

Oregon TECH

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes

Feb. 7, 2017, 6:01 PM, Mt. Bailey/Thielsen Room, College Union

Attendance/Quorum

President David Thaumert called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm. All senators or alternates were present with exception of Ben Bunting, and Leanne Reed. A quorum was determined.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the Dec. 6, 2016 meeting were approved as written.

Reports of Officers

Report of the President – David Thaumert

- President David Thaumert stated that SenEx has had several meetings, including meetings with Interim Provost LeAnn Maupin and Dr. Steven R. Neihsel, Vice President of Strategic Enrollment Management regarding the Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) steering committee.
- There will be an Open Educational Resources Symposium at Portland State University on May 11, 2017. If anyone is interested, Lita Coolidge has information.
- An ad hoc committee has been formed to study the Academic Calendar. Issues being reviewed include the need to meet state contact times with students and to scrutinize week 9 of fall quarter. Robyn Wilde is chairing this committee and members include Jim Fischer, Mathematics, Teshome Jiru, Wilsonville EERE, Phil Howard, CSET, Wendy Ivie, Registrar's Office, Suzette Yaezenko, Chief of Human Resources and Mandy Clark, Student Affairs.
- There are currently openings on the Board of Trustees for a student and a staff member. Four candidates for each position have applied. The applications have been ranked and forwarded to Interim President Jay Kenton and incoming President Dr. Nagi Naganathan. They will select the top candidate for each position and their choice will be sent to the Board of Trustees and the Oregon Governor for appointment.

Report of the Vice President – Hugh Jarrard

- Hugh gave a report on the elections for Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS). He stated that the elections committee sent out 180 ballots via Qualtrics and received 109 responses. The committee had hoped to have a higher response rate, but they believe that the number of responses were negatively impacted by the holiday break. The election was close, as there was only a twelve vote spread between the first and fourth candidates. In addition, only three votes separated the first and second candidates. He stated the committee plans to use Qualtrics again for the elections of Senators in spring. Feedback on the use of Qualtrics for IFS Elections is welcomed.
- Hugh then reported on Academic Council, which met on Jan. 24, 2017. The bulk of the meeting was made up of by a presentation from Erin Ferrera, Coordinator of Disability Services. Discussion began with the process through which students provide documentation of need for accommodation and types that are commonly requested. It then turned to the issue of noncompliance on the part of Faculty in meeting requested reasonable accommodations. The first point made was that rates of compliance are very high, with only isolated instances of non-accommodation (if at all). Secondly, Disability Services exists to support Students and FACULTY in ensuring that standards governed by Federal and State Laws are met. The key is early intervention to resolve potential violations. A lengthy WHAT-IF discussion then followed on the process through which a Faculty member's refusal to (or inability to satisfactorily make) reasonable accommodations is resolved. It became clear that the process would require the Department Chair to provide documentation to Dean (or Provost) of repeated attempts to encourage Faculty to alter approach (verbal counselling, written counselling). Furthermore this documentation would need to be kept in some sort of personnel file that seem to currently not exist (according to OIT 22-010 Faculty Records), in that there are no long-term files that would be appropriate for this type of material. Hugh brought this issue of the lack of a mechanism for long-term storage of

noncompliant behavior up to Senate Executive for possible consideration as a charge – it was not felt that this required generation of a charge for committee like Faculty Welfare at this point in time. In conclusion, compliance with reasonable accommodation is important for our current students and for future students (that might be affected by student opinion and institutional reputation). Erin will continue to visit individual Department to work with them to inform and ensure compliance.

Reports of Standing Committees

Faculty Rank Promotion & Tenure (RPT) – reported by Matthew Sleep

- Matthew presented the report, appended as Attachment 1, and stated that 1) the policy being drafted is for Instructional Faculty only 2) the policy is incomplete so 3) the committee wishes to obtain Faculty Senate advisory approval on the draft sections only. Joe Reed moved to accept the Instructor 1 to Instructor 2 wording as written. Gregg Waterman seconded. Discussion followed including about the difficulty in defining 'equivalent education'. Dean Maupin stated that there may be times when certifications may be suitable equivalents for a Master's degree and mentioned a preference for more precise wording. The point was made that this policy would not impact accredited fields as their accreditation bodies have more rigorous requirements. Aja Bettencourt-McCarthy amended the motion to state "industry standard certifications" (based on an application and review process TBD by RPT) rather than "equivalent education." Robyn Cole seconded amendment. Motion passed with no nays or abstentions. For advancement from Instructor II to Senior Instructor, Terri Torres moved we accept the proposal. Motion was seconded by Joe Reed. Discussion followed, motion passed with no abstentions and no nays. The committee will continue working on the proposals.

Faculty Welfare – Yasha Rohwer

- Yasha stated that the committee believes the "White Paper" looks good and will be sent out for general assignments. They believe it should be included in the September Institute not just on the Faculty Senate website. It should also be given to every faculty member. They would like to see the deadline for assignments to be the end of spring term and no later than the first day of Convocation. If this was done, then the committees could start work earlier and could meet face-to-face during Convocation. They would like to see Faculty Senate establish a deadline and have it published in the Provost's calendar. This could establish precedent.
- On the second charge, workload, the committee has finalized their workload sheet and has started to interview department chairs.
- Regarding the third charge, Committee Chair Assignments, the committee recommends that the Faculty Senate Charter be updated so that all chair assignments be consistent. Currently, only welfare has any guidelines on chair assignment, all other committees have no guidelines on chair assignment. They believe Senate experience and tenure, as well as committee experience should be considered, as many charges carry over from year to year. This is why they recommend Charter revisions. President Thaemert stated that SenEx will take this issue under consideration. He also stated that the committee may want to consider whether this is actually a Charter or a Bylaw issue. A Charter revision will be a more in-depth undertaking than a Bylaws change.

Academic Standards – Chris Caster

- The committee has met but there is no report at this time. However, a third charge was presented to the committee Dec. 6, 2016. This charge was presented as follows:

Review and make recommendations regarding potential revisions to Transfer of Credits (OIT-13-011) policy, including:

- a. limiting courses and/or total number of credits transferred to a student's Oregon Tech academic record (i.e. Determination of Transfer Credit, Applicability of Transfer Credit);
- b. removing policy redundancy or conflict (i.e. OIT-13-013 versus CLEP and CPL sections); and
- c. updating language (i.e. "college," "OIT" etc.).

The committee will be meeting with Sandra Baily and Wendy Ivie to work on details of the committee's second charge and perhaps also this policy.

Faculty Compensation (FCC) – Joe Reed

- Joe presented the report, appended as attachment 2. He stated that the committee is hoping that the data will be finalized and the report can then be publicized and go to Human Resources for inclusion in the coming year. One item Joe mentioned was the fact that benefits were difficult to calculate as new hires have a higher health cost versus retirement costs while longer-term faculty have higher retirement costs than health costs and this needed to be taken into account.
- Dean Neupert stated that she is receiving drafts and MGT is getting close to completion, whereupon a full report will be made public.

Reports of Special or Ad Hoc Committee

No report. The Ad Hoc committee to review the Academic calendar, which was discussed in the President's report, the committee was appointed this morning.

Unfinished Business

None.

New Business

- David Thaumert presented information held from the December meeting due to elections concerning IFS elections and Bylaws appended as Attachment 3. The following possibilities for changes are coming from SenEx and they are requesting feedback from Faculty Senate.
- Joe Reed moved to accept the proposal of identified qualifications for IFS representative s. Robyn Cole seconded. There was further discussion on the SenEx list, items A-G. The motion was retracted and President Thaumert will take comments back to SenEx for additional work. These comments include taking item "F" off the list. It was generally agreed that all eligible faculty, not Faculty Senate, should elect this representative.
- Regarding the IFS alternate, following discussion, it was discussed whether to keep the current procedure which is to have the IFS representative instruct the Faculty Senate Secretary who their alternate is. An option would be to require that the alternate meet specified qualifications for the position of alternate.

Open Floor Period

- Kevin Pintong brought up the issue of the agenda order and if ASOIT will be moved to earlier in the meeting. President David Thaumert stated that this was part of an earlier discussion on the Bylaws and will be addressed in the future.
- Eve Klopff asked about the ratio of tenure to non-tenure positions being hired currently and how the decisions are being made regarding whether a position is tenure or not. Interim Provost Maupin stated that the Provost Leadership Team (PLT) reviewed all positions, each departments' strategic plans, the budget with Brian Fox and made recommendations to each department as to what how positions should be offered. Dean Neupert stated that there is always an avenue for non-tenured positions to move to tenured. One factor that affected the decisions was the return on investment (ROI) calculated by each department chair and presented to the PLT for consideration. Dean Maupin stated that the ultimate decision regarding tenure versus non-tenure lies with the Provost, who has final say on this decision.
- Mike Pierce stated that Dr. Steven Neiheisel from Strategic Enrollment has put together a work group that will assess potential initiatives for short term impact (2017 fall enrollment figures). Anyone who has ideas on how these figures might be affected can submit their ideas to either Mike Pierce or Dr. Steven Neiheisel.
- Joe Reed stated that FAST training is something he recommends all faculty undertake as there are all sorts of student information, even student photos in the class rosters.

Report of the Provost – Interim Provost LeAnn Maupin

Dean Maupin reported on the Provost Leadership Retreat which was attended by herself, Farooq Sultan, ^{Laura McKinney} Brian Fox, Dean Neupert, and Steven Neiheisel. It was held on the University of Oregon campus. She stated it was a very productive time to work with the Strategic Plans and they were able to come back and present plans to the Academic Council to tell the chairs what the next steps are. The Provost Leadership Team report will be presented at a future Faculty Senate meeting. Dean Neupert will also highlight how faculty will fit into this strategic plan.

Report of the President's Council Delegate – David Thaumert

David reported that President's Council has not convened since the last Faculty Senate meeting.

Report of the Association of Oregon Faculty (AOF) Representative – Christian Vukasovich

Christian stated that AOF is tracking introduced to the legislature that may impact faculty. IFS met earlier in February and he will get a report out on that meeting. When questioned on issues of national scope, he stated they are monitoring this national scenarios regarding sanctuary cities, states and schools.

Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Representative – Scott Prah

Scott stated that IFS has not yet met.

Report of the Fiscal Operations Advisory Council (FOAC) Representative – Hugh Jarrard

- FOAC met on January 20th, 2017. The Agenda included an Update on the Athletics Department from Greg Stewart (Interim Athletic Director), an Analysis of Wilsonville by Brian Fox and Laura McKinney, a presentation on the Budget and Tuition Setting process by Brian Fox, A Legislative Update with Budget Scenarios by Brian Fox, and an update on Academic Equipment Purchases by LeAnn Maupin.
- In news from the Athletic Department, Greg Stewart began with a descriptions of Accomplishments and Upgrades. Accomplishments included an overall 3.3 Department GPA, 15 teams honored as scholar teams with a minimum GPA of 3.0, and the best team GPA in the country (3.78) held by Women's Basketball. Upgrades included a new soccer field and a new team bus (that will result in savings over time due to a decreased need for renting transportation, in addition to increased marketing opportunities). Greg also expressed regret that the process followed surrounding the funding of the new soccer field was less than ideal, and stated that improved transparency was part of their department vision moving forward.
- Major challenges facing Athletics include a 50 year old building that needs major upgrades and overhaul, an outcome that would benefit not only the athletic department but also Oregon Tech students, Faculty, and Staff. In discussion about funding of the building overhaul, Brian Fox reported that the state had been asked for \$5 M and committed \$3.5 M for the reservation. It is hard to get State funding when the building is not a 'educational space' because we do not have a physical education department. Some discussion then followed regarding the creation of the physical education department, how one would hire faculty, and the credentials they might need to have.
- Challenges facing athletics included the need to rebuild campus relationships, and increase consistent funding opportunities for travel when student teams perform well and perform on the national stage. It was noted that alumni support is greatly needed. Finally, Greg described a department vision which included development of an action plan, improving student Fitness opportunities and equipment, improving the transparency of policies and procedures (as already mentioned), and creating personnel evaluations and increased expectations.
- The meeting then moved to the next item on the agenda which was a revenue and expense analysis of Wilsonville. Brian Fox described how total revenue from Wilsonville increased from \$8.5 in 2015 to \$10.6 M in 2016. Expenditures remained roughly the same across this time. This meant that direct income increased from \$1 M to \$3M over that time. Wilsonville has seen significant growth in student credit hours, has had an increase in state funding, and has used cost-containment measures. This has resulted in a lower cost-basis. Wilsonville also has fewer tenure track faculty, and a lower overhead model. Laura McKinney then described some philosophical goals for Wilsonville which included sustainability, quality, efficiencies, and an investment ahead of growth. Many programs in Wilsonville are in a startup phase, and the average class size will increase as these programs become established. There was a discussion of the challenge in Wilsonville of trying to support growth in classes, in the face of restrictions in growth due to facilities space constraints. A discussion was had about the optimal class size to break even, and it was revealed that while Klamath has a barbell shaped distribution in student enrollment (across the enrollment categories of 1-10, 11-15, 16-20, and 21 students or more), Wilsonville enrollment distribution is shaped more like an inverted pyramid with the majority of students in classes under 20. Across the entire portfolio however the average class size is 15.7 falls and 12.1 in Wilsonville.
- The next item on the agenda was a discussion of the Budget and Tuition Development timeline. The budget development process at the state level begins after November elections, then continues through different government bodies in November and December. The release of the Governor's Recommended Budget (GRB) enables the movement of the process on campus, starting with the Tuition Recommendation Committee in January, and discussion what tuition will be for Oregon Tech that year. The end of the process is the meeting of the Board of Trustees to make budget adoption decisions.

- The next item on the agenda was a legislative update and a discussion of budget scenarios built around the governor's recommended budget (GRB).
- The GRB for the next biennium is \$667 M for the PUSF (Public University Support Fund), with approximately \$48.5 M going to Oregon Tech. Brian then described three possible budget scenarios for Oregon Tech, built around the GRB, all of which are significantly impacted by the dramatically increased costs associated with PERS (\$4.5 M per biennium for Oregon Tech alone). All three scenarios will require a drawdown on the fund balance for Oregon Tech. In a scenario of funding at the GRB (\$667 M PUSF), a drawdown of \$4 M would be required from the general fund, along with \$1 M in cost reductions and a 10-15 % increase in student tuition. In a scenario of funding at the GRB plus \$50 M (\$717 M PUSF), a drawdown of \$1 M would be required from the general fund, along with a 5-10 % increase in student tuition. Finally, in a scenario of funding at the GRB minus \$50 M (\$616 M PUSF), a drawdown of \$5 M would be required from the general fund, along with \$1.95 M in cost reductions at the University. This scenario would also require a 10-15 % increase in student tuition.
- Brian Fox stated that the state budget was wrecked for at least the next decade. He felt that the only way out for Oregon Tech is to rapidly focus on increased enrollment and either grow in student enrollment, or start cleaving off sections of the University. He felt that we have a viable pathway through this challenging time, but that we have seize the opportunities and position ourselves to take advantage of our strengths. The final word on the outcome of State funding will not be known until June or July.
- The final item on the agenda was a discussion of the Academic Equipment Award list from last fall, by Dean Maupin. She described that the requested equipment lists from all departments totaled some \$3.1 M, but there were several big ticket items (such as a \$1.6 M ultrasound lease) that different funding sources will be found for. In total the awarded equipment award list was for \$709,000. There was additional discussion surrounding the fact that many requests for teaching tools were not funded, and that the university needs to have an equipment replacement in place.
- Meeting was then adjourned.

Report of the Administrative Council Delegate – Leanne Reed

There was no report but Dean Maupin did state that they are working on their Bylaws.

Report of the ASOIT Representative – Zachary Pascual

- Zachary stated that he has replaced Gaius Nikola who is concentrating on his studies.
- In December, ASOIT gave a letter to Interim President Jay Kenton supporting the proposal of improvements to the Rec Center. Out of 190 surveys sent out, 130 respondents are for changing the pool area into a basketball court, weight room and other proposed changes.
- On January 28, 2017 ASOIT held their “Blackout for Hunger” drive to collect food for charity.
- On February 24, 2017, ASOIT will attend a Legislative hearing at SOU.
- He also reported that student responses regarding SODEXO concerned the need for gluten-free and vegan meal choices. He stated that SODEXO has made changes to accommodate these needs.
- A question was asked of Zachary if there has been any outreach to the Wilsonville ASOIT student body. He stated that they are currently trying to get a meeting scheduled with both groups.

Adjournment

Motion and second to adjourn; motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 9:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
 Don McDonnell, Secretary
 /jp

Attachment 1
RPT Update January 2017: NTF Policy

RPT particularly seeks an advisory vote regarding the highlighted section on p.3 of this draft. That would help us finish other sections (procedure etc) for the March Senate meeting

The purpose of this policy is to provide criteria and procedures for the evaluation and promotion of non-tenure track instructional faculty at the Oregon Institute of Technology. This policy serves to define and differentiate fixed term faculty appointments from the traditional tenure track faculty. This policy defines the responsibilities of fixed term instructional faculty at OIT and serves to provide guidance to such faculty in assessing the appropriateness of their activities. OIT recognizes several faculty categories. Each category is created to be unique to the responsibilities and expectations of faculty within, but nothing in this document is to imply a hierarchy of importance between tenure track and other faculty.

Whenever possible, the regular academic instruction of students should be the responsibility of faculty members who are responsible for the curriculum and participate in the governance of the institution, and to whom the institution is willing to make the commitment of tenure. However, as a public university which offers innovative and rigorous applied degree programs in fast-evolving fields, there are legitimate uses for fixed term positions. Appropriate circumstances might include programs for which the enrollment or funding is uncertain, or when the instructor is exclusively online and therefore unable to easily participate in faculty governance and other campus activities.

This policy directs that the institution limit reliance on fixed term faculty. The use of fixed term faculty should be no more than 15 percent of the total instruction within the institution, and no more than 25 percent of the total instruction within any given department.

Oregon Institute of Technology provides for a comprehensive peer review to encourage, reward and support the continuous development of the Instructor ranks of the faculty, and identify those faculty members who merit promotion.

The focus of Instructor ranks within the faculty is strongly centered on teaching, with a higher teaching workload of typically 45 workload units per nine month academic year, except at the Instructor I level where it is typically 36 WLU. Correspondingly, expectations for professional development and departmental service are reduced, and there are no expectations for institutional service from Instructors. Broader institutional service, including serving on institutional committees or on Faculty Senate, is permitted, but will not be considered as a promotion criterion between Instructor ranks.

Promotion between ranks is intended to:

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

Evaluation

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

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

The concentration of a faculty member's professional activities may shift over time. As faculty progress through their careers, they may devote proportionately more time to different activities such as departmental service, program and curriculum development, teaching, advising, and/or activities related to professional development. Consequently, the expectations for individual faculty members may change. For the purpose of promotion

between Instructor ranks, the fundamental criterion is meeting established expectations and goals within the four criteria listed above. Because a faculty member's Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) is based on meeting objectives established in collaboration with the department chair and agreed upon in the Faculty Objectives Plan, the APE may guide reviewers in assessing the faculty member's performance as the focus of his/her career evolves. The criteria in the following sections are included here to guide the evaluation process.

Instruction

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

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

Professional Development

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

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

Departmental Service

Faculty will contribute to the advancement of their department and programs consistent with departmental and personal goals and objectives. Examples include, but are not limited to:

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

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

Professional Integrity & Willingness to Cooperate

Candidates shall demonstrate professional integrity in the following ways:

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

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

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

Instructor I to Instructor II

Eligibility Requirements: Master's degree or higher, or equivalent education as previously defined and documented by the department and approved by the dean.

Criteria for Promotion:

...

Instructor II to Senior Instructor I

Eligibility Requirements: Four full years in current rank, Master's degree or higher.

Criteria for Promotion:

...

Senior Instructor I to Senior Instructor II

Eligibility Requirements:

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

Criteria for Promotion:

...

Salary Increase for Promotion in Rank

Salary Increase for Promotion in Rank shall be 5%, except in the case of promotion from Instructor I to Instructor II, where the increase shall be either 5% or to the discipline-specific floor for an assistant professor, whichever is greater.

Attachment 2 FCC Update January 2017: MGT Study

History of the MGT Study: After several years of issues with the faculty compensation process developed in-house, in the fall of 2015, FCC proposed that the administration hire a third-party expert to conduct a faculty compensation study. Following an RFQ process in the winter of 2016, the MGT study began in April of 2016, when the OIT/MGT group reviewed the process and OIT faculty data was provided to MGT by Brad Burda or Ron McCutchen. During the spring and summer of 2016, MGT tried to recreate the current process that utilized 25 comparators and 4-digit CIP codes to identify disciplines, which ultimately was determined to be insufficient since it did not provide adequate data to produce valid results. During the summer and fall 2016, MGT worked with OIT to determine the most valid process which resulted in – (1) a multi-factor filtering method to identify 50 comparators, (2) 2-digit CIP codes. (It should be noted that a comparison of 4-digit and 2-digit CIP codes uncovered minimal differences.) In October and November of 2016, MGT provided OIT with study results however, we realized that the original data supplied to MGT had issues that need to be corrected by OIT.

December 2016: A modified working group of FCC (Hallie Neupert, Brian Fox, Suzette Yaezenko, Joe Reid, Stephen Schultz, Sharon Beaudry) was formed to work through a number of issues related to the MGT faculty compensation study. This group met several times over the break regarding the following:

- **Data:** The data was re-gathered and scrubbed for accuracy which specifically included:
 - **Locations:** Previous data did not include locations with applicable location adjustments.
 - **CIP Codes:** Corrections were made to those with obvious errors (i.e. Natural Science department was previously assigned multi-disciplinary study code (SIP 30). By definition, this should only be given if a PROGRAM, as opposed to a department, is a combination of disciplines. Therefore, NS was changed to reflect discipline.)
 - **FTE/FTE conversation:** Previous data did not include FTE. In addition, all FTEs were converted to a standard of 1 FTE = 9 Months/ Full Time. This standard, used by CUPA, is needed to compare OIT data to MGT study data.
- This data took one month to gather and scrub. It was sent to MGT on January 25th.
- In addition, during this past month the group determined the following to be used for the study:
 - **12.5% Ranges:** The same ranges as in the current policy (87.5% of CUPA) was maintained for the study.
 - **Internal Equity Adjustments:** After interviewing faculty that developed the compensation policy 15 years earlier, the adopted philosophy was to recognize internal equity. With the goal of moving disciplinary differences closer:
 - Communication (CIP 9), the lowest CIP among our departments, was adjusted upward (for wage calculation) to the next highest CIP code PSY(42).
 - Management (CIP 52), the highest CIP among our departments, was adjusted downward (for wage calculation) to the next lowest CIP code Engineering (14).
 - The study will include both CIP 9 and 52 data for transparency.
 - **Benefit adjustment:** Preliminary data in the study revealed that OIT benefits are presently about 4% higher than peer institutions. As such the following calculation will be used to adjust salaries to reflect this differential: ((OIT Average Salary) x (OIT Benefits %) – (CUPA Peer Institution Benefits Average %)). This is currently being re-run to confirm this differential.
 - We also asked MGT to provide guidance on the following:
 - **Location Differentials:** What process should we use to develop location differentials?
 - **Adjuncts/Overload:** MGT will also provide available market information on adjunct/overload pay.

- **Compression:** How will OIT adjust for compression?
- **Ongoing Maintenance:** How will OIT maintain market comparable salaries in the future?
- The complete study should be finished in February. It will be disseminated to faculty via an on-campus presentation by MGT consultants. Their report will be available at that time.

Work that remains by OIT includes the following:

- **Incorporation of the Study:** How and when will the study be incorporated into faculty compensation while considering budget issues.
- **Adjuncts:** While the MGT study has included a review of adjunct pay based on what they can gather legally, this is limited by data available both nationally and locally, therefore Oregon Tech will need to do additional work to dig deeper in this area.
- **Librarians:** Librarians are not included in the study since their data comes from *CUPA Professionals in Higher Education Salary Survey*. This data has been pulled by the HR utilizing the same process developed by MGT. We then need to develop pay ranges for librarians.
- **Policy:** The current Faculty Compensation Policy needs to be reviewed and updated. Specifically:
 - **Policy:** The policy needs to be simplified, legally compliant, and clarified so it is understandable by all.
 - **Procedure:** The current policy contains a procedure that is not complete. In order to understand the procedure, we had to interview faculty who originally developed the policy 15 years earlier. Our goal is to develop an updated separate written process document that is made available to all faculty and administrators to address all faculty compensation issues.

FCC: We would also like to review the make-up of FCC. Those on the working group have found that this mixed group of faculty and administrators has helped to pull data and work through procedures more efficiently for the benefit of all faculty.

Attachment 3 Bylaws Revisions January 2017

A Faculty Senate *ad hoc* governance committee, in place during the 2014-15 academic year, reviewed the body's governance documents and recommended updates for consistency with practice and structural and governance changes within the institution. The chair of that committee, Mark Clark, recently requested input from the Faculty Senate and its constituency regarding the changes that were enacted to determine if these changes were sufficient and met the Senate's functional needs. The input and his own insight were compiled into a white paper for Senate Executive Committee (SenEx) consideration. The following issues are tabulated to provide Senate direction to SenEx in crafting any potential changes to the Bylaws.

Election of Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Representative

IFS representatives are involved in discussions at the state level that potentially have significant effects on Oregon Tech. IFS is the main faculty voice in discussions with the state legislature and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission. It is important that Oregon Tech has IFS representatives who are broadly familiar with our institution.

- A. Elect IFS representatives following current procedures.
 - a. Election by vote of the faculty as a whole.
 - b. No specific qualifications for election are established, other than being an Oregon Tech faculty member.
 - c. Two IFS representatives are elected on an alternating schedule, one serving specifically as an at-large member of the Faculty Senate.
- B. Establish qualifications for elected service as an IFS representative. One or more of the following options may be enacted to ensure that candidates for election as IFS representatives are more qualified to represent Oregon Tech and thereby can function more effectively in that role.
 - a. Require the candidate to submit a written statement for circulation before the election (as was requested by the Elections Committee for the recent IFS representative election)
 - b. Require previous service on SenEx
 - c. Require a minimum number of years of service at Oregon Tech.
 - d. Require that the candidate be tenured
 - e. Require previous service on Faculty Senate
 - f. Change to Faculty Senate as the electing body rather than the faculty as a whole
 - g. Make the IFS at-large Senator a member of SenEx

Selection of IFS Senator/Representative Alternate

Current Faculty Senate rules call for each senator to select their alternate. If one accepts the importance for Oregon Tech to have an IFS representative with some particular qualifications, then some sort of selection/screening system—that mirrors whatever change is made to the required qualifications and selection of the IFS representative—is appropriate for their alternate.

- A. Select IFS alternates following current procedures.
- B. Establish qualifications for IFS alternate. Qualifications/procedures to be consistent with discussions and decisions for above issue.

Call for Nomination, IFS At-large Representative

Fall, 2016 Elections Committee (Hugh Jarrard, Chair)

The following is a Call for Nominations for the position of the OIT At-Large Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Representative (one of two IFS Representative positions at Oregon Tech). A description of the position, position responsibilities, and the ideal characteristics of a candidate follow:

Position Description: The Oregon Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) is made up of elected representatives from each Oregon public university. The purpose of IFS, as stated in the Constitution of that body, is *... to serve as a voice of the faculties of the institutions of the Oregon University System in matters of system-wide concern; to consider statewide policies and to make recommendations thereon; and to endeavor to strengthen the participation of faculties in the governance of the various institutions, through representatives of their own choosing.*

(<http://oregonstate.edu/senate/ifs/PDFs/CONSTITUTION.pdf>). The OIT IFS Representative position is a three-year term (ending Dec. 2019) that will seek to represent the Faculty of Oregon Tech in this manner. Whenever possible, the geographical diversity of the University should be reflected in the choice of the Faculty Senate and At-Large IFS Representatives.

Position Responsibilities: The responsibilities of the OIT IFS At-large Representative (in coordination with the second OIT IFS Representative) include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Attendance at Quarterly IFS Meetings and delivery to that body of OIT Faculty perspective on issues of current concern.
- Preparation and submission of an 'Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Report' to the OIT Faculty Senate Secretary for inclusion in the Faculty Senate Agenda, when appropriate.
- Attendance at monthly OIT Faculty Senate Meetings, and presentation of the IFS Report to the Senate, when appropriate.

Ideal Candidate Characteristics: Candidates for the OIT IFS At-large Representative position would ideally possess the following characteristics:

- Be tenured within their Department at Oregon Tech and/or,
- Have prior experience in Faculty Senate, and/or similar exposure to issues of Faculty concern through participation in Academic Council, Fiscal Operations Advisory Committee (FOAC), or similar committees.
- Be committed to not only effective conveyance of IFS proceedings to Faculty Senate, but also to active engagement in representation of Oregon Tech Faculty to IFS. Candidate ideally would also have a willingness to represent IFS and OIT on various statewide or HECC task forces/committees.

After nomination, candidates will be asked to submit to the OIT Faculty a statement outlining the qualifications and perspective they possess that would predispose them to success in this position.
