Bend in collaboration with COCC & having additional positions on governing board (1 for faculty).
- OSU approved 4.65% tuition increase for next year. Receiving \$10M one-time money to offset athletic scholarship commitments for students enrolled in light of PAC-12 dissolution. A lot of uncertainty in budgets going forward.
- PSU admin predicts 3% across board cuts for FY 2025 could result in job losses. Intensive English language program losing 12 positions. They have a new library dean and looking for more deans.
- SOU continuing to search for new CFO. New fee structure for students taking mostly in person classes but one online class due to lack of availability for in-person, trying to avoid them pay extra.
- UofO has a new provost. Their faculty senate has established a significant academic disruption task force to separate labor disruptions from other emergencies/academic disruption policy (response to previous adjunct strike).
- WOU hosting 3<sup>rd</sup> annual Hispanic serving institution summit on April 26<sup>th</sup>. New strategic plan.

Cristina – Issues at OHSU, faculty being disciplined for outside activities

Randall – The provost council recommended that all classes have to be same number of hours?

Cristina – Yes, provost said they have to be same. IFS recommends 1 credit variance. We can share the letter from provost statewide council.

### New business

#### Report from GEAC – Andria Fultz

Charge 1: Develop a process to review gen-ed courses to see if they qualify as gen-ed. This is difficult because ISLOs are currently being refurbished w/ assessment. We haven't had AVPAE to help guide.

Charge 2: Read previous work done for gen-ed reform. There was a gen-ed task force 2016 and an ad-hoc committee in 2018. There was a lot of information, but also common course numbering and transfer maps mean we have a lot more to align with than we did 5 or 6 years ago. It will be good to see what other schools are doing and also what we have to do at the state level. We plan to wait until common course numberings are done. The next round is done in June.

## **Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024**

Charge 3: Track changes at state level for Common Course Numbering (CCN) and transfer maps. Got it on record, tracking through HECC. Transfer maps have a few majors that they affect, but overall just waiting for CCN. Number of credits will throw us off the most.

Charge 4: Connect gen-ed with institutional objectives – best to wait until AVPAE arrives to determine ISLOS and incorporate to gen ed.

When we move to gen-ed reform, it will be good for students to have more flexibility in the courses they choose. Perhaps required courses and also things they're interested in - minors, certificates within gen-eds, or other ideas to get student interest.

End of report

### **Report of the FOAC Representative – Dibyajyoti Deb**

Hasn't met. No report.

### **Administrative Council Report – Kelly Sullivan**

4/17 Admin Council Meeting

New Staff

- Omar Abdelnaby – Admissions Communications Specialist (KF campus)

Kudos Awards

- Winner – PM IT Team – Carl, Silas, and Thomas
- Classified Winner – Lian Li

Presentation by Sandi Hanan for the Stay Survey regarding Preliminary Unclassified Retention Results (65 faculty responses)

Need more: in-house training for positions; opportunities for advancement; open communication; community's acceptance of diverse groups.

Themes: Unnecessary divisions between departments & silos; unhappy with compensation & flexible work schedule

Mid summer (late July, beginning of Aug) – the admin salary survey will be completed and shared out.

Spotlight on Financial Aid – Jake Coatney shared that the data from the government has been way delayed this year due to changes in the FAFSA. They're just now getting this info, which has pushed back awards, but scholarship deadlines were also moved to accommodate for these delays

Every term FinAid hosts "Owl's Worth events" on different financial topics for students such as loans, budgeting, mortgages, & more -Sarah Henderson-Wong and Desiré Brown did a presentation on Accepting Job Offers and Benefits last month

The most important thing is that elections right now are happening for the 2024-2026 exec team. My 2 year is up so there will be a new admin council liaison. I can't make it to the June meeting, so this will be my last meeting. I've enjoyed being part of this, thank you for your work.

End of report.

### **Open Floor**

Bobbi: For Faculty Senate to look over faculty senate grievance policy. What can happen after Dean has ruled? It's an old policy and having mechanisms for rulings, and not all information was considered.

Terri: I will get your recommendations and will pass on recommendations to new Faculty Senate President

Cristina: After NTT policy was passed, CBA triggers impact bargaining. Currently, issues surrounding ranks because people have to be updated. Also, bargaining promotion increase that would occur. Latest proposal from admin key

## Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024

points – all NTT faculty who meet requirements start as instructor, and promotion raises from instructor to senior 1 to \$1000 and senior 1 to senior 2 another \$1000.

Sean Sloan: Where are market rates coming from?

Cristina: Admin said they consider them very reasonable and when asked what made them reasonable, they were told it was by virtue of them saying they were reasonable. Told them that there is data that across Oregon, raises are over 5%. We want between 5% and 10%. Admin doesn't have anything based on any metrics or actual market data.

Ken: Was there discussion about using a lump sum amount versus a percentage?

Cristina: Admin prefers lump vs percentage because they prefer "consistency". Pointed out that recent raises that administrators got were percentages, but that was ok because "they are cost of living raises and not promotion increases."

Terri: Everyone is going to start at instructor? What about individuals who are already promoted?

Cristina: Those individuals should start at instructor so they receive the opportunity to receive 2 promotional raises.

Terri: That ignores the fact that they already got promoted?

Cristina: Yes, because their promotions didn't come with a raise.

Kamal: Those faculty would have to resubmit material and get promoted next year.

Matt Schnackenberg: The raise should be applied retroactively.

Cristina: We are countering that.

Kamal: Christine Meadows is the person actually speaking on admin's behalf.

Vanessa: A few months ago, we asked for a policy surrounding faculty safety/

Terri: I talked to Provost Mott about it, asked Dave Groff to do research on the state level before we create a policy. Haven't heard back yet.

Vanessa: I was asked by a staff member to let faculty senate know that there has been a student allowed to be back on campus who made threats of gun violence and she is concerned that if the student were to come back she's concerned for her own safety and doesn't have a place to vet that concern. Where do staff go

Dave Goff: There is a university policy explaining the process. For this body, I would advise to keep conversations at level of policy and not at the level of specific instances, as that can pose specific liabilities.

Terri: Is there anything on the state level? If there is a policy, can you tell us what it is? Where it is?

Dave Groff: Policy is online at OIT-01-010 violence free campus policy

Vanessa: What do we do when this isn't followed and you still feel unsafe as a faculty member?

Dave Groff: The purview of senate is to discuss policy in the abstract.

Terri: Was there any policy on the state level? Looking at OIT-01-010, do you see a place where this could be beefed up/changed to deal with current situations? (revised 2022)

Dave Groff: If faculty senate wishes to address, I'm happy to consult along that way.

Terri: Will look at developing policy, but it will have to wait until next year.

Sean StClair – PTR is extremely onerous. It shouldn't be a full portfolio and nobody else does this.

Terri – The provost thinks it should be onerous.

Sean – We could write a policy.



## **Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate Minutes – May 7, 2024**

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 9:41 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashton Greer, Secretary

# GenAI and Academic Integrity

Subcommittee Report

# Subcommittee

- David Johnston
  - Kristin Whitman
  - Matt Schnackenberg
  - Rishikesh Sahay
  - Ryan Madden
  - Vanessa Bennett
- Charge: draft a revision to the academic integrity policy addressing generative AI use
  - Meetings throughout AY 23-24

# Agenda



Review of campus-wide syllabus statement



Sample policies from other institutions



Presentation of 2 subcommittee drafts



Open floor

# GenAI Definition

- GenAI (Generative Artificial Intelligence) refers to artificial intelligence technologies that can generate text, images, and other content based on input parameters. These technologies use complex algorithms to create content that resembles human-generated content.

# They're Not Just Text Generators

- These tools can also generate:
  - Computer code
  - PowerPoint slides
  - Realistic images and videos
- With plugins, they can also do math (ChatGPT-4 plus Wolfram Alpha plugin)

# AI Detectors Aren't a Solution

- Right now, there are no 100% accurate AI detection tools, so using AI detection tools can lead to false accusations

## **Current AI Statement: OIT Campus-Wide Syllabus**

This statement is currently included in OIT's campus-wide syllabus:

“Oregon Tech recognizes that recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI), such as ChatGPT, have changed the landscape of many career disciplines and will impact many students in and out of the classroom. To prepare students for their selected careers, Oregon Tech desires to guide students in the ethical use of these technologies in coursework. Appropriate use of these technologies is at the discretion of the instructor. Students are reminded that all submitted work must be their own, original work unless otherwise specified. Students should contact their instructor with any questions as to the acceptable use of AI in their courses.”





# Features of Note

- Acknowledges GenAI's potential and the need for career readiness.
- States that:
  - Appropriate use is at the discretion of the instructor.
  - All submitted work must be students' own, original work **unless otherwise specified.**
  - Students should contact their instructor with any questions as to the acceptable use of AI in their courses.

# Examples

All examples in this deck are sourced from: the AI Observatory collection at [higherstrategy.com](https://higherstrategy.com)

# Policies vs. Guidelines

- Some examples in this deck are formal policies
- Other schools have no formal policy and are instead relying on guidance documents

# Policies

# Université de Montréal – Disciplinary Regulations

- **Formally bans the use**, complete or partial, literal or disguised, of a text, table, image, presentation, recording or any other creation generated by a generative AI tool (including ChatGPT), **with the exception of specific authorization in the context of an evaluation.**

[Source: AI Observatory](#)

# Vanderbilt – Honor Code

- If faculty do not expressly tell students that technologies like ChatGPT are allowed, then the use of that technology would represent a violation of Vanderbilt’s Honor Code, which already has a provision for giving and/or receiving unauthorized aid that covers any unauthorized technology.
- From their “Guide for Teaching in the Age of AI”

# Stanford University - Policy

- Absent a clear statement from a course instructor, use of or consultation with generative AI shall be treated analogously to assistance from another person.
- Individual course instructors are free to set their own policies regulating the use of generative AI tools in their courses, including allowing or disallowing some or all uses of such tools.

## Student Feedback at OIT

- Students are concerned that needing to ask their instructor about *\*every\** type of use will have a chilling effect
- They are concerned that asking for permission will create a negative impression



# The Gray Area

- I am already using GenAI frequently to edit my own writing
  - To create an outline of a paper from my notes
  - To help come up with a better poster title
  - To get ideas for the graphic design of the poster
- Did I violate an innate academic integrity principle? (No)
  - Would an Oregon Tech faculty member agree with me?
  - Would I have been comfortable asking them?
  - Might I innocuously do this and run afoul of an instructors' expectations?

# Proposed AI “Bill of Rights”

- You should be able to expect clear guidance from your instructor on whether and how automated and/or generative systems are being used in any of your work for a course.
- You should be able to ask questions of your instructor and administration about the use of automated and/or generative systems prior to submitting assignments without fear of reprisal or assumption of wrongdoing.

Source Student [AI Bill of Rights for Education](#)

# **More Examples: Guidance for Instructors**

# Hong Kong Polytechnic – Guidelines for both Instructors and Students

- **Subject and assessment documents should mention** if students may use generative AI tools.
- **Students need to declare** their use of these tools and how they have been used. AI-generated materials must be properly referenced.
- **When the use of AI-generated materials is not permitted**, submitting AI-generated materials as one's own work constitutes an act of academic dishonesty, leading to disciplinary actions.

[Source: AI Observatory](#)

# Yale Guidance for Instructors

1. Instructors should be direct and transparent about what **tools students are permitted to use**, and about the **reasons** for any restrictions;
  2. Controlling the use of AI writing through surveillance or detection technology is probably not feasible; and
  3. **Changes in assignment design** and structure can substantially reduce students' likelihood of cheating—and can also enhance their learning.
- The guidance also recommends including GenAI statements in syllabi.

# Guidance for Students

# Algonquin College – Guidelines for Students

- Gives examples of inappropriate use of GenAI tools:
  - Altering your writing style to the point that it is not recognizable as your own
  - Using these tools to mask plagiarism
  - Submitting work you cannot sufficiently explain or understand

Note: the guidelines also indicate how to properly cite GenAI.

[Source: AI Observatory](#)

# King's College London - Guidance

- Does not ban any type of AI, but states: “above all, any work submitted must represent a genuine demonstration of your own work, skills and subject knowledge, [and] adhere to the guidelines of the assessment task [...]”
- In their guidance they suggest three “golden rules:”
  1. Learn with your chats and interactions with AI, but never copy-paste text generated from a prompt directly into summative assignments.
  2. Ask if you are uncertain about what is allowed in any given assessment.
  3. Ensure you take time before submission to acknowledge use of generative AI.

Source: [Generative AI - Student guidance - King's College London \(kcl.ac.uk\)](https://www.kcl.ac.uk/guidance/generative-ai)



# OIT Drafts

Both drafts also contain the definition of GenAI at the beginning of this presentation - it is omitted for space

# Draft 1: Edit Existing Language

- **Cheating:** obtaining or providing unauthorized information during an examination through verbal, visual or unauthorized use of books, notes, text, [electronic devices](#), and other **materials means**; [...omitted for space...]; altering other official academic records; [any use of GenAI tools that are explicitly prohibited by the course syllabus or written instructions for an assignment](#); or otherwise interfering with the accurate evaluation on an individual's knowledge.
- **Plagiarism:** submitting the language, ideas, or work of another as one's own or assisting in the act of plagiarism by allowing one's work to be used in this fashion. [This includes the submission of content created, in whole or in part, by GenAI tools as one's own original work.](#)

# Draft 1

Note: Uses “permitted unless prohibited” framework for “cheating”

## Pros

- Simple, relies on generally accepted definitions of cheating and plagiarism

## • Cons

- Plagiarism language does not allow for AI assistance such as grammar help, tone/style editing, outlining
- What does “created in whole or in part” mean?

## **Draft 2: Add New “Unauthorized AI Use” Item**

- **Unauthorized use of GenAI:** submitting work that one has received assistance or feedback on from GenAI tools without written permission to do so from the course instructor, is considered academic dishonesty equal to plagiarism. Written permission may take the form of a syllabus policy, an assignment instruction, an individual email, or otherwise. Students must declare any use of GenAI assistance in their submissions.

# Draft 2

Note: Uses “prohibited unless permitted” framework

## Pros

- Acknowledges AI can be used to assist writing tasks, and these uses can be permissible
- Clear rules:
  - “written permission”
  - “declare use”

## • Cons

- Requiring students to obtain advance permission may unintentionally dampen GenAI use
- What’s an appropriate level of detail for the declaration

# Going Beyond Policy

Is a revised policy enough?

# Considerations

- Is a new academic dishonesty policy enough?
  - Without guidance to students and faculty, policy can dampen AI use or expose well-meaning students to potential consequences
- Individual faculty members must make expectations clear within the context of their courses

# Considerations

- Are Oregon Tech faculty members ready to make their own policies? Do they know:
  - What GenAI can do?
  - How students are commonly using GenAI?
  - What university leadership's attitude is toward GenAI?
- Do they realize that some GenAI use is already built into our tools?
  - E.g. simple generative AI (text prediction) is already present in MS Word
- How can the university help them prepare?



# Discussion

Where do we go from here?

# Virtual GenAI Discussion Group

- Tomorrow, 2pm
- Email me for an invitation
- [Kristin.Whitman@oit.edu](mailto:Kristin.Whitman@oit.edu)

## IFS Report (May 7<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate)

by David Hammond and Cristina Negoita

The IFS had a virtual meeting on April 19.

The EOU VP of Finance, LeeAnn Case, presented the Student Success and Completion Model (SSCM).

In an overview, statewide FY 24 funding at 49% = \$489,452,891 and FY 25 at 51% = \$509,430,560. Broken into Mission Support (MS), Outcomes Based Funding (OBF) and Student Credit Hour (SCH).

Excerpt from HECC SSCM document (more at

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1\\_e2CsleN6bMm9BQz1CXD8uidBa7QYxcG/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_e2CsleN6bMm9BQz1CXD8uidBa7QYxcG/view?usp=sharing)):

- Mission Differentiation (MD) Funding supports the unique regional, research and public, service missions and activities of each university, as “line item” funding for services, programs, or general operations.
- Activity-Based Funding distributes resources based on student credit hour (SCH) completions of Oregon resident students at undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Outcomes-Based Funding rewards degree and certificate completions by Oregon resident students. Completions by underrepresented students (underrepresented minority, low-income, rural and veteran status) and those in academic disciplines in high-demand and high-reward fields (STEM, Health, Bilingual Education) are provided additional weighting in the allocation formula.”

The VP compared EOU with the state allocations under this model.

There was further discussion of the model, including the 40-40-20 goals, and background on HECC student success and budget summary.

Peter Geisinger EOU interim provost also gave a very short update since he just started in the interim position, but they are searching for a new provost.

Further conversations on CCN credit variance followed - with an interest in bridging the differences between IFS's response to that provided by the Statewide Provosts' Council to HECC's request on the credit variance issue.

We received a legislative update from Rico Lujan Valerio from WOU (see HECC's paper regarding advancing a \$18.7 million request to the [Legislature's Emergency Board](#) meeting on May 9<sup>th</sup>), and ended the meeting with campus updates as reported below.

Campus updates from each school were collected electronically, and are summarized below:

OHSU : Due to senate Bill 423, there are 2 new positions on the OHSU board, one for faculty. OHSU admin and faculty senate are developing criteria for faculty interested in serving. OHSU is extending its BS in nursing to Bend, in collaboration with Central Oregon Community College and St. Charles health system.

OSU : The OSU board of trustees approved a 4.65% tuition increase for next year. The new performing arts center (PRAX) has opened. OSU released its newest strategic plan, covering 2024-2030, the plan has an emphasis on growing the E-campus degree programs. OSU has launched a complete overhaul of the baccalaureate core curriculum (i.e. general education). OSU will receive a one-time infusion of \$10M to offset athletic scholarship commitments to students who are already enrolled, in light of the dissolution of the PAC-12. It is unclear how the future loss of PAC-12 revenue will be addressed going forward.

PSU: PSU administration is predicting 3% across the board budget cuts for fiscal year 2025, which could result in 100-200 job losses. The intensive English language program will lose 12 faculty positions, with the program elimination currently working its way through the PSU faculty senate. PSU has a new dean of library. Searches continue for deans for the college or urban & public affairs, the college of education, the school of social work and the school of business. The departments of geography, anthropology, geology, environmental science and management, and complex system program have proposed to merge forming a new School of Earth, Environment and Society. An amendment to the faculty senate that would allow adjunct faculty representatives has passed, however the amendment is being challenged. If the challenge succeeds, this amendment would be voted on by the full faculty on campus.

SOU : The university is continuing to search for a new CFO. SOU is developing a new course fee structure to help students who are taking most classes in-person but are forced to take an online class due to lack of availability of in-person sections. The SOU student health and wellness center is now partnering with La Clinica, which will give students more locations to access medical services.

UO: The university has hired a new provost, Christopher Long. The faculty senate passed the following three motions : A Military and federal agency deployment accommodation rights policy, an academic freedom and freedom of speech policy, and a student registration holds policy. Faculty senate established a significant academic disruption (SAD) task force to update the academic council representation and separate labor disruption from other emergencies. The faculty senate is working with the university general council to ensure that the university does not overreach the supreme court decision on affirmative action.

WOU : WOU will host its 3rd annual Hispanic-serving institution (HSI) summit on April 26. The schools in in the middle of bargaining. WOU has recently adopted a new strategic plan.

OIT : The Oregon Tech Board of Trustees met April 9 - 12, and many students gave verbal feedback detailing problems with understaffing in their academic programs as part of the public comment portion of the meeting on Fri., April 12th. A new major (and minor and certificate) in construction management was highlighted by our administration at the Board meeting; this is the result of a \$500,000 gift from the Beavers Charitable Trust, and seems to be “fast-tracked”, with the ambition of hiring a new Program Director this summer of 2024, and enroll our first class in Fall 2025. New budget adjustments suggest that OIT is short about \$7 mil for the upcoming 24-25 fiscal year (up from about \$3 million previously reported by our budget officials, and from a total budget of about \$72 mil “general fund”); every department has been asked to provide a new budget which implements a 5.7% cut; to “balance the budget” would require a 21% increase in tuition, which is unlikely. Union representatives are continuing negotiations around the recently passed Non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) promotion policy, specifically focusing on salary raises triggered

by promotions; workload is also under scrutiny as the Provost has proposed unilateral changes to the workload guidelines without consultation with Academic Council or Faculty Senate, as stipulated by our CBA; faculty are in conversations on these proposed changes as they are intended to take effect in Fall 2024, and negatively impact graduate courses, externships in our medical oriented majors, and labs.

**Oregon Tech Policy**  
**OIT-14-030**  
**STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

---

**1. Policy Statement**

[This policy defines academic dishonesty and its various forms in the interest of maintaining academic integrity and a beneficial learning environment for Oregon Tech students. It also explains academic actions and disciplinary procedures that may result from academic dishonesty, along with clarifying the rights of students in relation to academic dishonesty.](#)

**2. Reason for Policy/Purpose**

As part of our mission to enable students to become responsible citizens by developing ethical awareness, Oregon Tech expects that students, staff, and faculty share in the responsibility of maintaining high academic standards. Faculty and staff are expected to encourage and sustain academic excellence. Students are expected to demonstrate their knowledge with honesty and integrity. Oregon Tech considers academic dishonesty to be an unacceptable practice.

**3. Applicability/Scope**

This policy applies to all students of the university currently enrolled in coursework.

**4. Definitions**

Academic Dishonesty is defined as cheating, plagiarism, **unauthorized use of GenAI**, or otherwise obtaining grades under false pretenses. The following defines these terms in greater detail:

- **Cheating:** obtaining or providing unauthorized information during an examination through verbal, visual or unauthorized use of books, notes, text, [electronic devices](#), and other [materials means](#); obtaining or providing unauthorized information concerning all or part of an examination prior to that examination; taking an examination for another student or arranging for another person to take an exam in one's place; altering test answers after submittal for grading; changing grades after grades have been awarded; altering other official academic records; [any use of GenAI tools without written permission from the course instructor to do so](#); or otherwise interfering with the accurate evaluation of an individual's knowledge.
- **Plagiarism:** submitting the language, ideas, thoughts or work of another as one's own or assisting in the act of plagiarism by allowing one's work to be used in this fashion. **This can include the unauthorized use of GenAI (see definition).**
- **Unauthorized Use of GenAI:** submitting work done with the assistance of GenAI or a similar technology without written permission from the course instructor to do so.

Essentially, such an act is a form of plagiarism or cheating, depending on the assignment, carrying the same penalties. Written permission may take the form of a syllabus policy, an assignment or exam instruction, an individual email, or otherwise. Even with written permission, students must declare/cite any use of GenAI assistance in their submissions.

- **GenAI (Generative Artificial Intelligence):** refers to artificial intelligence technologies that can generate text, images, and other content based on input parameters. These technologies use complex algorithms to create content that resembles human-generated content.

## 5. Policy

### 5.1 Academic Action and Disciplinary Procedures

Disciplinary procedures for incidents of academic dishonesty may involve both academic and administrative action. After following the settlement procedures outlined below, the instructor of record may choose one or more of the following actions:

1. Provide a written warning to the student (with copy to the Office of Student Affairs).
2. Award a failing mark on the test or paper in question.
3. Require the student to retake the test or resubmit the paper.
4. Refer the case to the Student Hearing Commission.

Academic action by instructor of record may not include assigning a grade of "F" for the course or administratively withdrawing the student from the course based solely upon the incident of academic dishonesty. (Oregon Department of Justice Memorandum, 1979)

Administrative directors who determine in the course of their duties that academic dishonesty has occurred will also use the settlement procedures outlined below, notifying the instructor of record, and may choose either action 1 or 4, above.

All academic dishonesty cases will be reported to the Office of Student Affairs. If a faculty member and/or administrative director has evidence that a student has violated the Student Academic Integrity policy, the case may be handled either through settlement or a hearing. If the student is attending [OFF Oregon Tech](#), the faculty member and/or administrative director must meet with the student as soon as possible after discovering the violation. After meeting with the student, the faculty member and/or administrative director will determine the appropriate procedure based on the following:

1. If the faculty member and/or administrative director believes that the suspected violation can be resolved under the settlement procedures, s./hethey will contact the Office of Student Affairs to determine if the student is eligible for settlement. If a student has a prior academic dishonesty offense, s/he is they are not eligible for settlement.
2. If the student is eligible, the faculty member and/or administrative director may proceed with the settlement procedure.
3. If the student is not eligible for settlement, or if the faculty member or administrative director believes the suspected violation is serious enough to warrant a greater penalty than those outlined under the disciplinary procedures, the faculty member or administrative director must refer the case to the Student Hearing Commission by notifying the Office of Student Affairs.

## 5.2 Settlement Procedures

1. Faculty member and/or administrative director meets with the student and presents [him, /her /them](#) with the allegation and evidence of the academic integrity violation.
2. Faculty member and/or administrative director requests an explanation from the student.
3. After hearing the explanation, the faculty member and/or administrative director will determine whether ~~or not~~ a violation has occurred. If so, [s, /he /they](#) will fill out a settlement form noting the penalty and give a copy of the form to the student.
4. The student will be allowed, ~~at most,~~ 48 hours to consider and seek advice on whether to admit guilt and accept the penalty by signing the form.
5. If the student agrees to sign, the original must be signed in the faculty member's or administrative director's presence.
6. If settlement is reached, the faculty member and/or administrative director imposes the penalty and delivers the settlement form in a "confidential" envelope to the Office of Student Affairs who keeps a record of offenses. The student is given a copy of the form.
7. If the student refuses to meet with the instructor or administrative director, the faculty member and/or administrative director must forward the form to the Office of Student Affairs.
8. If during the meeting the student neither admits guilt nor agrees with the penalty and signs the settlement form accordingly, the faculty member and/or administrative director must forward the form to the Office of Student Affairs.
9. Students have the right to file an appeal as outlined in the Student Handbook.

## 5.3 Record Keeping

All Academic Dishonesty Settlement forms must be forwarded to the Office of Student Affairs.

## 6 Links to Related Procedures, Forms, or Information

[Dean of Students](#)  
[Student Hearing Commission](#)

*Standards of conduct are authorized by Oregon State Board of Higher Education Administrative Rules, Chapter 580, Division 22, Section 0015, and by concurrent action of the ASOIT and the Faculty Senate with the approval of the President of the College acting on behalf of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.*

[Name As It Appears in Policy or Document, with hyperlink](#)

## 7 Policy Review/Consultation

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

- [Faculty Senate](#).

This policy was adopted pursuant to Oregon Tech's policy review and making process.

## 8 Policy Approval



Approved by the President on ~~May 29, 2024~~~~May 28, 2024~~~~May 21, 2024~~.

---

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

**Adoption Date**

Sample: 02/16/2023

**Supersedes, Renames, and Renumbers**

Sample: Former OAR 580-021-0040

**Revision Dates**

Sample: 4/20/23

6/15/23

DRAFT

## Oregon Tech Policy OIT-14-025

---

### 1. Policy Statement

Dead Week (the period of Monday morning prior to finals week until the Monday morning of finals week) is the last week of regularly scheduled activities for the term. As such, Dead Week includes routine activities (i.e., lectures, discussions, laboratories, quizzes, assignments, appropriate course reviews, etc.). The purpose of Dead Week is to provide a period for classes to conclude, for cumulative review and reflection on course content, and to prepare for Finals Week. Since finals week represents the culminating assignment in classes, culminating assignments should be reserved for Finals Week. This allows for students to have an opportunity to prepare for finals and to reflect on their learning.

### 2. Reason for Policy/Purpose

The purpose of Dead Week is to provide a period for classes to conclude, for cumulative review and reflection on course content, and to prepare for Finals Week. Since finals week represents the culminating assignment in classes, culminating assignments should be reserved for Finals Week. This allows for students to have an opportunity to prepare for finals and to reflect on their learning. In recent times some instructors have encroached on the period and restrictions of Dead Week causing hardship to students and other instructors.

### 3. Applicability/Scope

This policy applies to all academic course work of the University.

### 4. Definitions

**Definitions:** Dead Week (the period of Monday morning prior to finals week until the Monday morning of finals week) is the last week of regularly scheduled activities for the term

### 5. Policy

#### Policy Details

- Final examinations, when utilized, must be given at the scheduled time during Finals Week (OIT-14-023).
- Projects and/or examinations due Dead Week may not exceed 20% of the final course grade.
- The appropriate Dean must approve any exceptions to this policy

## 6. Links to Related Procedures, Forms, or Information

[OIT-14-023, Final Examinations](#)

## 7. Policy Review/Consultation

This policy was reviewed and open to consultation of the following Oregon Tech committees and/or advisory groups: Academic Standards sub-committee, Faculty Senate, Admin Council, ASOIT, President's Council.

## 8. Policy Approval

Approved by the President on XXXX XX, 20XX.

---

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

## Oregon Tech Policy OIT-14-023 Final Examination

---

### 1. Policy Statement

The final week of each academic term serves as final examination week, i.e., Finals Week. The purpose of Finals Week is to provide a conducive environment for instructors and students to conduct final course assessments. Such assessments are generally culminating in nature and require special time to prepare and perform. Therefore, Final Exams will be carried out during, or due on, the time designated in the official “Final Exam Schedule” set by the Office of the Registrar.

### 2. Reason for Policy/Purpose

Finals Week serves as the closure of each academic term where students’ comprehension of course material is evaluated as it relates to each course’s learning objectives. The purpose of this Finals Week policy is to establish a framework that promotes fairness, integrity, and academic success for all stakeholders during Finals Week. Furthermore, this policy reduces potential time conflicts for all stakeholders.

### 3. Applicability/Scope

This policy applies to all academic course work carried out on the Klamath Falls campus. Finals related to academic course work carried out on the Portland Metro campus will be held during their regularly scheduled class time during finals week.

### 4. Definitions

**Definitions:** Finals week is the last week of each academic term.

**Responsible Office:** The University units responsible for coordinating, maintaining, and implementing this policy include school Deans, Department chairs, Instructors, Athletic Department, and the Offices of the Registrar, Provost, and Academic Excellence.

### 5. Policy

#### Policy Details

To provide a conducive environment for instructors and students to conduct final course assessments, the following will occur:

- No student activities or athletic events will be scheduled during Finals Week.
- Methods of evaluation are at the discretion of the instructor. They should be specific in the course syllabus and distributed to students the first week of class.
  - Instructors who use a final examination will administer that exam at the time designated in the official ‘Final Exam Schedule’ set by the Office of the Registrar.

- Instructors who use any other form of assessment will have it due during the time designated in the official “Finals Exam Schedule” set by the Office of the Registrar.

Individual students may request exceptions to this policy. These must be approved in advance by the instructor.

Instructors may request exceptions to this policy. The exception must be approved by the appropriate [DEPARTMENT CHAIR, SCHOOL DEAN, OR DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND SCHOOL DEAN] and students should be given at least three weeks prior notice of the change.

## **6. Links to Related Procedures, Forms, or Information**

[OIT-14-025 Dead Week](#)

[Name As It Appears In Policy or Document, with hyperlink](#)

[Name As It Appears In Policy or Document, with hyperlink](#)

## **7. Policy Review/Consultation**

This policy was reviewed and open to consultation of the following Oregon Tech committees and/or advisory groups: [Faculty Senate, Admin Council, ASOIT, President’s Council, etc.](#) depending on procedural history circumstances of this particular policy.

## **8. Policy Approval**

Approved by the President on [XXXX XX, 20XX.](#)

---

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