

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 1994 Minutes

File is over 40 pages. Use caution when printing.

1994 Minutes

Minutes for Faculty Senate meetings can be accessed by clicking on the desired date. Minutes are distributed to Senators for approval each month. Contact the Faculty Senate Office at or 541-737-4344 for more information.

- [December 1](#)
- [November 3](#)
- [October 6](#)
- [June 2](#)
- [May 5](#)
- [April 7](#)
- [March 3](#)
- [February 3](#)
- [January 6](#)

Please note that some links go to websites not managed by the Faculty Senate. As such, some links may no longer be functional or may lead to pages that have since been changed or updated.

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344

[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)

[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)

Valid [xhtml](#).

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 507

Oregon State University

December 1, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 pm by President Michael V. Oriard. There were no corrections to the November minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports were presented by the following individuals: John V. Byrne, Bill Danley, and Carroll DeKock
- Action Items - The following items were approved: Effects of Measure 8 Statement; Executive Committee election; Baccalaureate Core recommendation to reduce three floating credits; and a Category I Proposal to create an Ethnic Studies Department [Motion 94-507-01 through 04]
- New Business - Collective Bargaining Resolution was tabled to January [Motion 94-507-05 through 06]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Hart, B. McCullough; Headrick, W. Earl; Leid, J. Block; Maughan, E. Brazee; McDaniel, D. Selivonchick; Mukatis, S. Martin; Pyles, D. Jackson; Sproul, I. Delson; and Verts, J.C. McGinty.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Canfield, Clement, Collier, Cowles, DeAngelis, Farber, Hogue, Huddleston, Humphrey, Ingham, B. Lee, Liebowitz, Logendran, Mason, McDowell, Meints, Orzech, Sanchez, Strik, and Taylor.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

C. Allen, G. Beach, R. Becker, P. Borsa, M. Collier, J. Dunn, J. Hale, K. Heath, J. Hendricks, J. Herzog, M. Jimenez, L. Kesler, K. Krane, P. Lee, W. Loveland, J. McCubbin, R. Michael, D. Nicodemus, J. Nishihara, B. Paige, K. Piepmeier, R. Sahr, S. Sanford, K. Schaffer, A. Torres, and H. van der Mars.

Special Reports

John V. Byrne, OSU President

Dr. Byrne's comments were directed at Measure 8. He felt that all public employees have been unfairly treated

by a small majority of the voters. He shares the feelings of anger, resentment, and depression of faculty members. He noted that OSU's salary structure is nothing to be proud of, but faculty can be proud of the accomplishments achieved under those circumstances.

Although it has been officially accepted as passing, a recount of Measure 8 will take place. Once it has been certified after the recount, it is anticipated that it will be challenged legally with at least two lawsuits: one will be filed in Portland by the Oregon Public Employees Union and another by the University of Oregon Law School which will challenge it on constitutional grounds.

Byrne mentioned that, since the outcome of Measure 8 has a direct effect on the future of higher education, several university president's have urged the Chancellor to set up a series of regular conference calls to deal with the problem. He shared some of the comments, as he interpreted them, from the first conference call on 11/28:

- The Board will be requested to implement the pre-tax reduction at the December OSBHE meeting (Board action would affect faculty only).
- The university presidents' indicated that the general sense (other than at OSU) was a sense of calm and depression and waiting. He noted there was "considerable angst" at EOSC and OIT.
- Chancellor Cox reminded those listening that there were no dollars allocated for salary increases in the 1993-95 budget by the legislature.
- Considerable concern was expressed on behalf of Management Service employees.

As an aside to the Senate, Dr. Byrne mentioned that faculty morale is "realistically, at an all-time low." He felt that Measure 8 is the worst thing that has happened to faculty.

Byrne read a letter he composed on Thanksgiving Day and sent to the President's Cabinet, who shared it with Chancellor Cox who then faxed it to the other OSSHE university presidents. The Cabinet questioned whether the resources were available within our institution if the following were the core:

- Responsibility of institutional and system-wide administration to maintain and enhance, to the extent possible, the integrity and quality of public higher education in the State of Oregon.
- The agreement with the 1993 legislature not to make salary increases during the '93-95 biennium was made in the absence of the provisions of Ballot Measure 8. In view of the present circumstance which threatens the integrity and the quality of public higher education

in Oregon, that agreement is now considered null and void.

- During the '93-95 biennium when no salary increases were made, purchasing power of faculty and staff was reduced 5.6%. Inflation during FY '94 is estimated to be 2.9% and estimated at 2.6% during the first half of fiscal '95 — a cumulative inflation index of 5.6%.
- Action required to justifiably minimize the effects of Ballot Measure 8 on the integrity and quality of higher education:
 - 1) Immediately state that the 6% retirement contribution will be made before taxes (tax on this amount will be deferred until retirement). This creates a tax advantage that reduces the impact on take-home pay. [Dr. Byrne noted that, since the letter was written, he has been told that the Board can authorize the pre-tax contribution for faculty, but only the Governor can authorize it for all state employees.]
 - 2) For all employees, give a Cost Of Living Adjustment (COLA) of 5.6% effective December 1. This can be considered to be an offset against inflation during the period of no salary increase.
 - 3) If at all possible, agencies (including college and university foundations) create a program of short-term (3-6 months) low or no interest loans for those in greatest need.

Byrne shared with the Senate what was thought to be known:

- All existing contracts, including letters of appointment, will be honored as contracts.
- Unused sick leave, as a calculation in retirement packages, will disappear as of 12/31/94 if not retired before that date. Sick leave will continue to accrue.

The sense is that there is an increasing level of awareness that salaries in higher education are too low, that Measure 8 was clearly unfair, and that there will now be a move toward salary increases in the next round of budgeting.

Byrne also briefly mentioned the public corporation concept which is now being referred to as the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act for the 21st Century. This Act would allow higher education to create its own administrative system, including personnel, pay, and purchasing.

Dr. Byrne acknowledged that the faculty, including himself, are upset, but he urged them to avoid giving the taxpayers reason to believe that they were right in passing Ballot Measure 8. He noted that it was a time for reason, consideration, and action; the action needs to come from the Chancellor's Office and the OSBHE. He mentioned that it was understandably difficult for some state workers to see other public employee organizations making adjustments prior to the implementation of the constitutional amendment. Byrne suggested that Measure 8 was the biggest issue facing higher education since the system was created in the early 1930's.

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned whether the only appropriate action for higher education employees was to allow the Board and the Governor to act on our behalf. Byrne disagreed with the term 'allow' and felt that better terminology would be to 'urge' them. In response to Gamble questioning why the Board was not proactive prior to the election, Byrne felt that they actually were proactive since Measure 8 passed by a much smaller number of votes than anticipated.

Senator Gould, Science, questioned why he was not allowed to give raises to post doctoral students who are paid from federal money administered by the State. He was told by OSU representatives that no raises, regardless of the source of money, will be approved at this time. Byrne immediately questioned whether they were in the Public Employees Retirement System and noted that a number of OSU employees are not in the PERS system and these people will not be affected by Measure 8. Gould went on record by saying he is opposed to the practice of Federal grants paying the 10-11%, so called, State contribution to retirement for post docs who never stay in the system for five years to be vested, but the money continues to be taxed on grants going into the State System; Gould has been told by the Research Office that nothing can be done without changing the law. Byrne felt this was a legitimate concern and should be researched.

IFS Representative Wilcox was concerned that if faculty are not vocal enough, they may not get anything in the next legislative session. Byrne felt that bold actions are necessary but cautioned that actions must be reasonable and substantiated by facts and presented in a professional way.

Jon Hendricks, Sociology Chair, urged faculty to focus initial efforts on classified and management service staff since they will be the first to be impacted and have the least amount of discretionary income. Byrne noted that some employees would be affected 1/1/95 and there is talk of an equity plan which would allow them until June to prepare for the reduction — the same as other employees.

Senator Tricker, Health & Human Performance, felt that we should use this period as a time to plan for the future and to stand fully behind President Byrne who is serving on our behalf; he felt that Measure 8 was just the beginning of what was to come.

Bill Danley, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate President

President Danley spoke very much along the same lines as Dr. Byrne concerning Measure 8 and noted that "we are facing a very serious threat because of the challenge that the people of Oregon have given to all public employees." He felt that our response to Measure 8 will determine what will follow. Danley reiterated Byrne's comment that this calls for bold action and not a reaction to what happened.

He stressed that regardless of the course of action taken, we must pick the battle we want to fight and then recognize who the enemy is — the Board and Chancellor are not the enemy. He thinks that the Chancellor is willing to listen and that the Board is responsive and that both are willing to help fight the Measure 8 battle if faculty carefully choose the actions to be taken.

Danley mentioned that PERS is preparing a fact sheet which may be out the second week in December. He was told by Weldon Ihrig, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, that Governor-elect Kitzhaber would do everything he could to ensure that public employees are protected. He also noted that concern has been expressed about the use of the initiative process to change the Constitution.

Danley stated that it has long been the opinion of IFS that faculty are underrepresented on major decisions affecting higher education in Oregon. He will propose (at the IFS meeting on December 3) that a resolution and legislation be prepared to add two faculty members to the Board; this would give faculty the same representation as students currently have.

Senator Mukatis, Business, questioned how faculty could organize a boycott of businesses who supported Measure 8 and stated that a public record is available to determine who supported the Measure. Danley stated that he would not advocate a boycott, but would be careful of where his money was spent. Senator Brownell, Science, disagreed with a boycott and felt that it was displaying the same mean-spiritedness as Measure 8 spawned. Senator Gould, Science, felt it was unfortunate that the voters have placed public employees in an adversarial situation and didn't see anything wrong with those affected to act appropriately. An incomplete list of supporters was distributed during this discussion.

Senator Holmes, Home Economics & Education, expressed concern that litigation surrounding Measure 8 is not coming from the faculty and felt that faculty should be making an impact. Danley suggested that AOF be urged to take action. President Oriard stated he had talked with Caroline Kerl, OSU's Legal Advisor, and was told that any legal action must be handled through an external agency, such as AOF, rather than from faculty members. Bob Becker, AOF Board Member, stated that AOF is involved with the PERS coalition (which includes AAUP, AOF, OPEU and others) and attorneys are now discussing what action to take.

Senator Crockett, Extension, felt that the dichotomy between state and private employees needs to be researched and persuasively inform the media of the differences.

Senator Scheuermann, Student Affairs, urged coordination of substance and timing of any legal actions taken.

Carroll DeKock — Election Results

Carroll DeKock, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, an-

nounced that Steve Esbensen, Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, had been elected to a three-year term as an IFS Representative and that Ken Krane, Physics, had been elected President-Elect. DeKock acknowledged Mary Alice Seville and Larry Curtis whose names were also in nomination.

Action Items

Effects of Measure 8

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee presented the following statement for Senate approval:

Higher education in Oregon is in crisis. Education more generally, and Oregon's future in the broadest possible terms, are threatened, but the crisis in higher education is more immediate. What is perhaps most painful in this situation is the fact that, through ballot initiatives rather than an economic downturn, Oregonians have brought these crises on ourselves. The approval of Measure 8, four years into the budgeting that has resulted from Measure 5 in 1990, could easily undermine in just a year or two the quality of higher education in Oregon that has been generations in the making. With Measure 8, a tiny majority of voters (themselves a minority of adult citizens) have taken from a small segment of the population 6% of our income (up to 8% if taxed), in order to maintain services from which all Oregonians benefit. In being told that faculty and other state employees are overcompensated, Oregonians have been systematically misled. Good benefits have merely compensated, in part, for low salaries. Now, with Measure 8, following a two-year wage freeze (as the cost of living has gone up about 3% each year), by July 1995 faculty and other state employees will have lost 14% in real income in two years. Should the legislature continue this wage freeze for the 1995-97 biennium, the loss of real income would exceed 20%.

Faculty at OSU are angry and deeply resentful. In the coming months, some faculty—particularly in fields where competition for good faculty is greatest—will decide to leave OSU for jobs elsewhere. The damaging loss of faculty and the undermining of morale for those who remain, coupled with the expense and at least temporary chaos that will result from the loss of similarly outraged and underpaid classified staff and management, will be felt immediately. Recovery, even under the best of future circumstances, will take years.

The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University, therefore, supports the efforts, including litigation, of the Association of Oregon Faculty to alleviate the effects of Measure 8.

The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University also calls on Governor-elect Kitzhaber, the State Board of Higher Education, the chancellor, and particularly the new legislature, to provide the vision and leadership during the upcoming legislative session necessary to preserve the quality of education, and of educators, in Oregon. Education—from kindergarten through graduate school— must be recognized, at the very

least, as the key to attracting and keeping the most desirable businesses, and to preparing Oregonians for employment in them. For the long term, Oregonians must be convinced by their elected and appointed leaders that the fabled quality of life in Oregon will be eroded if adequate funding is not guaranteed by a wisely reformed tax structure. In the short term, Oregon's leaders must make the financial commitment necessary to prevent the devastation to higher education threatened by Measure 8. Faculty compensation must be one of the highest priorities for the 1995-97 biennium.

Senator Gamble recounted a discussion with his great-grandmother, whose own grandmother was a slave, who told him in response to his question of why some have privileges not afforded to others, "People, even people of good will do not always take seriously those things which they write down, profess to live by, and believe... Your primary objective should be to survive with dignity." At a time when, and in a State where, individuals can purchase 50,000 signatures for a dollar each on an initiative which results in changing the Constitution of this state by a mere plurality of those voting, OSU's faculty need to do what is necessary to preserve their dignity.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, explained that the results of exit polls in Benton and Deschutes County showed that 16% of public employees in that sample voted in favor of Measure 8.

Motion 94-507-01 to approve the above statement passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Executive Committee Election

Those running for two-year terms were: Ataa Akyeampong, Russ Dix, John Lee, Russel Meints, Maggie Niess, and Manuel Pacheco.

Ballots were distributed and counted during the meeting. Those elected were: Russ Dix, Registrar's Office; John Lee, Mathematics; and Maggie Niess, Science & Math Education.

Baccalaureate Core Committee Recommendation

Rob Sahr, Baccalaureate Core Committee Chair, presented the following proposal (unanimously approved by the Committee) which changes two elements of the listing for baccalaureate core requirements:

Under Perspectives, it deletes: ~~+ one additional course in one of the five preceding areas~~

Under Total, it changes: "54 credits + WIC" to read "48 credits + WIC"

The Committee felt the reduction was justified due to the change in the minimum number of credits required for graduation from 192 to 180; the proposal reduces the baccalaureate core requirements in approximately the same ratio as the 192 to 180 change.

Motion 94-507-03 to reduce the baccalaureate core requirements by three floating credits passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Category I Proposal — Ethnic Studies Department

This proposal was published in the November agenda and presented as a Discussion Item at that meeting.

In response to Senator Glenn, Liberal Arts, questioning the type of curriculum that an undergraduate would be taking as a major, she was told that the core curriculum is skeletal. Basically, the initial proposed offerings contain sequences on the history of each ethnic/racial group at the 300 level; lower division courses are general; and an internship is required. Barbara Paige, Acting Director of the Difference, Power, and Discrimination Program and Chair of Ethnic Studies Department at Cal State Hayward, noted that a skeletal draft of courses conforms to other programs.

Senator Gupta, Forestry, questioned whether other ethnic groups not listed would eventually be included. He observed that the four groups included in the proposal are minorities and suggested that a Department of Minority Studies would be more appropriate. Linc Kesler, Ethnic Studies Committee Chair, stated that the focus was aimed specifically at the groups in the proposal, which is not meant to be exclusive, and that the Theory of Ethnicity would include other groups. He noted that the 'Ethnic Studies' title is the recognized title for this type of activity and will be easily recognizable to individuals from other campuses.

Senator Macnab, Extension, has received comments from individuals who have been effective in lobbying and obtaining funds for OSU. The general feeling concerning spending money for this proposal is, if the money is available for this department, then perhaps they don't need to be spending the time lobbying for OSU; some don't feel it is basic to the land grant mission. There was a consensus that a need for cultural awareness and education exists, but not in the form of a department. Kesler noted that many people feel that this type of proposal is unimportant — which is why this issue needs to be addressed. The Committee considers this proposal to be the most cost effective way of handling this issue at OSU at this time, in a way that will be meaningful. The Committee believes that investigations at OSU have established a need for action in this area.

Walt Loveland, Curriculum Council Chair, noted that the Committee felt this proposal was a unique opportunity to enrich the education of OSU students and to allow, and emphasize, research in this area.

John Dunn, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, noted that 1,300 prospective new students have already expressed an interest in the recently approved Honors College. He suggested that the Ethnic Studies Department would provide an additional attraction to students, both minority and non-minority, and generate additional revenues.

Motion 94-507-04 to approve the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department, as proposed in the November agenda, passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.

Information Items

- New Senator Orientation will be January 5, 1995, preceding the regular Senate meeting.
- Senators whose terms end in December are asked to return their Faculty Senate Handbook to the Faculty Senate Office as soon as possible so they can be updated and redistributed to new Senators.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard reported on the following items:

- Measure 8 — Reiterated that, although faculty are being hurt, they recognize that others (Classified and Management Service) are being hurt as badly and worse.
- Ethnic Studies — He commended the faculty for passage of the proposal by recognizing the need to deal with minority issues through multicultural education of all students. He noted that, with the passage of Measure 8, new challenges have been created — it will be more difficult to get faculty to agree to do anything more than they do already.

New Business

Senator Mukatis presented the following motion, which was then seconded [Motion 94-507-05]:

I move that a special task force be created to search for a bargaining agent to represent Oregon State University faculty that has a record of delivering results for other faculties nationally.

Senator Burns, Home Economics & Education, questioned whether the intent was to participate in collective bargaining if an agent was found. Mukatis responded that if agents are identified, the faculty would then decide whether to select one.

Motion 94-507-06 Senator Lee, Science, felt that since Senators represent their colleagues, they needed time to get a sense from them and moved to postpone the vote to the January meeting; motion was seconded. Motion 94-507-06 to postpone the vote passed by voice vote with more than a 25% margin.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:22.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 506

Oregon State University

November 3, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm by President Michael V. Oriard. There were no corrections to the October minutes. President Oriard acknowledged Thurston Doler for sitting in as Parliamentarian.

As a result of confusion at the October meeting, President Oriard briefly discussed the rationale and proper procedure for bringing New Business to the attention of the Senate. The Bylaws concerning New Business are so written to prevent an individual from introducing and acting on a motion at the end of the meeting when fewer Senators are present to discuss and vote on the issue. The proper way to introduce New Business is to have a Senator move to discuss a particular issue, limit discussion and then discuss the issue. Voting on New Business must be postponed to the next meeting if 25% of the Senators present are opposed to voting at that time.

In regard to State law, Oriard informed Senators that it was inappropriate for the Faculty Senate, during work hours, to introduce motions which take a position on a political issue; however, issues and consequences can be discussed.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports - None
- Action Items - The following items were approved: 1995 Apportionment Table, OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award, Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, Nominees for elected positions, and a Resolution to Reaffirm Commitment to Tolerance and Diversity. [Motion 94-506-01 through 09]
- Discussion Item - Category I Ethnic Studies Department Proposal
- New Business - None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Helle, V. Collins; Holmes, C. Raab; Knight, D. Ehrensing; Logendran, S. Randhawa; Maughan, J. Davidson; Mukatis, C. Brown; Niess, G. Pearson; Plant, C. Koc; Ragulsky, J. Beary; and Reed, P. McFadden.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Beatty, Brownell, Calder, Cornelius, Cowles, Crockett, DeAngelis, DeYoung, Gould, Headrick, Hogue, Huddleston, Humphrey, Ingham, Jensen, Krueger, Ladd, Lunch, Lundin, McDowell, Miller, Orzech, Pyles, Rathja, Riggs, Robbins, Rossignol, Sandine, Sherr, Strik, Taylor, and Tricker.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

C. Allen, G. Beach, M. Collier, M. Cook, J. Dunn, D. Ellsworth, M. Jineng, L. Kesler, D. Liberty, W. Loveland, C. Manuelito-Kerkvliet, J. Marten, D. Nicodemus, B. Paige, L. Roberts, R. Sahr, K. Schaffer, B. Shepard, and M. Stewart.

Action Items

1995 Apportionment Table

President Oriard announced several FTE increases to the distributed apportionment table due to additional appointments being made. The increases raised the total FTE from 1801.67 to 1804.97; however, it did not change the number of Senators in any unit. The FTE translates to 127 Senators which is an increase of 14 from 1994. The apportionment table includes OSU FTE in the ranks of Instructor or above, including No Rank faculty and Senior Faculty Research Assistants. This is the first year that all No Rank faculty have been included in apportionment. Motion 94-506-01 to approve the apportionment table passed by voice vote with no objections.

Faculty Awards

Gordon Reistad, Faculty Recognition & Awards Chair, presented two proposals for approval. Since Burlington Resources no longer funds faculty awards at OSU, the Committee recommended that the former 'Burlington Resources Foundation Faculty Achievement Award' be renamed 'OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award.' Changes to the award criteria consisted of restricting the award to Associate or Assistant Professor or Instructor with less than ten years of OSU service. This change was deemed desirable to distinguish the award from the Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor and Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Awards. Another change was that nominees not selected for the Ritchie Award will no longer be eligible for this award. Reistad stated that John Dunn was looking for funding for this award. Motion 94-506-02 to rename the award was approved by voice vote.

The second proposal recommended creation of the 'Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award' which recognizes significant and meritorious achievement which enhances the effectiveness of extended education. The award is for full-time faculty with five or more years of service to OSU who devote a significant amount of time to extended education, whether on or off campus. Motion 94-506-03 to approve the award was passed by voice vote.

Faculty Senate Elections

Carroll DeKock, Committee on Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented the slate of nominees:

President-Elect - Nominees recommended were: Larry Curtis (Professor, Fisheries & Wildlife), and Ken Krane (Professor, Physics). There were no nominations from the floor. Motion 94-506-04 to close the President-Elect nominations passed by voice vote with no objections.

Executive Committee - Nominees recommended were: Ataa Akyeampong (Assistant Professor, Educational Opportunities Program); Russell Dix (Associate Professor, Office of the Registrar); John Lee (Professor, Mathematics); Russel Meints (Professor, Botany & Plant Pathology); Maggie Niess (Professor, Science & Mathematics Education); and Manuel Pacheco (Assistant Professor, Philosophy). There were no nominations from the floor. Motion 94-506-05 to close the Executive Committee nominations passed by voice vote with no objections.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Representative - Nominees recommended were: Steven Esbensen (Professor, Atmospheric Sciences) and Mary Alice Seville (Associate Professor, Accounting & Information Management). There were no nominations from the floor. Motion 94-506-06 to close the IFS Representative nominations passed by voice vote with no objections.

Endorsement of Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Resolution

Sally Francis, IFS Representative, presented the following resolution, which was approved by IFS in response to their concerns, regarding the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act and asked the Faculty Senate to endorse the intent of the resolution.

The IFS supports the intent of the State Board of Higher Education, as embodied in the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act, to improve administrative efficiency and maintain student access while preserving the rights and authority of the faculties and the autonomy of individual campuses.

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned what the changes would be under the proposed structure. Francis replied that most of the efficiency would result in areas of personnel and purchasing. In response to Gamble, Francis affirmed that the implication is that the savings would result in providing instruction for 2,000 more students. Gamble questioned the rationale behind the resolution. Francis replied that the IFS took the action to show support for the State Board in pursuing the Act and asked each of the IFS Representatives to present it to faculty on their respective campuses. Provost Arnold noted that the Act would provide a higher level of autonomy for the State Board to approve actions.

When asked the difference between the Act being discussed and the Public Corporation Model, Provost Arnold responded that the name is the basic change with some minor refinements.

Senator Scheuermann, Student Affairs, questioned the

use of the word 'intent.' Francis responded that it was worded that way since the final form has not yet been drafted, but IFS wanted to go on record as supporting what they felt the intent to be.

To set the record straight, Provost Arnold noted that the OSU President and Provost had not been asked to support the Act, even though IFS had been told that every OSSHE president and provost supported it.

Senator Rose, Forestry, expressed concern that the Senate was voting on something that no one had actually read. Francis reiterated that it was important to IFS that the intent was to preserve the rights and authority of the faculties and maintain student access.

Senator Burns, Home Economics & Education, amended the motion to delete "as embodied in the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act,"; motion 94-506-08 was seconded by Senator Rose. The amendment passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes. President Oriard found the amendment problematic in that the OSU Faculty Senate was changing what IFS was supporting.

Motion 94-506-07 to endorse the amended IFS resolution failed by voice vote with some votes in support.

Faculty Reaffirmation of Commitment to Tolerance and Diversity

President Oriard presented the following resolution for approval which addressed issues raised by Ballo Measure 13:

Oregon State University policy affirms tolerance for everyone, regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age, disability, or veteran status. Moreover, consistent with centuries-old educational and constitutional guarantees, Oregon State University affirms free and unconstrained intellectual inquiry. The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University recognizes these basic principles and reaffirms their essential role in our university community.

There was no discussion on the motion. Motion 94-506-09 passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Discussion Item

Category I Proposal - Ethnic Studies Department

Walt Loveland, Curriculum Council Chair, presented the Ethnic Studies Department Category I Proposal. He noted that the proposal received unanimous approval from the Curriculum Council and also received approval from the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee. He addressed several specific aspects of the proposal:

- 1) Faculty - It is envisioned that the department will consist of four faculty members, probably one Associate Professor serving as Chair and three Assistant

Professors, with their expertise distributed amongst the four major ethnic study curriculum emphases.

- 2) Hiring — He noted that hiring would be conducted differently than in other areas since the hiring committee includes representatives from the ethnic communities in Oregon. The faculty hired will be expected to perform scholarly research normally expected at a research university.
- 3) Department vs. Program — The Council spent a great deal of time discussing whether the proposed unit should be a department or a program. The information received by the Council indicates that the departmental status is necessary to recruit the best possible people and shows a respect for the discipline. Over the past 15 years, institutions which have a 'program' and not a department encountered the most problems, specifically at PSU and the U of O. It is anticipated that the department will increase the number of ethnic minority students at OSU, as well as become an important factor in hiring minority faculty.
- 4) Budget — A revised budget, correcting minor errors, was available at the Senate meeting. The department is 100% state funded; the money derives from the University administration, not the College of Liberal Arts. Unused funds will revert back to administration.
- 5) Curriculum — The degree is consistent with other Liberal Arts degrees. Fifty-one credits in the major are necessary to complete the degree and it has appropriate major requirements. Students are required to specialize in two ethnic areas and are required to participate in an internship.

There is some deliberate vagueness associated with particular aspects of the curriculum since the yet-to-be-hired faculty should be instrumental in defining the course content.

Senator Leklem, Home Economics & Education, commented that the travel budget appears to be relatively high. Carol Brown, Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee, stated that the suggestion came from her committee to include a substantial travel budget since they felt it was absolutely essential to interact with other individuals in this discipline. Leklem thought the rationale was true of any department, and was concerned with the amount. He felt that, after the first few years, research dollars could be generated to cover travel costs.

Senator Davis, Engineering, questioned how many of the recommended staff would be new to OSU. Loveland responded that the objective was to recruit the best possible people and most would be new. Davis then questioned whether there were qualified faculty currently at OSU. Linc Kesler, Ethnic Studies Committee member, mentioned that the curriculum design includes the possibility of courses taught in other OSU departments functioning as part of the curriculum, in the form of electives, which would be taught by existing faculty. The committee sees an opportunity in hiring new faculty who bring additional expertise in this field.

Senator Burns questioned whether the budget would come from new funds allocated at the University level. Provost Arnold responded that, if the proposal is approved by the Faculty Senate, the commitment is to build this department into the budget in the next biennium. As

an aside, Arnold reported that there was a significant amount of discussion at the last OSSHE Board meeting concerning a report for the System about the progress made in the recruitment and hiring of minority faculty. He noted that, despite all the efforts in effect throughout the System, the result has been disappointingly slow and there is a strong expectation that the Board will ensure that each institution takes this obligation seriously.

Senator Drexler, Business, questioned what specific problems have been encountered by the programs at PSU and the U of O. Loveland responded that the U of O has experienced difficulty in recruiting faculty to teach classes due to responsibilities in their own departments; volunteer spirit only goes so far. Loveland also noted that you can't be 'borrowing' faculty all the time if the unit is going to be seriously engaged in research.

Kesler noted that the Committee had been asked several times whether Ethnic Studies represented a real discipline; he offered the following suggestions on behalf of the Committee:

- 1) It is a discipline in the sense that there are a group of scholars working and conducting research in this area.
- 2) More traditional disciplines have been defined by a change in concentration and a refocusing of effort on a particular set of problems; scholars frequently have backgrounds in already existing areas.
- 3) Many disciplines that now exist in Liberal Arts consist of a great diversity of opinion as to what the discipline consists of.

IFS Representative Wilcox questioned whether there are similar models on campus consisting of four faculty and what would the governance structure be for this department. Loveland responded that Radiation Health has a small FTE and faculty from Nuclear Engineering teach some of the classes. The Curriculum Council discussed the issue of using adjunct faculty and felt that would be an appropriate structure for involving faculty already on campus. Kesler noted the importance of the perceived involvement of adjunct faculty.

Wilcox cited the recent ARC report which focused on combining small programs in light of now proposing a department consisting of four faculty. Kesler responded by stating that providing a strong central core to the department is essential since there is already research and integrity in this field and reiterated the problems facing a program versus department status. He went on to note that, in a time of budgetary constraint, the committee is presenting a minimal proposal with minimal expense.

Senator Stevens, Agricultural Sciences, questioned the types of training and programs envisioned. Barbara Paige, Difference, Power and Discrimination Acting Director, noted that people are usually trained within traditional disciplines; this is mainly due to the fact that there is only one Ph.D. granting institution in this discipline. She commented that the usual beginning number of faculty for this type of department is four and expands as the demand for courses grows. She noted that the reason for the initial size is that every academic senate

has the same type of concerns being expressed during this discussion.

Senator Gupta, Forestry, questioned whether PSU and the U of O are considering upgrading their programs to department status. Kesler stated that the PSU program is very different from this proposal since it concentrates on African American Studies. Mary Jane Collier, Ethnic Studies Committee member, met with the U of O Ethnic Studies Coordinator, who is the only faculty member and whose job it is to solicit volunteers to teach courses. She knows of no plans to at the U of O to elevate the program to department status.

Kesler noted that, when the Committee was soliciting information from ethnic studies units on other campuses, they were given the advice that it was better to do nothing if given the choice between activating a substandard program and doing nothing.

President Oriard noted that the proposal will be voted on in December and reminded Senators to bring their November agenda with them to the December meeting since the proposal will not be reprinted.

Information Items

- Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act for the 21st Century - included in the agenda.
- Measure 5 Effects - Testimony before the House Committee on Education by Bill Danley, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate President.
- Graduation Statistics - Summary provided by Barbara Balz, Registrar.
- D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award - Nominations must be submitted to the Faculty Senate Office by January 27, 1995.
- Senator Attendance Summary by Apportionment Unit for 1993/94 - included in the agenda.
- Faculty Awards - Information for the following awards can be obtained from the Faculty Senate Office; deadline for nominations is February 15, 1995:
 - OSU Distinguished Service Award
 - OSU Alumni Assoc. Distinguished Professor Award
 - Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award
 - Dar Reese Excellence in Advising Award
 - Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award
 - OSU Outstanding Faculty Research Assistant Award
 - OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award
 - Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award
- Instructions for Nomination and Election of Faculty Senators - Information to be sent to heads of all voting units.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold's report contained the following items:

- Ethnic Studies Proposal - The Provost complimented those responsible for drafting the proposal.
- Enrollment Statistics - The total enrollment now stands at 14,264 which translates to an increase of about .4%. There is an 8.3% increase in the number of new students; graduate students are up from 3,003 to 3,102; and undergraduates are down from 11,261

to 11,221—community college enrollments are also down. A possible explanation for the lower numbers is that, since the economy is strong, students may have chosen to remain employed longer to earn tuition money.

- Honors College - Even though the Honors College has not been widely promoted, 640 students have requested information. The Provost noted that, whether or not they are admitted to the Honors College, they may learn about opportunities at OSU and choose to come here anyway.

The Honors College Council has been appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and will be contacting departments to determine the level of interest in offering Honors sections of Baccalaureate Core courses.

- Extended Education Dean/Director Search - A Dean has not been named and it is likely that the search will be reopened. Input will be invited to determine an interim Dean/Director appointment.
- OSBHE - An area of discussion centered around the concern that OSSHE is not a complete higher education system since community colleges are excluded.
- Freshmen Statistics - *The Long and Winding Road: Retention, Attrition, and Graduation of OSSHE Freshmen Entering 1986-87* was available as a handout. A recap of the report is that the probability of graduation for students starting at OSU or the U of O is substantially higher than many other OSSHE institutions.
- Women Faculty - A report titled *The Status of Women Faculty in the Oregon State System of Higher Education* was also available. The report addresses distribution of women among ranked faculty, average salaries and gender comparisons in faculty promotion.
- Budget - The Chancellor plans to assemble university presidents next week, after the election, to discuss options to present to the Board.
- Acknowledgements - A national AISES (American Indian and Science and Engineering Society) publication, *Winds of Change*, focused on 200 institutions to identify support programs available. Of those 200, eight, including OSU, were summarized. This recognition acknowledges the effort that OSU is making to try to achieve a more supportive and friendly environment for minority students.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard reported on the following items:

- Honors College Council - Has now been fully formed.
- Promotion & Tenure Guidelines - Nearing completion.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:57.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 505

Oregon State University

October 6, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Michael V. Oriard. There were no corrections to the June minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports were presented by the following individuals: Provost Roy Arnold and Kevin McCann
- Action Items – There were no action items
- New Business – Approved a motion to analyze future ballot measures [Motion 94-505-01 through 03]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Ebbeck, R. Michael; Griffiths, K. Krane; Holmes, G. Olson; Niess, L. Flick; and Rose, K. Cromack, Jr.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Acker, Beatty, Canfield, Christensen, Cowles, S. Davis, Deboodt, Drexler, Gould, Hogue, Huddleston, Johnson, Knight, Krueger, Ladd, Lassen, B. Lee, Logendran, Lunch, Macnab, Maughan, McDowell, Miller, Mukatis, Orzech, Pacheco, Pereira, Pyles, Rathja, Robbins, Snyder, Somero, Strik, and Zollinger.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, J. Dunn, J. Hendricks, J. Hughes, K. McCann, D. Nicodemus, B. Shepard, and A. Waddy.

Special Reports

Provost Roy Arnold

Dr. Arnold welcomed Senators to a new academic year. He updated the Senate on several issues:

- All programs recently approved by the Faculty Senate have been approved by the OSBHE. These include:

the Honors College, the Masters of Engineering in Manufacturing Engineering, and a Certificate in Applied Ethics.

- Enrollment – Overall numbers are up from last year and the number of new students is significantly up.
- Facilities – The institution's first multi-media laboratory was dedicated over the summer and a second lab has been launched.
- Library Campaign – The campaign has been successful in raising \$10 million in private funds which gives OSU the opportunity to take advantage of matching bond sales by the State to enter into the construction process of Phase I. Arnold asked faculty to acknowledge the efforts of staff in the Development Office, unit fundraisers, Dr. Byrne, Dr. Spruill and others who devoted their efforts in support of this project.
- Personnel Changes – There were several State System positions appointed on an interim basis: the Chancellor and President's at the U of O, SOSC and WOSC. Dr. Arnold spoke about the impressive group of faculty who were assembled at OSU's New Faculty Orientation; he felt it was the most diverse group to arrive at OSU for some time. Dean Brent Dalrymple, Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, and Dean Kay Schaffer, Liberal Arts, are both new to OSU. Searches are underway for the Dean and Director for Extended Education and Vice Provost for Student Affairs, and a search will begin soon for the Dean of Health and Human Performance. Lynn Spruill has resigned as the Chief Institutional Advancement Officer and Bob Bruce is serving on an interim basis in that position; a decision regarding filling the position on a permanent basis will be deferred until after the November election.
- Councils/Committees – The Undergraduate Education Council is up and running. A group of faculty concerned with an interest in teaching is calling itself the IT Group and is generating proposals for how the institution can provide a greater focus on the teaching mission.
- Looking Ahead – Major themes in the OSBHE work plan for 1994/95 include:
 - a continued focus on the 2010 Vision Report
 - Abandonment of the terminology of the Public Corporation Model, but not the concept. The process is

now being referred to as the Higher Education Efficiency Act for the 21st Century.

A proposal to consider renaming OSSHE to State University of Oregon has run into some opposition to the name change. The Board gave approval, in concept, to the proposal pending determination of the name change. The Efficiency Act would be the legislation which would propose to modify several statutes to allow greater flexibility and a greater entrepreneurial approach for higher education.

The Board will also consider an expectation that technology plans will be developed by each institution and an overall OSSHE technology plan will be drafted. This arises from a recommendation in the Education Unbounded Report which projects a continued provision of higher education serving a substantial number of students in off-campus locations through distance learning approaches.

The Board will consider four productivity reports during the coming year: 1) Faculty; 2) Curriculum; 3) Enrollment; and 4) Technology. These reports will summarize what various OSSHE institutions have done to increase productivity in these areas.

There will also be a series of reports on gender and ethnic diversity documenting progress, or lack thereof, in OSSHE.

— OSU Agenda Items – Items to be considered by OSU during the coming year include:

1) Proficiency Based Admissions Standards (PASS) – Implementation will continue to be discussed throughout the University.

2) Assessment – Four funded assessment projects will be conducted at OSU, and several others at other OSSHE institutions, which are funded by the Chancellor's Office. The projects are designed to aid in understanding assessment and how it should be used and applied to better understand the outcomes of educational programs and efforts.

3) Productivity – Provost Arnold met with each dean over the summer to review the status of the college plans they were preparing and provided feedback.

There are a series of funded productivity projects, again with funding from the Chancellor's Office. One involves instructional activity on the use of multi-media in instruction.

4) Diversity – The Board of Visitors for Minority Affairs has continued to act as an advisory body to President Byrne. During the summer they, and members of the Office of Multicultural Affairs, met with OSU minority students and summarized their findings. The Provost

has asked a group of people to review the function of the Office of Multicultural Affairs and its relationship to other entities in the institution to determine how the office can make the most significant contributions to meeting the goal of cultural diversity.

During the summer President Byrne met with minority students at the cultural centers and collected comments pertaining to the environment for minority students at OSU. An outcome of these meetings was the decision by Dr. Byrne to appoint a Commission on Hate Crimes and Hate Related Activities.

The Minority Affairs Commission has been reviewing the progress reports from academic units and other support service units as an update of what has happened in relation to the plans they developed in the last few years. The findings by units submitting reports have been summarized and compiled in a report. The report and recommendations by the Committee will soon be distributed to academic deans, the President's Cabinet and Provost's Council. After distribution, discussions will take place to implement the recommendations and develop an action plan for the University.

5) Extended Education – College plans will be developed for extended education functions. The Extended Education Council, which includes academic deans and the Dean of Extended Education, has begun functioning and is discussing plans and recommendations.

6) ARC & LIT Activities – The committees are not active, but are still receiving a few reports and are engaged in some accountability activity in relation to the recommendations.

The planning of the new Financial Information System (FIS) is ongoing with an implementation target date of July 1, 1995.

7) Information Services – There has been some additional restructuring in the Information Services area which has been in the planning and discussion stages since the arrival of Joy Hughes in January. A number of structural changes will take place in the next year which are designed to improve responsiveness and services, and increase efficiency.

8) Promotion & Tenure – A committee is reviewing several areas of the current Promotion & Tenure guidelines: 1) the instructions provided to individuals; 2) process and procedural issues; and 3) the definition of scholarship.

9) Ongoing Work – A number of proposals will be working their way to the Faculty Senate which will create challenges and excitement. The Provost emphasized that this is not a time for higher education

or OSU to be timid; it's a time to think about bold actions and opportunities where faculty can influence the direction and destiny of the institution and the System in positive ways.

Kevin McCann — Impact of Ballot Initiatives on Higher Education

Kevin McCann, Director of Community and Government Relations, presented an informational report on the fiscal impact of ballot initiatives on higher education.

Prior to speaking about the initiatives, McCann gave the latest expectations in election races. In the Governor's race, the polls indicate that John Kitzhaber has a fairly substantial lead: Kitzhaber 50% and Smith 29%. In the Legislative races, it is anticipated that the Republicans will have a definite edge in the Senate and the House will be up for grabs.

McCann made available a summary "Analysis of Fiscal and OSSHE Impact of 1994 Initiatives" and discussed the measures which seem to be most troubling to the higher education budget. He noted that there is more detailed information on the ballot measures in the most recent *Board Bulletin*. He also mentioned that the budget referred to in the summary is the 13.8% higher education budget adjustment proposed by Governor Roberts.

- Measure 5 — Prohibit increases in taxes or fees without a vote of the people or three-fourths vote of Legislature. OSSHE institutions would have to have approval by the voters for regular operating fees; tuition would be exempt.
- Measure 8 — Repeals "6% pickup," excludes sick leave in retirement benefit determination, prohibits public employers from salary off set of benefit reduction. OSSHE savings are estimated at \$48 million; however, there would be a significant negative impact on employees.
- Measures 10 & 11 — #10 — Prohibits the Legislature from reducing sentences adopted by vote of the people except by two-thirds majority vote. #11 — Sets mandatory sentences for a set of violent felonies, remands juveniles 15 years and over to adult court. Both measures would dedicate the General Fund resources to the Corrections Department and reduce the amount available to support higher education.
- Measure 15 — Guarantees minimum state funding of K-14, plus student growth and CPI adjustments. It pushes the OSSHE budget cut target from 13.8% to more than 25%. Would require either severe restriction on admission or astronomical tuition increases.

Senator Lee, Liberal Arts, questioned what the impact of Measure 13 would be on higher education. McCann noted that it was difficult to interpret what the impact would be based on the information he has received.

Senator Davis, Engineering, questioned whether the effect of Measure 8 would be implemented if it passed and legal suits were filed against it. McCann's best answer was that it would depend on how it was presented in court.

Senator Leklem, Home Economics & Education, asked whether the estimated \$48 million savings from Measure 8 would remain in higher education. McCann's understanding is that this would be decided during the next legislative session when the entire system budget is determined. Provost Arnold noted that one scenario is that the money would likely be placed in escrow until a court determination is made.

Senator Burns, Home Economics & Education, questioned whether the information presented could be shared with students. McCann responded that the summary could be shared with students and faculty can encourage students to register to vote. He also encouraged faculty to share the most recent *Board Bulletin* with students since the contents have been approved by the Attorney General. He cautioned faculty to be careful about using state resources to photo copy materials to share with students and emphasized that faculty absolutely cannot tell students how to vote on anything nor appear to be lobbying for an issue. The safest avenue is to tell students where the information is available.

Senator Scheuermann, Student Affairs, questioned whether faculty could work through student organizations to get the information to students. McCann cautioned that students on payroll have the same limitations as state workers during work hours. April Waddy, ASOSU President, reported that ASOSU has a Student Voter's Guide available to students.

Senator Folts, Liberal Arts, was concerned that only fiscal issues were being considered and observed that Measure 13 will have extremely grave impacts on academic freedom.

Information Items

- Faculty Senator Calendar — All meetings have been scheduled in the Construction and Engineering Hall of the LaSells Stewart Center, unless otherwise noted.

November 3, 1994
December 1, 1994
January 5, 1995
February 2, 1995

March 2, 1995
April 6, 1995
May 4, 1995 — TBA
June 1, 1995

- Distinguished Professor Award Deadline — Nominations for the Distinguished Professor Award are due mid-November 1994 (exact deadline yet to be announced). This award recognizes individuals who have achieved national/international stature as a result of their contribution to scholarship and research and whose work has been notably influential in their fields of specialization. For more information, contact Don Reed at 737-4438.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard introduced and welcomed April Waddy, ASOSU President, and reported on the following items:

- Promotion & Tenure – A committee, consisting of 14 members and chaired by Oriard, was created over the summer to review and revise the 1988 promotion & tenure guidelines document. When the committee feels it has a coherent document, which truly governs all faculty, it will be widely distributed on campus; the revised document will come before the Senate for approval.
- Commission on Hate Crimes and Hate Related Activities – The Executive Committee was asked by President Byrne to approve faculty appointees to the Commission.
- Salary Equity Planning Committee – The Executive Committee recommended names of faculty to serve on this committee whose charge is to recommend a process for conducting a salary equity study across campus focussing on gender. The request for this study came from the Presidents Commission on the Status of Women.
- Honors Council – The Executive Committee is in the process of forming an Honors Council, which will be a Faculty Senate Standing Council. Early recruiting reports indicate there is a great deal of enthusiasm from prospective students.
- Committee Chairs Meeting – The Executive Committee will meet with Faculty Senate Committee Chairs on October 11 to discuss issues and agendas for the coming year.

New Business

Senator Crockett, Extension, felt that the information presented by Kevin McCann, which was prepared by the Chancellor's Office, should not only address fiscal issues but also address issues concerning academic freedom. Crockett made the following motion, #94-505-01, which was seconded:

In the future, the Faculty Senate analyze not only the impact of ballot measures to include the fiscal impact on the University, but to also include the impact on the University's ability to perform its educational mission.

President Oriard read the section of the Bylaws which states what is eligible to be included in introducing New Business main motions; this motion did not meet the requirements. President-elect Francis moved to suspend the rules, motion 94-505-02, and was seconded by Senator Liebowitz, Liberal Arts. Motion to suspend the rules passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Senator Olson, Home Economics & Education, questioned whether the Faculty Senate has the resources to carry out the intent of the motion. Oriard responded that there is currently no committee which is assigned to analyze legislative measures and there are no resources available.

Senator Liebowitz noted that her interpretation of the motion was to present the sense of the Senate resolutions and discussion on the Senate floor which would use a minimum of resources.

McCann suggested that someone explore the legalities of where lines are drawn for public employees. He noted that "exploring" and "analyzing" are quite different from taking a stand on an issue.

IFS Representative Wilcox reminded Senators that, two years ago, the Senate reasserted its stand with regard to opposition to discrimination and felt that the Senate should assert its defense of academic freedom at every opportunity. Oriard noted that the resolution referred to by Wilcox did not directly address a particular ballot measure, but addressed the issue that a ballot measure addressed.

Senator Gamble, Science, moved the previous question; Senator DeKock, Science, seconded the motion. Motion 94-505-03, to move the previous question, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 94-505-01 to analyze the impact of ballot measures passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:35.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 504

Oregon State University

June 2, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Michael V. Oriard. There were no corrections to the May minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items - The following items were approved: Proposed list of degree candidates; establishment of an Honors College; establishment of a Certificate in Applied Ethics; reduce the minimum number of graduation credits from 192 to 180; revise AR 26; and election of members and alternates to Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees. [Motion 92-504-01 through 92-504-06]

- The following item was disapproved: Revise AR 26.b.(1) to require the Baccalaureate Core for subsequent degrees. [Motion 94-504-05]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

J. Glenn, C. Rusk; Holmes, C. Jordan; Liebowitz, K. Moore; Sanchez, D. Healey; Seville, N. Nielson; Snow-Harter, R. Michael; and Warner, G. Tiedeman.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Akyeampong, Beatty, Burrige, Burton, Canfield, Christensen, Collier, Cowles, Daniels, L. Davis, Drexler, Farber, Gould, Griffiths, Hart, Hogue, Huddleston, Johnson, Lassen, B. Lee, John Lee, Leklem, Macnab, Miller, Pacheco, Robbins, Rosenberger, Sandine, Snyder, Somero, Strik, Swan, Tricker and Zaerr.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

B. Becker, C. Brunner, L. Clement, S. Dodrill, C. Jordan, C. Kolbe, K. McAlexander, D. Nicodemus, S. Potter, B. Shepard, C. Smith, C. Thomas and N. Wendt.

Action Items

Faculty Senate Consideration of Degree Candidates

Barbara Balz, Registrar, recommended for approval the proposed lists of degree candidates and honors subject to final confirmation of all degree requirements. There are 3,557 students who are candidates for 3,634 degrees which include: 2,709 Bachelors, 696 Masters and 229 Doctors, including Veterinary Medicine. There are 75 students who are candidates for two degrees and one student who is a candidate for three degrees.

The Class of 1994, OSU's 125th class, has 381 seniors who qualify for Academic Distinction and includes: 203 "cum laude" (gpa 3.50-3.69), 112 "magna cum laude" (gpa 3.70-3.84) and 66 "summa cum laude" (gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 94-504-01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Category I Proposals

Cheryl Jordan, Curriculum Council Chair, presented two Category I proposals for Senate approval to establish an Honors College and a Certificate in Applied Ethics.

Proposal to establish an Honors College at OSU — Jordan explained that the function of this proposal is to develop and offer an Honors Program which will enhance the Baccalaureate Core experience for exceptional undergraduates. The proposal under consideration was a result of faculty input to the University Honors Program Committee and was reviewed by both the Curriculum Council and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

While approving the proposal, the Curriculum Council concluded the following points in their review:

- The establishment of an Honors College (HC) provides the means to recruit and retain exceptional students at OSU. An HC may provide an additional incentive for potential students to select OSU.
- To maintain a quality honors program, there is a need to establish a formal structure; this proposal establishes the academic unit and provides the means to sustain the program.

Senator Mukatis, Business, questioned how this program will impact a particular course of study. Jordan stated that the Honors Degree would be awarded in conjunction with a regular degree upon completion of a thesis in their subject matter area, as well as honors courses to be offered in the Baccalaureate Core. She noted that not all of the curriculum has yet been determined.

Senator Davis, Agriculture, asked if any comments received from faculty were negative. Sandra Potter, University Honors Program Chair, responded that two negative comments were received; both were budget related. Davis commented that he would have to vote against the proposal due to the reallocation from existing funds of \$300,000–\$500,000. Oriard stated that money was targeted toward the proposal for this year, but agreed that the money would eventually come from the general budget. In response to Davis' comment about future money being derived from cutting other budgets, Provost Arnold stated that during the budgeting process last year planning money was committed for this year and recurring money committed at a level of \$300,000. Arnold emphasized that the money budgeted for the HC was not cut from other programs, but came from funds allocated to the tuition pool as a result of increased enrollment, particularly from non-resident students, in the State System.

Senator DeKock, Science, asked the Senate to consider this issue from another point of view: OSU is in competition with other universities for students and by establishing an HC, the University looks more attractive and additional tuition revenue will be generated by increased enrollment.

When questioned about projected student enrollment, Potter responded that 75–100 were estimated in the beginning with not more than 400 per year.

Norma Nielson, Business, expressed concern that if the best and brightest students are put in a class by themselves, then the quality of education in an average class is reduced.

Senator Liebowitz, Liberal Arts, questioned whether the proposal really serves the intended purpose and didn't understand the rationale for having a separate unit to handle these students. Bruce Shepard, Academic Affairs, noted that parents and prospective students place great importance on an Honors College which offers a stimulating and challenging curriculum. He emphasized that the University needs to use whatever mechanisms are available to attract students. Provost Arnold added that he learned at a recent meeting in Portland that individuals are interested in knowing that there is a magnet at OSU for top quality students.

Senator Stevens, Agricultural Sciences, felt that the time was long overdue for OSU to establish a solid HC. He also expressed the opinion that the HC would compete

with other programs and it would also be elitist, as it should be.

In response to Senator Gamble's concern about the omission of criteria in the proposal, President Oriard responded that the HC Council and Director will determine the criteria, upon approval of the Curriculum Council.

Barbara Balz, Registrar, responded to Senator Koller, ROTC, that the HC was targeting all students when questioned whether the HC was targeted to attract Oregon students or out-of-state students.

Senator Scheuermann, Student Affairs, supported the concept but noted that the term "elitist" can be either positive or negative and questioned whether the word "college" indicated a separation and possibly contributed to the negative side. Potter explained that the term "college" was chosen to further separate it from the previously existing program. Jordan added that the Curriculum Council reviewed the proposal and compared it to the previous program which did not have an academic unit; this proposal will provide a structure and provisions to sustain it. Scheuermann felt that the cost seemed modest and asked how it compared to similar programs. Potter responded that questionnaires were sent out to Honors Colleges programs and the OSU budgeted amount is comparable.

In response to a question from Senator Sherr, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, regarding the percentage of universities which have programs, Potter did not have an exact number, but stated she had a list of all the honors programs in the United States which was quite lengthy and added that the list included many community colleges as well.

Senator Krueger, Science, felt this proposal should be enthusiastically received because it provides another means for creating new courses and, at the same time, enhancing quality and it provides increased interaction with colleagues in other colleges.

Senator Michael, Health & Human Performance, commented on Nielsen's concern by reminding senators that this proposal will account for 15–30 credits out of the total required with the remainder being taken in regular classes across the campus; he felt it would be exciting to have more students of this caliber in class. He also felt it would be a great recruiting tool and that the OSU proposal was a better model than the one used at the U of O. He added that he would have been more comfortable with the proposal if there had been provisions for an increase in the Director's salary during the first four years.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, stated that an honors program/college is the norm for a public institution and OSU is quite conspicuous by the absence of a program.

He noted there was a shock wave throughout national and regional conferences when the OSU program was discontinued in 1991. He was mystified by the concern over elitism because he felt that the university is here to stimulate intellectual experiences and felt the HC created a parallel to what is done intentionally when honors societies are established.

Motion 94-504-02 to approve the Honors College proposal passed by a show of hands with some dissenting votes.

Proposal to Establish a Certificate in Applied Ethics - Jordan explained that this undergraduate program was unique in that three integrated areas of concentration would be addressed in the program: The application of ethics to scientific inquiry, to the environment, and to health care. The proposal was reviewed by the Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee and approved by the Curriculum Council.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, questioned if this program would be related to the existing Ethics, Science & Environment program. Kathy Moore, Philosophy Chair, responded that they would be connected and that organizational unit would administer the certificate.

Motion 94-504-03 to approve the proposal was passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Revisions to Academic Regulations 25 and 26

Court Smith, Academic Regulations Chair, presented proposed revisions to AR 25 and 26. The proposals contain highlighted sections which indicate additions and strike-throughs which indicate deletions.

AR 25.b.: Institutional Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees

The Committee reviewed the 192 hour graduation requirement and recommends that the requirement be changed to 180 hours. The Committee coordinated its review with the Curriculum Council and also reviewed other credit hour requirements that might be affected by reducing credit hours to 180. Credit hour requirements, such as, residency, subsequent and concurrent degrees, upper division graduation requirements, lower division transfer limits, master's degree, and maximum and minimum registration need not change under this proposal.

The reasons for this recommendation are:

- 180 hours is the more commonly used requirement.
- This change could increase access to class spaces.
- Expenses for some students could be reduced.
- The rate of progress to graduation could be faster.

- This change could have a number of benefits with respect to advising.

Motion 94-504-04 reads as follows:

AR 25.b.

Credits: Minimum ~~192~~ 180, which must include:

AR 25b(1) and (2) remain unchanged.

Senator Gamble questioned how the changes could have a number of benefits with respect to advising. Smith responded that freshmen are advised to take only 13 or 14 hours their first year and, if the credits were decreased, they wouldn't feel so far behind. After Gamble stated that the electives would be reduced, Smith agreed that could be an impact and noted that the committee suggests a discussion, at all levels, of requirements. He also noted that some programs currently require more than 192 hours for graduation and it is up to individual programs to set their standards and requirements.

Senator Scheuermann questioned how the committee responds to the criticism that lowering the minimum quantity of credit hours required would, to some extent, lower the quality of the degree. Smith responded that he didn't view that as lowering the quality since the Baccalaureate Core and major requirements are still in place; he felt students would make better choices by choosing more carefully.

Senator Davis questioned whether every department would need to submit a Category I proposal to revise programs. Smith responded that existing programs would not have to change at all if faculty were happy with the curriculum. The Committee has talked with the Curriculum Council about having a period of time where programs which wished to reduce the number of requirements in their major could submit Category I changes and the changes would be expedited. Smith noted that this is not a requirement to reduce 12 hours from each program.

Smith noted that if this change is accepted, implementation should be carefully coordinated with the Curriculum Council and the Baccalaureate Core, as requested by some faculty members.

Senator Rose, Forestry, asked which specific programs this proposal was aimed at. Smith stated no program has been identified as requesting to reduce their credit hours by 12. This proposal is a result of a faculty member asking why OSU required 192 hours when many peer institutions required only 180 hours.

Senator Plant, Engineering, questioned the rationale of the proposal in view of decreasing productivity by having fewer student credit hours taught since students would be earning fewer credits and also having just approved additional money for an Honors College. Smith felt there

were several benefits: it provides the potential to lower costs to the student by moving through the system more quickly; it enables students to more efficiently earn concurrent degrees; and it also allows OSU to graduate more students with the same effort, which actually increases productivity.

Senator Lunch agreed with Smith's explanation and noted he had spoken with legislators who expressed concern about programs which require more units than a student can reasonably squeeze into four years. He noted this change would be perceived by the public as increasing productivity.

Senator Williams, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether a department choosing to revise curriculum and reduce the number of requirements is in danger of losing academic programs and teaching FTE. Smith explained that the Committee felt that this would increase access since there is enough need for seats that most programs are turning students away.

Motion 94-504-04 to revise AR 25.b. to reduce the minimum number of credits for graduation from 192 to 180 passed by a show of hands with some dissenting votes.

AR 26: Concurrent and Subsequent Baccalaureate Degrees

Smith explained that the Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate set the policy by voting first to accept or reject AR 26.b.(1), to determine whether the Baccalaureate Core should be required for subsequent degrees, and then decide on the whole regulation.

The regulation, as it is rewritten, tries to be more consistent with AR 25, which specifies the requirements for graduation. Other than the Baccalaureate Core issue, the regulation mainly updates the old wording, but does not change the concept of concurrent and subsequent degrees that is in place.

As a result of the discussion at the May 5th Faculty Senate meeting a question of requirements for a subsequent degree was raised (see 26.b.(5)). The issue is that OSU has a lower credit hour requirement than other PAC-10 and comparable universities for people with degrees from other universities who want a subsequent degree.

The Academic Regulations Committee looked at this issue and agreed with the suggestion that those without a previous OSU degree should meet our current residency requirement, which is more typical of PAC-10 and comparable universities. The requirement for OSU graduates does not change from the 32 hours required for a concurrent degree.

Replace AR 26 with the following:

- a. **Concurrent Baccalaureate Degrees:** An undergraduate student may be granted two or more baccalaureate degrees (for example the B.A. or B.S. with same or different majors) at the same graduation exercise, provided that the student: **The student must:**
- (1) **meets Complete the institutional, college, and departmental requirements of the curricula represented by the degrees for the degree;**
 - (2) **Completes, for each additional degree, a minimum of 32 credits more than the requirements of the curriculum requiring the least number of credits; and**
 - (3) **Completes each additional 32 credits in residence, or as a minimum, 24 of the 32 credits in residence if authorized by approval of a petition to the Academic Requirements Committee.**
- b. **Subsequent Baccalaureate Degree(s):** (1) A student who has received a previous baccalaureate degree(s) from Oregon State University either OSU or another accredited university may be granted additional baccalaureate degree(s) subsequently provided that the requirements for concurrent degrees (AR 26a) are satisfied. The minimum of 32 term credits specified in AR 26a(2) may be completed at any time.² **a subsequent baccalaureate degree. The student must:**
- (1) **Complete the Baccalaureate Core requirements or their equivalent (See AR 25a);**
 - (2) **A student with a baccalaureate degree(s) from an accredited institution other than Oregon State University may be granted a baccalaureate degree from Oregon State University upon satisfying the institutional, college, and departmental requirements of the curriculum represented by the degree. Such a student may also obtain concurrent degrees from Oregon State University by satisfying the requirements for concurrent degrees (AR 26a);**
 - (2) **Complete, for a B.A. degree, the requirements for foreign language proficiency (AR 25c);**
 - (3) **Achieve a minimum of 2.00 on OSU cumulative grade point average;**
 - (4) **Complete requirements of the major college and receive the Dean's certification; and**
 - (5) **Meet the requirements for a concurrent degree as specified in AR 26a, if a previous baccalaureate degree has been received from Oregon State University. The additional credits may be taken at any time prior to or subsequent to the granting of a previous OSU baccalaureate degree.**

Students with a baccalaureate degree from another institution must meet the Academic Resi-

dence requirement in AR 26c:

AR 26c remains unchanged.

The Committee recommends that, upon approval, all changes become effective Fall term 1994.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, affirmed that this applied to a student coming to OSU for a subsequent degree who would probably have fulfilled most of our Core curriculum, but would still be required to take courses in: global issues; science, technology and society; and possibly a writing intensive course. Smith added that they may also need to fulfill the health course requirement.

Cheryl Kolbe, Agricultural & Resource Economics, noted that it also affects many who took science courses which did not have a lab or who do not have courses which fit the Cultural Diversity requirement.

Senator Rathja, Engineering, felt uncomfortable about requiring U.S. educated students to complete the Core since they usually have completed a reasonable breadth of courses; however, some international students haven't received the breadth of courses.

Senator Gamble, Science, noted that some students would have difficulty if a literal interpretation of the Core was required. Smith explained that the Committee is attempting to establish a consistent policy across the University so that everyone knows what is expected.

Senator Davis, Agriculture, was not in favor of making it easier for students from other institutions to get an OSU degree.

When questioned as to what it would mean if AR 26.b.(1) was disapproved, Smith explained that the Baccalaureate Core would not be a requirement for graduation for concurrent degrees; each college would decide whether or not to require the Baccalaureate Core.

Motion 94-504-05 to revise AR 26.b.(1) to require the Baccalaureate Core for subsequent degrees was defeated by a show of hands with dissenting votes.

AR 26 a.(1)-(3) and b.(1)-(5) — Smith noted that most of the changes, as noted above, are clarifications of wording, with the exception of 26.b.(5) which recommends that the student receiving a subsequent degree meet the residency requirement.

Kolbe affirmed that a student receiving a concurrent degree will need only 32 credits beyond the 180 credits.

Senator Michael, Health & Human Performance, questioned whether a student in a college like Engineering, which requires 204 rather than 180 credits to earn a degree, would have to earn 204 credits in order to earn a concurrent degree from another college. Smith

responded they would need only 180 plus an additional 32 credits for a concurrent degree.

Motion 94-504-06 to revise AR 26, as shown above, with the exception of b.(1) being deleted and what is shown as b.(2), (3), (4) and (5) renumbered to (1), (2), (3) and (4) was approved by a show of hands with some dissenting votes.

Annual Reports

President Oriard brought to the attention of the Senate that the Baccalaureate Core Committee reported that last year's synthesis course crisis has been alleviated. The agenda contained annual reports from the following committees:

- Academic Advising Council
- Academic Regulations Committee
- Academic Requirements Committee
- Administrative Appointments Committee
- Advancement of Teaching
- Baccalaureate Core Committee
- Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee
- Committee on Committees
- Curriculum Council
- Faculty Economic Welfare Committee
- Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee
- Faculty Status Committee
- Graduate Admissions
- Graduate Council
- Instructional Media Committee
- Research Council
- Retirement Committee
- Student Recognition and Awards Committee
- Undergraduate Admissions Committee
- University Honors Program Committee

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold's report included the following items:

Degree Candidates — He asked faculty to think about the process that started from a dream and led through teaching, advising, counseling, support services, encouragement, motivation, and a variety of support that finally culminates in a diploma. He also encouraged faculty to think about the outcomes in conjunction with the list of degree candidates approved earlier by the Faculty Senate.

Enrollment — OSU's projections for 94-95 are the most encouraging for any state institution.

Productivity — Provost Arnold advised faculty to take the issue seriously because there will be some serious implications. Although units are struggling with the concept, they are making progress.

OSBHE — They are still endorsing the Public Corporation

proposal and plan to move it forward to the Legislature. They also approved the Proficiency-based Admissions Standards Study (PASS) requirements which will be effective in 1999.

Miscellaneous — Units are informing him that they are very pleased with the quality of new faculty that are being hired.

Although there is uncertainty, OSU is moving forward with some exciting program initiatives, including the Honors College.

Chancellor Bartlett will retire in June and Joe Cox, president of SOSC, will replace him. Arnold's sense is that Cox will be a high profile individual and include university presidents, and others when appropriate, to promote OSSHE.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard's report consisted of the following items:

- Thanked Thurston Doler for sitting in as Parliamentarian.
- Noted that the Executive Committee had filled most of the Faculty Senate committee vacancies and thanked all faculty who volunteered for committees. He hoped that faculty who were not appointed to a committee were not disappointed and mentioned that a reason why faculty may not be placed on a committee is that, for 1993, there were four times as many volunteers as there were vacancies. An effort was made to appoint faculty who indicated they had not previously served on committees. He also thanked committee members' whose terms were ending.
- Reminded faculty that University Day is September 16 and that exhibit space is still available.
- Noted that there was a good turn-out for Mark Nelson's appearance earlier today.
- He was pleased that the Honors College was approved and felt good about being proactive rather than reactive.

Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees

President Oriard called the Senate into an Executive Session to consider nominees for Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees. Oriard explained that a faculty member who is dismissed "for cause" is entitled to a formal hearing of charges by a hearing committee to be selected from a faculty panel. There are two panels in existence and those elected will serve through June 30, 1998. The ballots were distributed and voting for no more than ten nominees took place after the Executive

Session ended and visitors were invited to return.

There were no nominations from the floor. Motion 94-504-06 resulted in the following nominees being elected to Panel B:

MEMBERS

Michael G. Maksud	Melvin R. George
Arlene Holyoak	Patricia S. Muir
Laverne Woods	Dutch Baughman
Judith C. Krueger	Masakazu Matsumoto
Rachelle A. McCabe	Lisa T. Sarasohn
Mary Alice Seville	

ALTERNATES

Elaine L. Pedersen	Mary L. Powelson
Roger Keys Weaver	Douglas F. Barofsky
Clifford Fairchild	Donald R. Buhler
Lynn B. Jensen	Ronald P. Lovell
Mina E. Ossiander	Clifford B. Pereira
Fred R. Rickson	Edward C. Waymire

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:50.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 503

Oregon State University

May 5, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm by President Michael Oriard. There were no corrections to the April minutes. President Oriard introduced Thurston Doler as acting Parliamentarian.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports were presented by the following individuals: David Conley, Proficiency-based Admissions & Implications and Lynn Spruill, Institutional Advancement Activities
- Action Items - The following items were approved: Category I proposal to establish an Exchange Program with the Former Soviet Union (FSU) through American Collegiate Consortium (ACC); revision to AR 17; and referral regarding Veteran's Day. [Motion 92-503-01 through 92-503-03]
- New Business - There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Baggott, N. Rambo; Drexler, S. Martin; Knight, M. Moore; Mason, J. Cross; Reed, P. McFadden; Rose, B. Yoder; Sanchez, M. Witbeck; Seville, N. Nielson; and Snow-Harter, R. Michael.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Acker, Boyer, Calder, Christensen, Clement, Collier, Cowles, Daniels, de Szoeko, DeAngelis, DeYoung, Esbensen, Farber, Gamble, C. Glenn, Hardesty, Hart, Headrick, Hogue, Huddleston, Humphrey, Koller, Ladd, Lassen, B. Lee, Janet Lee, Leklem, Liebowitz, Logendran, Lundin, McDaniel, McDowell, Meints, Orzech, Pacheco, Rathja, Robbins, Rosenberger, Rossignol, Sandine, Snyder, Strik, Vuchinich, Warner and Zaerr.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

I. Delson, C. Jordan, D. Nicodemus, C. Smith, L. Spruill, A. Waddy, N. Wendt and B. Wilkins.

Special Reports

Proficiency-based Admissions and Implications

David Conley, Director of the OSSHE Proficiency-based Admission Standards Study (PASS) and Associate Professor of Educational Policy and Management at the University of Oregon, discussed how PASS will affect how K-12 interacts with higher education.

Conley explained that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE) has adopted as a policy direction the notion that it will provide to the K-12 system a list of proficiencies upon which admission to the eight Oregon institutions of higher education in OSSHE will be based beginning in 1999. The timeline coincides with the changes occurring in K-12 mandated by House Bill 3565, also known as the "Katz Bill Oregon Educational Act of the 21st Century" passed in 1991. This bill, which does not address higher education in any substantive fashion, contains requirements for two performance-based certificates: a Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) at age 16 and a Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) at age 18 based on student-demonstrated abilities in a series of areas. The goal of the educational reform program in K-12 is to create higher standards of student learning. In order to reach the goal, the K-12 program must be redesigned.

OSSHE prepared a series of recommendations for how to respond to the changes in K-12. In July 1993 the Joint Boards instructed the PASS committee to prepare a list of proficiencies students would be able to demonstrate that they knew or were able to do in order to enter higher education and transmit the information to the K-12 system to design the CIM and CAM appropriately.

The PASS committee conducted a national and international study, which culminated in a prepared report, to determine what was taking place in the following areas: performance-based assessment, proficiency-based admission, and performance standards.

Conley described a System recommendation in which admission would be determined based on student demonstrated proficiency, not the amount of time spent in a course. He outlined a series of proficiencies which have been proposed in six content areas and nine process areas:

Content Proficiency Areas:

- 1) Math
- 2) Science
- 3) Social Sciences
- 4) Foreign Languages
- 5) Humanities & Literature
- 6) Fine & Performing Arts

Process Proficiency Areas:

- 1) Reading
- 2) Writing
- 3) Oral Expression
- 4) Critical/Analytic Thinking
- 5) Problem-solving
- 6) Technology as a Learning Tool
- 7) Systems/Integrative Thinking
- 8) Teamwork
- 9) Quality Work

The proposed content and proficiency definitions were contained in a hand-out available at the Faculty Senate meeting. The content and processes are to be taught and assessed in the context of challenging content.

There will be a system of assessment tasks developed which will provide the information on student performance. The standards and tasks will be developed collaboratively between OSSHE and K-12 and community colleges. The assessment system would support the movement of students between professional, technical and college preparatory programs. In order to enter higher education, a student would have to demonstrate a mastery of the proficiencies.

The timeline calls for final adoption of the proficiencies at the OSBHE meeting on May 27. PASS hopes to have most of the important pieces of this program in place by September 1997 with final implementation in 1999.

Senator pro-tem Neilson asked if students who are proficient in some areas could advance to college-level courses while acquiring proficiency in other areas. Conley anticipates that this will be possible.

In response to Senator Mukatis, Business, Conley responded that students could be able to attend both high school and college classes simultaneously.

Senator Burton, Science, questioned the possibility of proficiency-based standards replacing grades in higher education. Conley stated that there is an effort within OSSHE to try to identify ways to assess "value added" to students. He noted that the differentiation is greater in higher education when talking about the value-added component.

Senator Davis, Engineering, expressed concern about students receiving a CIM or CAM but who want to attend institutions out-of-state. Conley explained that there is an active partnership with the American College of

Testing Service and College Boards. They have expressed great interest in this project and have offered technical assistance and in-kind contributions to help the project succeed. He named other states and organizations PASS is currently working with to deal with out-of-state issues. Conley has been told by admissions officers around the country that the proposal will pose absolutely no problem. For example, the Admissions Director at the University of Wisconsin told Conley that the proposal is much better than what they currently receive. Conley also said that every institution in the country already has means to deal with non-standardized transcripts.

Senator Helle, Liberal Arts, asked what the efforts are to coordinate outcome-based standards. Conley explained that they reviewed about 60 national standards reports as the basis for the proficiencies which were identified today. The commitment is to update the standards on a continuous basis.

Senator Strohmeyer, Student Affairs, asked how this will affect the ability to recruit and admit out-of-state and, particularly, international students. Conley has spoken with admissions people in OSSHE who say it's not that difficult since they already deal with non-standardized transcripts.

Senator Bayne, Science, questioned to what extent University faculty would be involved beyond 1999 in working with K-12 in development of assessment tasks. Conley responded that communication across the systems boundaries is the key element. The process will be started during the summer and fall with four partnership sites consisting of a high school, community college and higher education institution. There are two sites in Portland and one each in Eugene and Ashland. Conley encouraged participation by OSSHE faculty to help design, review or comment upon ongoing work. He invited faculty interested in serving in these areas, or those with questions, to contact him at 346-5799.

Institutional Advancement Activities

Lynn Spruill, Chief Institutional Advancement Officer, reported on activities administered by his office.

Fund-raising — He reported that the OSU Foundation and OSU Development activities have raised more money than any private or charitable organization in the State of Oregon. The total assets of the OSU Foundation will be roughly \$170 million by May 13. This fiscal year alone, the development programs at OSU have raised over \$37 million. This figure does not include the value of a gift about to be closed.

Three fund-raising priorities have been established for this biennium:

- 1) *Raise \$6 million in scholarship funds for students, either endowed or currently expendable* — As of May 4, 1994, \$4.2 million had been raised toward that goal. One endowment in particular is almost \$1 million to provide scholarships for Native American students; it will be announced toward the end of May.
- 2) *Creation of endowed faculty positions* — There are currently 13 endowed faculty positions. The most recent is the \$1.5 million Hundere Chair in Religious Studies which will be occupied by Marcus Borg.

Over the last two biennia, there have been almost \$15 million worth of endowed faculty positions created at OSU; the endowment return of which has been matched by the State.

- 3) *Kerr Library project* — The priority established for this biennium was \$12 million.

OSU's Image — Spruill mentioned that there is interest in creating a joint effort between the Faculty Senate and Institutional Advancement to look at ways of involving the campus community to enhance OSU's image.

Alumni Activities — The University would be very pleased to have an Alumni Center completed in three years, financed entirely with private funds. In conjunction with the Alumni Center Project, OSU would like to lease land near the LaSells Stewart Center for the purpose of constructing a hotel; OSU will not build the hotel.

The orientation of the OSU Picnics has been changed considerably to take on a recruiting focus. Every high school student who has applied to OSU, as well as high school counselors and prospective legislators, have been invited to all picnics to be held in Oregon. During the summer, current OSU students will also be invited to picnics near their hometown.

The Alumni Association is working with the Senior class to send free *Oregon Stater* subscriptions to graduating seniors for the next year.

OSU Press — The sales figures for the OSU Press are far above previous years; they are striving to make the operation self-sustaining.

News Coverage — Spruill feels that OSU is getting more and better coverage in the major newspapers in the State. Since OSU is not yet being recognized for the quality of programs and activities, his staff is working with editorial boards on a regular basis and are responding to inaccuracies. He mentioned that there is a half-time press person working out of the Portland Center whose focus is on students.

Legislative Lead-up — Kevin McCann and President Byrne are visiting with current legislative members and

those running for office.

Portland Center — Due to the lease expiring, the Portland Center will be moving to a larger location on July 1 after six years at the corner of 1st and Taylor. The new location will be at 3rd and Yamhill and will include Development Office staff, an admissions person, Extension information, a large conference room and an OSU Bookstore. US West is working to provide advanced technology wiring for uplinks and downlinks.

Action Items

Category I Proposal

Cheryl Jordan, Curriculum Council Chair, presented a Category I proposal to establish an Exchange Program with the Former Soviet Union (FSU) through American Collegiate Consortium (ACC). Jordan reported that the Curriculum Council had approved this proposal and felt it would enhance the International Degree Program.

Senator Mukatis questioned if he correctly interpreted the proposal as requiring students to have three years of Russian to participate and asked how many would be affected in the next two years. Irma Delson, International Education, responded that the program is structured for a maximum of six students to participate. If the reciprocal component was used, three students from OSU would participate and three from the FSU. She indicated there are two students this year planning to participate if the program is approved. OSU has been notified that students will be considered with two years of Russian proficiency if they agree to take intensive Russian courses the summer prior to departure.

Motion 503-94-01 to approve the Category I proposal to establish an Exchange Program with the Former Soviet Union (FSU) through American Collegiate Consortium (ACC) was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Academic Regulations Recommendations

President Oriard proposed a 15-minute limit on discussion of each of the following regulations; there were no objections.

Court Smith, Academic Regulations Chair, presented proposed revisions to AR 25b and AR 26 as discussion items to be voted on at the June meeting. He also presented a recommendation to revise AR 17, which the Executive Committee recommended for approval.

AR 25b - *This proposal would reduce the minimum number of credit hours required for graduation from 192 to 180. This recommendation is a result of a request from a faculty member asking the committee to review*

OSU's non-standard policy of a minimum of 192 hours for graduation. The Committee found that the standard is 180 term hours and 120 semester hours. The U of O requires 180 hours; PSU, EOSC and SOSC require 186 hours; and WSU, UW, Berkeley and Davis also require 180 hours. The Committee recommends that the change be adopted and asks faculty to recognize that this is a minimum requirement only since there are some programs which exceed this minimum and there is no intent that those programs would change. The Committee does not intend that electives be sacrificed and feel it would be prudent for colleges, committees and departments to talk about the full range of options in terms of accommodating a change of the major requirements for graduation.

President-elect Francis favored the proposal, but expressed concern from the perspective of a faculty member from a professional school concerning the constraint programs would be under if they were not permitted to reduce the number of electives and Baccalaureate Core Courses (BCC) proportionate to the 12 reduced credit hours. She asked the committee to discuss the option of reducing the BCC, if not proportionately, then at least reducing one of the perspectives courses. Smith explained that the Committee did not want to specify how the adjustments would be made for varying reasons, including: 1) Some faculty feel that professional programs should push the accrediting organizations to reduce the number of credits or be offered as a different type of degree due to the additional hours required, and 2) some faculty felt that the BCC should be reduced.

In response to Francis' question of whether the recommended change in the regulation would specifically include a prohibition regarding reducing electives, Smith stated there was no prohibition in the regulation. Francis also asked, if this were to pass, whether every program needs to submit a change to the Curriculum Council to indicate a change in their requirements. Smith answered that, theoretically, programs would not have to change from their current hours. The Curriculum Council did discuss the option of having a period where program changes could be submitted to accommodate change and be processed on a 'fast-track basis.' Cheryl Jordan stated that the Curriculum Council had discussed having units submit a Category II request.

Senator Verts, Associated, expressed concern about the vague wording concerning the loss of electives. She didn't feel that students currently have much time for electives and asked how we're going to keep electives as an option. Smith wasn't convinced that electives were in jeopardy since there were indications that, in most College of Science programs, there would still be about 30 hours of electives. He reiterated that 180 hours was a minimum only and any program could increase the college, major or even elective requirements.

Senator DeKock, Science, spoke in favor of the proposal and cited two reasons: 1) we're currently under a mandate to increase productivity, which should be partially achieved if this were passed; 2) we're in competition for students, in particular out-of-state students, and the U of O only requires 180 hours vs. OSU's 192.

AR 26 - Concurrent and Subsequent Baccalaureate Degrees. The Committee was asked the question of whether the Baccalaureate Core should be required for subsequent degrees. The Committee held discussions with the Baccalaureate Core Committee and Academic Advising Council on this question; no consensus was found so the Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate set the policy. Other than the Baccalaureate Core issue, the regulation would mainly update the old wording, but would not change the concept of concurrent and subsequent degrees currently in place.

Smith outlined both sides of the issue by explaining that those opposing the proposal feel that if someone comes to OSU from another, quality, degree granting institution, why should a student be required to fulfill the equivalent of our Baccalaureate Core. Those in support argue that the Baccalaureate Core was put in place to try to modernize the educational process and if OSU really believes in this approach, it should not be diluted by making exceptions.

Senator Burns, Home Economics & Education, questioned what the current policy is concerning students transferring in with a degree. Smith responded that there is no consistent policy on campus since some colleges do not require the Core and others do; this proposal would create a uniform policy.

AR 17 - E-grade. Smith noted that the Committee reviewed the 'E' grade which is given when a student misses a final which results in the student petitioning the instructor and Academic Requirements Committee in order to take the final; 9% of all petitions deal with this issue. Since the petition is routinely approved, the Committee felt that this is a waste of student and faculty time. The Committee has attempted to eliminate the 'E' grade and revise the wording on the 'I' grade to accomplish the function of the 'E' grade.

The following sections which are struck-through indicate proposed deletions and highlighted sections indicate those to be added.

AR 17 E-grade.

Replace AR 17 with:

The grading system consists of twelve basic grades, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, and F. The grade of A denotes exceptional accomplishment; B, superior; C, average; D, inferior; F, failure. Other marks are ~~E, final examination not taken~~; I, incomplete; W, withdrawal; R, thesis in progress; P, pass;

N, no-credit; S, satisfactory; U, unsatisfactory.

~~A student who has done passing work to the time of the final examination but who does not take it will receive an E grade. The student must petition the Academic Requirements Committee for permission to remove the E grade and must present an acceptable reason for having missed the examination. If the petition to remove the E is denied by the committee, the student will be assigned an F for the course or the committee may direct the instructor to submit a grade for the course on the basis of an F for the final examination. An E not removed within the first term after the student's return to the institution will be changed to an F for the course unless a petition for extension of time is approved.~~

~~When the quality of the academic work is passing and the scheduled final examination has been taken but a requirement of the course has not been completed for reasons acceptable to the instructor, a report of I (incomplete) may be made and additional time granted. When a requirement of a course has not been completed for reasons acceptable to the instructor and the rest of the academic work is passing, a report of I (incomplete) may be made and additional time granted. The I is only granted at the discretion of the instructor. If a student misses the final without notification and approval acceptable to the instructor, the instructor will report the grade that is appropriate for the requirements of the course. The instructor states the deficiency and the deadline for completing the missing work on the grade roster. The additional time awarded shall in no case exceed one calendar year. To remove the I grade, the student must complete the deficiency within the allotted time and the instructor will then submit the appropriate grade. If the student fails to complete the work within the allotted time, the instructor has the option of either submitting a substitute grade or allowing a permanent grade of I to remain on the student's record. The I grade will have no effect on the student's grade point average.~~

An instructor may move to correct a grade erroneously given by filing a Change of Grade Card in the Registrar's Office. The Academic Requirements Committee routinely reviews grade changes.

Senator Davis, Engineering, questioned what would stop a student from not taking the final since they have to be passing to receive an 'I.' Smith responded that the proposal would enable the faculty member to handle the situation directly. One option is to include a statement in the syllabus stating there will be a reduction in the grade if the final is not taken. The faculty member can also include stipulations on the 'I' grade form which states the student must take the final within a certain time period or the grade becomes an 'F.'

In response to a question from Senator Holmes, Home Economics & Education, Smith stated that students are on the committee and ASOSU has been involved in the development of the change; they favor the proposal. Smith mentioned that advisors also favor the change.

Motion 503-94-02 to approve the proposed changes to AR 17 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. The changes will be effective with the beginning of Fall term 1994.

Veteran's Day Resolution Referral

A motion was made and ultimately referred to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as a result of an ASOSU resolution to allow students to not attend classes on Veteran's Day. The following recommendation is the Executive Committee response to the referral and was submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval:

At its April meeting the Faculty Senate rejected a motion to recommend that Veteran's Day become an official OSU holiday. Various views were expressed in the Senate's debate, but the consensus of the majority seemed to be that the University's calendar could not afford an additional holiday during a ten-week term in which two days are already lost to Thanksgiving weekend. While recognizing the contributions and sacrifices of American veterans, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate cannot support an alternation motion that would impose restrictions on individual faculty across the campus. To mandate that no tests be given nor papers be due nor students be in any way penalized for missing class on that day would be as restrictive in at least some courses (labs that meet on that day, courses in which quizzes are routinely given on that day of the week, and so on) as an official holiday would be. Students who wish to attend Veteran's Day activities will, of course, have the option all students currently have: to make arrangements with their professor to miss class on days when they have legitimate conflicts.

The Executive Committee therefore recommends that no change be made regarding the University's observance of Veteran's Day.

President Oriard explained that the Executive Committee (EC) made the above recommendation based entirely on academic grounds. The EC members discussed the motion that was referred to them at the April Faculty Senate meeting which stated that students would not be penalized for missing class while attending Veteran's Day activities. They determined that in some courses, such as lab sections, it would be virtually identical to an official holiday. Whether or not veterans deserved the honor of a holiday was not considered to be the central issue.

Senator Mukatis questioned whether the EC thought about having some type of activity on that day rather than simply recommending no change. Oriard stated that students continue to have the option of requesting approval from their instructor to miss class and make it up at a later date. However, the EC did not discuss a faculty-sponsored activity.

Motion 503-92-03 to approve the above recommendation passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Annual Committee Reports

The agenda contained annual reports from the following committees:

- Committee on Academic Standing
- Committee on Bylaws and Nominations

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold acknowledged David Conley's excellent leadership to the PASS project. Arnold reported on the following items:

- Budget - He mentioned that there were few changes from last month. At the April OSBHE meeting there was some discussion of the process for the 1995-97 biennium budget framework. Another discussion involved the series of stakeholders meetings for the 2010 report. Among the components in a State-System response to the Governor might be: 1) recognition of the savings being accumulated in this biennium; 2) continuation to focus on administrative and support services and, additionally, the public corporation model as a way in which the State System could do business differently and more efficiently; 3) emphasis on academic productivity; 4) increased enrollment as a way to offset reduction in State general funds; 5) revenue side, in terms of student numbers, and tuition policy - discussed further targeted tuition increases by program, level or institution; and 6) program reduction - clearly a last option. There is an additional undetermined issue concerning staff and faculty compensation which must be factored in. Arnold stated there is a recognition that, following two years without increases in compensation, the System cannot go another two years without attention to this issue.

The Chancellor was to meet with the Governor's staff on May 5 to respond to the earlier set of guidelines and instructions which included a series of stakeholders meetings. At OSU's meeting the need to focus efforts not just on State General Funds, but also to look at lottery funds as part of the total funding package was discussed.

- Extended Education Report & Recommendations - The committee has submitted its report to the Provost; he will consider the recommendations and announce a set of decisions. He has received a few comments since the teleconference held on April 2. The report contains references to further steps in the implementation process and his intent is to follow the normal kinds of expectations for faculty governance, such as issues concerning Faculty Senate committees. It also calls for involving academic deans in the role of the Extended Education Council.

- Searches - Arnold reported on activities involving four searches:

1) Dr. Brent Dalrymple has been named Dean of the College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences effective August 1994.

2) College of Liberal Arts Dean Search Committee is interviewing six candidates. After receiving input, the Committee will make a recommendation to the Provost, hopefully, by May 13.

3) The closing date has passed for the combined position of Extended Education Dean and Director of OSU Extension Service. The search committee is currently reviewing dossiers.

4) A search committee for the position of Vice Provost for Student Affairs has been appointed; Tom Scheuermann will chair the group.

- Promotion and Tenure Reviews are continuing at the University level. Almost all of the colleges that submitted dossiers early have been completed. John Dunn will be scheduling meeting with Deans; administration hopes to have the process completed in May.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard reported on the following items:

- The Executive Committee intended to have an OSBHE member at the June Faculty Senate meeting but, in view of the joint AOF/AAUP meeting on May 7 where a Board member will be present, it was decided that this would be redundant.

- Mark Nelson, AOF Lobbyist, was also scheduled for June to talk about the attack on PERS and ways to deal with it. However, sponsoring him at the Senate meeting would be in violation of State laws concerning State employees engaging in political activity during working hours. The solution to this problem is to have Nelson speak to the faculty at noon on June 2 in the International Forum.

- The Executive Committee has decided to convene the Faculty Consultative Group to informally discuss faculty positions on major budget issues.
- The Honors College proposal will be an action item at the June meeting.
- President Oriard announced that the University Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities is accepting nominations for a new annual award. This award will honor persons who go beyond the law (the American's with Disabilities Act) and show genuine caring, concern and sensitivity for persons with disabling conditions. It will be presented at University Day. Contact Kate Hunter-Zaworski at 737-4982 or Tracy Bentley at 737-3661 for nomination forms; nominations close on May 31.
- Please complete and return committee interest forms to the Faculty Senate Office as soon as possible.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 502

Oregon State University

April 7, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm by President Michael Oriard. President-elect Sally Francis, corrected the March minutes to reflect the following in the Information Item: The word "professional" should replace the word "professorial" under Article III, Sec. 1. of the Bylaws Recommendations. The minutes were approved with no other corrections.

President Oriard informed the Senate that Parliamentarian Trischa Knapp has a class conflict with Faculty Senate meetings during Spring term and has recommended that Senator Charlotte Headrick, Speech Communication, be recognized as the temporary Parliamentarian. There were no objections from the Senate.

President Oriard also noted that President-elect Sally Francis will be conducting the last half-hour of the meeting.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports - Lee Schroeder, Chief Business Officer and Sally Francis, IFS Representative
- Action Items - The following items were approved: 20 Bylaws revisions; Proposal to rename the Department of Aerospace Studies to the Department of Air Force Studies; Proposal for the initiation of a new instructional program leading to the Master of Engineering in Manufacturing Engineering Degree; and a Distinguished Service Award recipient
- The following item was disapproved: ASOSU Veteran's Day Resolution [Motion 94-502-01 through 94-502-06]
- New Business - Referral of a motion to the Executive Committee regarding Veteran's Day [Motion 94-502-08]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Akyeamong, L. Villarroel; Clement, J. Kashchy; Drexler, M. Fiegenger; J. Glenn, E. Brazee; Leklem, A. Messersmith; Maughan, C. Rusk; Niess, R. Thies; Rathja, T. West; and Swan, B. Lisec.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bayne, Bell, Burrige, Cowles, Deboodt, Gould, Hardesty, Hogue, Huddleston, Ingham, Johnson, John Lee, Liebo-

witz, Lundy, Macnab, Meints, Orzech, Pacheco, Reed, Riggs, Rossignol, Sanchez, Somero, Strik and Todd.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

C. Allen, B. Clem, D. Dungan, S. Gregory, K. Heath, D. Johnson, C. Jordan, P. Lee, D. Nicodemus, B. Shepard, D. Stern, and N. Vanderpool.

Special Reports

Lee Schroeder, Chief Business Officer

Dr. Schroeder spoke about the budget process in prior and current years and explained that the budget current process is different from the past. Governor Roberts announced in November that OSSHE would be required to carry-over \$12 million to help meet the 1995-97 reductions. OSU's share amounted to \$3,172,000 and was broken down in the following way:

Education & General Funds	-	\$2,800,000
Agricultural Experiment Station	-	153,000
Extension Service	-	165,000
Forest Research Laboratory	-	54,000

He mentioned that the old budget process was the continuation approach which consisted of the following steps:

- the Governor provided guidelines to OSSHE
- institutions made proposals to OSBHE
- OSBHE and OSSHE considered proposals and forwarded the recommended system-wide budget to the Governor's office
- the Governor and Legislature then considered the recommendations, made revisions, and distributed the final budget

The new approach this year arises from the peculiar circumstances of dealing with Measure 5 and an outgoing governor. OSSHE has been given a target amount for 1995-97 and has been instructed to prepare a budget based on that amount. The new governor will review the budgets for all agencies after the election and prepare final budgets.

The 1995-97 OSSHE budget targets, as released March 15, consist of the following:

- General Fund – \$575,619,570
 - 13.8% from 1993-95
 - 18.8% from continuing service level
- Lottery – \$20,065,000
 - 1993-95 amount, less Vet Med, less 13.7%
- Special Instructions
 - Program Option — Turns over passenger vehicle fleet operations to the state motor pool
 - Program Option — Turn OHSU into a public corporation
 - Decentralize administrative functions
 - Eliminate use of instruction resources for intercollegiate athletics
- Meeting in May with OSSHE and Department of Administrative Services to finalize a plan for the fall budget submittal.

In preparation for the above meeting in May, the Governor has asked each institution to gather input from a Stakeholders' Meeting. The OSU meeting will be held on April 28 from 3:00–5:00 pm in the LaSells Stewart Center. In addition to a meeting at each institution, there will be three meeting sites away from campuses. Those being invited to the Stakeholders' meetings by Lynn Spruill's office will include:

- Faculty
- Students
- Classified/Management Service Staff
- Campus based support groups (i.e. Agricultural Research Foundation, OSU Foundation)
- Campus based statewide public services
- Local education institutions, including community colleges
- Major related economic interests (i.e. businesses)

The meeting focus will be high level. Guidance will come from the OSBHE Office as to the philosophical approach to use and issues included will be:

- Board's 2010 plan introduction
- Consider tuition increase possibilities
- Public corporation model for OSSHE, notably decoupling of personnel and purchasing activities
- Identify budget issues

The Chancellor has provided the following local budget guidance:

- Discuss in general terms only — don't discuss individual programs or line items yet
- Philosophy is to sustain current academic programs
- Respond to instruction productivity initiative
- Increase resident and non-resident undergraduate enrollment
- Raise tuition for all categories of students
- Further examination of reduction in administrative and support services
- Address faculty/staff compensation issues

To aid in the OSU budget process, the President's Cabinet and Deans will meet on April 14 to help define the budget issues and process. Schroeder noted that the Faculty Consultative Group is advisory only and may or may not be engaged, depending on whether program reductions or faculty layoffs are judged a possibility.

ASOSU President Clem asked if students would be included in any of the consulting groups. Schroeder responded that he recalled that they want to involve students as much as is appropriate but he didn't remember specifically if students would be included.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

Sally Francis, IFS Senator, made available a written report at the meeting and included the following remarks in her report of the April IFS Meeting:

- Presidential Search Process - The OSU Faculty Senate voted in March to support the IFS position to reinsert portions of the OSBHE policy which would invite comments from concerned groups and individuals during a presidential search. Francis reported that all but three Faculty Senate's in OSSHE have passed similar motions. This recommendation will be before the OSBHE at its April meeting and they are expected to accept the IFS recommendation.
- Equal Representation - Francis asked Senators to think about the issue of both colleges and universities having equal representation on the IFS. Currently, universities each have three representatives while colleges have only two. OSU's IFS representatives do not support this change and, in the past, OSU's Faculty Senate has not supported this change.

Action Items

Bylaws Recommendations

Kathleen Heath, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented the following proposed Bylaws revisions; most are housekeeping in nature.

Article II, Sec. 1 - Correct frame work to framework

Article III, Sec. 1 - Change Object to Objects to be consistent with Article II, Sec. 2

Article IV, Sec. 2 - Capitalize state

Article IV, Sec. 1 - Remove the School category as there is only one School, the School of Education and it is included in the College of Home Economics and Education.

Article V, Sec. 3 - Includes the procedure for nominations from the Student Affairs apportionment group and the off-campus Extension Faculty. This was not changed in the Bylaws earlier.

Article V, Sec. 4 - Includes the election procedure for the Student Affairs apportionment group. This is not

included in the current Bylaws and should be.

Article VI, Sec. 2 - Adds University Day as responsibilities of the Senate President-elect.

Article VI, Sec. 4 - Deletes the FTE allocated to the President-elect. This deletion was part of the budget cuts.

Article VI, Sec. 2 - Reduces the total FTE release time from .75 to .50 as is the current practice.

Article VIII, Sec. 2 - Changes object to objects to be consistent with Article II, Sec. 2.

Article VIII, Sec. 3 - Change Committees to committees. Makes this section more consistent.

Article VIII, Sec. 3 - Change object to objects to be consistent with Article II, Sec. 2.

Article VII, Sec. 5 - Change Past Presidents Council to read Past Presidents' Council.

Article IX, Sec. 2 - Defines who has the responsibility to declare a position vacant. The apportionment unit should have this responsibility.

Article XII, Sec. 1 - Change object to objects to be consistent with Article II, Sec. 2.

Article XIII, Sec. 3 - Delete "of any rank" and define faculty as the Bylaws do in Article III, Sec. 1.

Article XIII, Sec. 3 - Change the word Chairman to Chair.

Article XIV, Sec. 3 - Changes "distributed" to "made available." Currently it is not common practice to distribute minutes to all faculty due to recent budget cuts. However, they are made available on GOPHER, in the Kerr Library Reserve Book Room, the Faculty Senate Office and from Faculty Senate Senators.

Article XIV, Sec. 4 - Deletes the school category (see the fourth recommendation above).

Senator Gamble questioned the recommendation to delete the FTE allocated to the President-elect and asked if voting in favor indicated approval. Heath stated that this is current practice as a result of budget cuts.

Motion 94-502-01 to approve the above Bylaws revisions passed by written ballot with 76 in support, none in opposition and one abstention.

Article III, Sec. 1 - Includes all no-rank faculty instead of those just in advising or counselling.

Heath explained that, currently, individuals with the following ranks are included in Faculty Senate apportionment: Instructor, Sr. Instructor, Sr. Faculty Research Assistant, Research Associate, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor AND individuals whose principal activity involve academically related advising or counselling of OSU students. The recommendation would eliminate the phrase, "individuals whose principal activity involve academically related advising or counselling of OSU students" and add "no-rank faculty in academic support, administrative support, and student support units who are assigned professional position titles without rank." She reminded Senators that OSSHE rules state there are three kinds of employees: Classified,

Management, and Unclassified which includes teaching, research, service, administration or other kind of service. The OSU Faculty Handbook refers to individuals who have professional position titles without faculty rank; this includes employees working in academic support, administrative support and student support units.

Based on 1993 apportionment figures, Heath displayed the following totals:

Faculty represented by the Faculty Senate = 1,819
 Total number of no rank faculty = 184
 Total number of no rank faculty represented = 34
 No rank faculty unrepresented = 150

If the 150 unrepresented faculty were included in Senate apportionment, 11 senators would be added (14 FTE = 1 Senator). The following shows the break-down by apportionment unit:

Agricultural Sciences - +1
 Associated Faculty - +7
 Business - +1
 Forestry - +1
 Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences - +1

Senator DeKock, Science, spoke in support of the proposal to include all no-rank faculty in Senate apportionment and noted that these individuals have no other representation.

Phyllis Lee, Multicultural Affairs, is a no-rank without representation and stated that she considered herself and others like her to be just as important as those who are represented. She also felt that no-rank faculty play an important role in retention.

Nancy Vanderpool, Dean of Students Office, and Clem, ASOSU, spoke in support of the proposal to include all no-rank faculty in apportionment.

Motion 94-502-02 to approve Article III, Sec. 1 to include all no-rank faculty in Faculty Senate apportionment passed by written ballot with 65 in support, 11 in opposition and 1 abstention.

Category I Proposals

Cheryl Jordan, Curriculum Council Chair, presented two Category I proposals:

1) *Rename the Department of Aerospace Studies to the Department of Air Force Studies*

Jordan noted that the Curriculum Council approved the change and recommended that the Faculty Senate vote in favor of the proposal. She explained that the proposal would more clearly and accurately identify the mission of the Air Force ROTC program.

Senator Koller, ROTC, noted that some people confuse

the name with Meteorology and Aerospace Engineering courses.

Motion 94-502-03 to rename the Department of Aerospace Studies to the Department of Air Force Studies was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes. The change will take effect immediately, however, since it is past the catalog deadline date, it will still appear as Aerospace Studies in the 1994-95 OSU General Catalog.

2) Initiation of a new instructional program leading to the Master of Engineering in Manufacturing Engineering Degree

Jordan explained that this innovative joint degree with PSU and OSU will utilize the resources of two OSSHE institutions and it is not currently offered by any institution in the West. A feature of this program is that the course content will be disseminated to students via electronic means which will enhance student access to the program. She noted that the proposal has been approved by both the Graduate Council and Curriculum Council and strongly recommended approval by the Senate.

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned the reference to supplemental funds being derived from SB 1076 which appropriated \$2 million for the OJGSE. Senator McDowell, Engineering, responded that this money was appropriated to the Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering for the biennium.

Senator pro-tem Thies, Science, questioned student composition. Senator McDowell stated that enrollment in the program is anticipated to be predominantly new part-time students since most will also be working full-time.

Senator DeYoung, Agricultural Sciences, questioned who will approve the waiver of the requirement that no more than half the courses counting toward a graduate degree may be by electronic delivery. Senator Burns, Graduate Council Chair, stated that the Graduate Council has discussed this and waived the requirement for this program. She noted that future waivers of this type will be on a case-by-case basis.

Motion 94-502-04 to initiate a new instructional program leading to the Master of Engineering in Manufacturing Engineering Degree was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

ASOSU Veteran's Day Proposal

President Oriard noted that the agenda indicated that the Executive Committee recommended not approving the resolution. He also received no objections to the suggestion of limiting this issue to 20 minutes.

Mike Kelly, OSU student and Vietnam veteran, presented

an ASOSU resolution citing honoring diversity through honoring veterans. He mentioned that a petition containing more than 2,300 signatures was presented to Dr. Byrne in support of the resolution. Kelly stated that he believed the intent of the resolution was well meant, but disagreed with a portion of the resolution which calls for essential facilities to remain open since he felt that everyone should have the opportunity to observe and participate in Veteran's Day activities. He suggested that if Senators didn't agree with the resolution, the following alternatives could be considered: a rotating basis on holidays observed with Veteran's Day included; have all classes on Veteran's Day focus on veterans; or allow students to attend Veteran's Day activities without penalty. The ASOSU resolution reads as follows:

Resolution to Give the Students at Oregon State University Veteran's Day Off

Whereas, This campus has a lot of veterans and people in the military ROTC programs, and

Whereas, The federal government has set aside a federal holiday, November 11, to recognize these people and their efforts for their country, and

Whereas, Of the other seven schools in OSSHE five of them give their students Veteran's Day off from classes.

The only two not to do so, not including OSU, are OHSU and UO, and

Whereas, Oregon State University should also recognize these people as the federal government does, therefore

Be it hereby resolved that the 53rd ASOSU Senate suggest to the Faculty Senate that November 11th be declared a holiday for OSU. On this day no classes shall be held but facilities essential to students such as; Kerr Library, Dixon Recreation Center, the MU Recreation Center, and all computer labs on campus, shall remain open.

Senator Rose, Forestry, spoke in support of the day off.

Senator Gentle, Agricultural Sciences, pointed out that it is a partial university holiday since Classified staff do have the day off.

Senator Esbensen, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, questioned how holidays are decided. Clem, ASOSU, responded that President Byrne has the authority, as delegated by the Board.

David Stern, OSU student and disabled veteran, stated that there is a big group of veterans who feel left out by the school since Veteran's Day is not observed and they would like to be recognized.

Senator Davis, Engineering, spoke to the issue of an equal number of class days per term and the removal of an additional class day during Fall term.

Clem stated that he is not in favor of just having another day off. He felt it would be acceptable to add another

holiday, which would be designated to honor veterans, where students would not be held accountable for class activities.

Senator Verts, Associated, stated she would be in favor of this motion if activities similar to those arranged for Martin Luther King Day were to take place on Veteran's Day.

Senator Burns, Home Economics & Education, amended the resolution by deleting the last sentence which begins, "On this day..." Senator McDowell seconded motion 94-502-06.

Clem noted that ASOSU had spoken with President Byrne about this resolution and Byrne had requested input from the Faculty Senate.

Senator Holmes, Home Economics & Education, reminded Senators that the decision was made last year to have every quarter equal ten weeks and adding another holiday would make Fall term shorter unless the quarter began a week earlier.

In response to Senator Scheuermann, Student Affairs, Senator Burns explained that the main reason why the Executive Committee (EC) recommended that the resolution not be approved was that they disagreed with some getting the day off to observe and participate in activities and others would not have that opportunity. Another reason was that the term would be of unequal length in comparison to other terms. Senator DeKock noted that the EC also discussed Memorial Day, which is a holiday, that also honors veterans. Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, mentioned that his sense of the EC discussion, given the resolution's exceptions, was that the thrust would be for students to get a day off rather than to truly honor veterans.

Senator pro-tem John Kashchy, ROTC, appreciated the effort to pay tribute to veterans. He noted that Army ROTC cancelled classes on Veteran's Day last year so that the students could focus on paying tribute to veterans; the color guard took first place in the Albany parade.

At the end of the time limit, President-elect Francis conducted a vote on the amendment. *Motion 94-502-06 to amend the ASOSU resolution by deleting the last sentence passed by voice vote with dissenting votes.*

Motion 94-502-05 to approve the ASOSU resolution failed by voice vote with dissenting votes. As a result of a request for a show of hands, the motion failed by a vote of 24 in support, 39 in opposition and 6 abstentions.

Executive Session

President-elect Francis called the Senate into an Execu-

tive Session to consider the Distinguished Service Award nominee. Duane Johnson, Faculty Recognition and Awards Chair, presented information about the nominee. There was no discussion. The nominee was confirmed by a written ballot of 61-3 with one abstention. The award will be presented at Commencement.

Information Items

Annual Reports of Committees/Councils Due - Annual Reports from Faculty Senate Committees/Councils are due for the Senate's information.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard read a memo from Bruce Shepard addressing concerns among students about the consequences of the change to recording only OSU grades included in the GPA. The memo stated that Graduation with Honors has always been based on only OSU GPA.

New Business

Senator Strohmeier, Student Affairs, explained that students felt strongly about the resolution allowing them to attend Veteran's Day observances and proposed the following motion. Motion 94-502-07 was seconded by Senator Koller:

Students should be allowed to attend Veteran's Day activities without penalty for missing class. Additionally, no quizzes or tests will be given nor will papers be due on that day.

Senator Esbensen, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, moved that the previous motion be referred to the Executive Committee and asked that they come back to the Faculty Senate in May with a motion regarding this issue. Motion 94-502-08 was seconded by Senator Zaerr, Forestry.

Senator Daniels, Forestry, encouraged the Senate to vote against the motion to table and against the main motion and asked the Senate to trust him to draft a carefully crafted resolution to bring back to the Senate in May.

Senator Gamble moved the previous question. *Motion 94-502-09 to move the previous question was approved by voice vote.*

Motion 94-502-08 to refer Senator Strohmeier's motion back to the Executive Committee was approved by voice vote with some dissenting votes and no abstentions.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:03.

Respectfully submitted: Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 501

Oregon State University

March 3, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 pm by President Michael Oriard. There were no corrections to the February minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports were presented by the following individuals: Joy Hughes and Mel George
- Action Items - The following items were approved: Presidential search recommendation and Multi-year or Fixed-term appointments recommendations [Motion 94-501-01 through 02]
- New Business - There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Cornelius, S. Miles; Headrick, T. Knapp; Knight, M. Moore; Koller, J. Zautner; Scheuermann, T. Tower; Suzuki, L. Kenneke; and Verts, J. Nishihara.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Acker, Baggott, Bayne, Canfield, de Szoeki, DeAngelis, Deboodt, Esbensen, Farber, Glenn, Hogue, Huddleston, Jensen, Lassen, Leklem, Liebowitz, McDaniel, Orzech, Pacheco, Robbins, Rosenberger, Rossignol, Sandine, Sherr, Snow-Harter, Snyder, and Strik.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

J. Dunn, D. Johnson, D. Nicodemus, S. Sanford, and B. Shepard.

Special Reports

Joy Hughes and Mel George

Joy Hughes, Associate Provost for Information Services, and Mel George, University Librarian, spoke about the new Information Services unit, Kerr Library activities and the library expansion project.

Hughes sees the challenge of Information Services to help faculty fulfill higher order responsibilities and help them to reach more students, for lower cost, without losing the sense of community which is important to the University's mission.

As a result of changes in cost and capabilities of technology, the demonstration of instructional effectiveness of technology and the new realities of declining state resources, she sees technology as an effective means of enabling faculty to reach more students with more learning for less cost and without increasing faculty workload. She noted, however, that technology is not effective in encouraging student ideas or helping students learn to critically evaluate their new knowledge.

She mentioned that OSU is the center for Ed-Net and showed slides of OSU instructors teaching courses via Ed-Net using both one-and two-way video and two-way audio. Educational researchers have found that students learn material faster and retain it longer when they are able to interact with sources that integrate voice data and video.

Hughes commended the Instructional Technology Innovation Consortium (ITIC) for establishing the faculty development lab in Kidder Hall. She noted that the ITIC consists of OSU faculty who work closely with CMC to provide facilities for faculty to integrate instructional technology into their courses. In the coming months, through the assistance of ITIC and the Computer Science Department, a 29-station multi-media teaching lab will be established. Three classrooms will be upgraded to 'smart' status this summer. These rooms will house a full range of multi-media and network capabilities for faculty use.

OSU applied for and received a Faculty Productivity Grant from OSSHE which will enable faculty new to multi-media technology to learn how to use the equipment to enhance their courses. The project is co-directed by Tim Brimmer, Music, and Zoe Ann Holmes, Nutrition and Food Management. Support is coming from vendors (such as Apple) as well as CMC, University Computing, the U of O and Chemeketa Community College. Materials will be distributed to faculty describing application procedures to participate in the project.

Hughes explained that technology is not the mission of

Information Services; it is a service organization whose mission is to enhance the University's ability to thrive in a future environment which is more competitive than at present. She listed the following changes to expect in the coming year and said she'd come back to the Senate next March and be held accountable if they are not accomplished:

- Pay more attention to systems integration by putting resources into projects that bring information to desktops in a usable form.
- Make Banner work for the academic departments — including demand scheduling simulation and degree audit.
- Place high priority on projects that facilitate the admissions and advising processes.
- Put major focus on computer mediated communication, such as e-Mail, to make the computer network as reliable as the telephone network.
- Provide greater hands-on support to faculty who seek to use technology to be more productive, which necessitates reallocating resources.
- Reduce frustration by developing more effective ways to communicate with customers; many people don't know who to contact.
- Work more closely with college computing administrators.



A vision group to plan for the future has been formed comprised of faculty, deans and directors. This group will identify ways that information technology can assist OSU to be competitive for resources and students.

Hughes shared her vision of an electronic library which includes voice, visual and data resources provided to the desktop which are paid for when accessed, known as 'pay per use'; the Library currently engages in 'pay to own.' Hopefully, by 2010, almost all new materials will be electronically accessed.

She noted there is a critical shortage of space in Kerr Library. The Library was designed to seat 3,500, but the current seating has been reduced to 1,000; 100 seats per year are lost due to space for acquisitions. A student survey taken in 1985 revealed that nearly 1/2 the student body were dissatisfied with the availability of space in which to study and do research. Additional space will be required to access new technology and to become a network information provider, including digitization equipment necessary to digitize the Linus Pauling Collection. She noted the need for small group study rooms as a result of faculty assigning collaborative work. There is also a need to update the Library with respect to technology and networking. Renovation is necessary

to solve environmental concerns and to provide better security for the Library collection in the event of an earthquake.

Mel George addressed the following three areas:

- 1) The process involved in planning for the new library
- 2) The campaign to raise private funds
- 3) The current state of the library

Planning for the new library – In planning the library expansion, the assumption was made that a library is not a building, but the process of bringing people and ideas together to meet the current and future information needs of OSU. The design of the new OSU Library allows for improving this process. Some of the plans called for in the expansion are: more study areas, more computer terminals and rooms, expanded storage and reference areas, expanded areas for faculty and group sessions, and more room for journals and special collections.

Campaign to raise private funds – Estimates for redevelopment of the central library indicate it will cost \$36 million. As Hughes explained, a major portion of the cost will go into redesigning the building to meet seismic requirements and to make the building more energy efficient. There is currently a matching challenge commitment of state funds where the State will sell bonds up to \$10 million if OSU privately raises that amount by June 30, 1995. The private donations currently exceed \$1 million; \$550,000 was raised by the students. President Byrne has launched the 'Campaign for the Library' to privately raise \$26 million. The campaign is currently in the 'silent' stage where a few donors are being asked to make large gifts.

George explained that it costs money to make money and the University has set aside a budget to properly run the campaign. It is estimated that fund-raising campaigns cost 10–12% of the amount intended to be raised. An internationally known fund-raising consultant has been hired to periodically review the Library's campaign.

Current state of the Library – Kerr Library was recently awarded a federal research demonstration grant of \$330,000 to create a user-friendly interface to network a large number of CD-ROM's containing government information to support economic development. The result will be standardized software that permits users to access and download information. He explained that the Library introduced a CD-ROM Network which is connected to more than 60 data bases. Last year there were more than 200,000 searches made by individuals outside the Library using the CD-ROM network system.

Special funding will enable the Library to automate portions of the Map Room in the near future. As Hughes noted, a project is underway to digitize the Linus Pauling Collection with money made available through the

endowed chair which George holds. Phase I will include 15,000 of the more than 135,000 items in the Collection.

Between 1988 and 1992, the Library found it necessary to cancel 1,897 journal subscriptions. George was optimistic when he reported that he believes the \$1.6 million journal budget will be able to accommodate the anticipated 10% increase in journal costs this year, without cancelling additional subscriptions.

George concluded by stating that the Library staff believe they are continuing to provide good, basic service and making progress on new technologies "which will allow us to face the future with hope, if not confidence."

IFS Representative Wilcox questioned how productive the campaign has been among the faculty. George responded he doesn't know the figures, but stated that the campaign was interrupted when the State decided it would not be constructing more new buildings. He noted that after the conclusion of the 'silent' phase, the university community would again be approached.

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned the cost of the new direction outlined by Hughes relative to the cost of maintaining current services and whether services currently offered will continue to be offered, e.g. CMC services. Hughes stated that the ITIC will talk about new priorities in the coming months to determine if some services will be eliminated. She also noted that some goals won't cost more, they'll just be accomplished in a different way.

Action Items

Presidential Search Recommendation

Sally Francis, IFS Representative, explained that the OSBHE adopted new policies on 10/22/93 concerning presidential searches at the eight public institutions. These policies included eliminating the requirement for the search committee to invite comments from the institution and community when preparing the statement of qualifications. IFS strongly disagreed with the elimination of this clause and passed a motion similar to the following which was passed by the OSU Faculty Senate by voice vote with no dissenting votes. (Motion 94-501-01). The highlighted section indicates the sentence to be added.

The Responsibilities of the Search Committee

1. Review Statement of Qualifications

The search committee should review the Board's position description and statement of qualifications, and recommend any modifications. The search committee shall invite comments from concerned groups and individuals (faculty, students, administrators, alumni, members of the community, etc.) The committee chair shall consult with the Board regard-

ing any search committee recommendations for changes.

Fixed-Term and Multi-Year Appointments

Stephanie Sanford, Faculty Status Committee Chair, presented the following two recommendations concerning fixed-term and multi-year employees. She noted that these recommendations resulted from a request by the 1990-91 Faculty Grievance Committee to consider the state system policy that permits non-renewal of fixed-term appointments without explanation or reason.

Annual performance evaluation shall be mandatory for all fixed-term employees, .50 FTE and greater. Current policy in the OSU Faculty Handbook should be changed to delete the provision that annual review must be conducted only "during the first five years of service" (see page 38). The Office of Academic Affairs shall have the responsibility for monitoring compliance with this policy.

Suitability for a multi-year or extended fixed-term contract shall be considered, as funding allows, following four (4) years of fully satisfactory continuous employment in a fixed-term position, .50 FTE or greater. Implementation of this recommendation will require revision of the "Eligibility" section of OSU's Guidelines for Multi-Year and Fixed-Term Contracts.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, questioned the fraction of existing fixed-term appointments that are multi-year. Associate Provost John Dunn responded there are 27 multi-year and 26 fixed-term employees.

Senator Sproul, Associated, referred to the term "as funding allows" in the second recommendation and asked where the decision-making lies. Sanford responded that the individual unit determines whether funding is adequate to offer a contract.

The Faculty Senate approved the recommendations by voice vote with no dissenting votes. (Motion 94-501-02)

Information Items

- Bylaws Recommendations - The Committee on Bylaws and Nominations recommended revisions to the Bylaws which were printed in the agenda. Most are housekeeping in nature, however, two are substantive revisions: 1) Article III, Sec. 1. - Would include in apportionment no-rank faculty in academic support, administrative support, and student support units who are assigned professorial position titles without rank, instead of those just in advising or counselling; and 2) Article VI, Sec 4. - Eliminates FTE allocated to the President-Elect; this deletion was part of the budget

*Professional
Corrected at May 1994
FS meeting*

cuts assigned to the Faculty Senate Office.

The recommendations will be voted on at the April meeting. Senators are reminded to bring their March agenda since the recommendations will NOT be printed again in the April agenda.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold's report included the following items:

- Productivity Report — He has received the report from the OSU task force. This report and input from the Academic Assembly will be used in structuring the final report, which is due in the Chancellor's Office by the end of the month.

Faculty are encouraged to review the report which is available via e-Mail at fso@ccmail.orst.edu or on GOPHER by selecting the following menus: OSU Information & Services, OSU Academic Departments and Colleges, Faculty Senate, Faculty Productivity Report. Comments should be sent to Provost Arnold or Leslie Davis Burns.

Wilcox asked at what point is the policy set. Arnold responded that guidelines from the Chancellor's Office last fall indicated there would be OSSHE and OSBHE review and approval of each plan.

- Legislative Hearing — Provost Arnold met with the House Higher Education Task Force last Wednesday to discuss distance education. He noted that the level of interest exhibited during the last Legislative session has not waned.
- Budget - No guidelines have been received from the State.
- OSBHE Meeting - The work session spent a great deal of time talking about the 2010 document and panel. A theme which has surfaced includes moving the higher education system to a higher degree of autonomy, such as a public corporation model. There is emphasis on entrepreneurial approaches, differentiated institutions with both resident students and distance education linkages, and a greater degree of independence, particularly on the non-state revenue portion of budgets.
- Newspaper Reports - Provost Arnold mentioned that many of the newspaper reports are not complimentary to higher education and felt there was an opportunity for more frequent, positive, stories. It's important to get stories out about faculty activities and consequences and how decision-making impacts the quality of life - for students as well as faculty. He encouraged faculty to be more proactive in identifying stories and noted that the people in University Relations can

help stories become more visible.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard reported on the following items:

- Productivity Report — He encouraged faculty to read the productivity report and keep in mind, "How would this affect my own unit?" He noted that the Task Force tried to maintain the emphasis on retaining the decision-making at the unit level. Faculty have until the end of the month to comment on the report.
- Honors College Proposal — The proposal has been forwarded to the Curriculum Council with a request that they respond as soon as possible so the Senate can act on it this Spring.
- Undergraduate Education Council Proposal — The draft proposal provides oversight for the range of programs affecting undergraduate instruction and consists of five identified work groups: Enrollment Management, Recruitment and Retention, Educational Effectiveness, Educational Outreach, and Diversity. Since both the Executive Committee and selected chairs expressed concern that the work groups have adequate faculty representation, they recommended that each one have at least two faculty members. The proposal was drafted by Bruce Shepard, reviewed by the Executive Committee and selected committee chairs, and returned to Shepard with recommendations.
- Proficiency-based Admissions — David Conley at the U of O is heading the state-wide effort to address this issue and has agreed to speak at the May Faculty Senate meeting. One of the issues will be how higher education responds to students who graduate with a proficiency-based credential rather than a diploma.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:38.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 500

Oregon State University

February 3, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Michael Oriard. There were no corrections to the January minutes. President Oriard noted that Parliamentarian Knapp was ill and called for volunteers to take her place. No one volunteered.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports were presented by the following individuals: Bernice Sandler, "Integrating Women Into Academic Life"; Dutch Baughman and Bob Frank, Athletics; and Leslie Davis Burns, Faculty Productivity and Workload.
- Action Items - The following items were approved: Category I proposal to rename the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Health to M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Public Health [Motion 94-500-01]
- New Business - There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Daniels, R. Johnson; Reed, P. McFadden; Todd, R. Hathaway; and Zollinger, H. Meyer.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Acker, Bayne, Boyer, Calder, Christensen, Clement, Collier, L. Davis, de Szoeki, DeYoung, Deboodt, Drexler, Folts, Gould, Headrick, Hogue, Huddleston, Humphrey, Johnson, Krueger, Ladd, Macnab, Mason, Meints, Miller, Orzech, Pacheco, Pyles, Rathja, Rivin, Rose, Rosenberger, Rossignol, Sherr, Snyder, Strik, and Verts.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; and V. Nunnemaker, Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

J. Anamaet, A. Anderson, D. Baughman, B. Becker, J. Dunn, H. Egna, B. Frank, L. Hahn, D. Johnson, C. Jordan, M. Henderson, M. McNamara, K. Murphy, M. Pacheco, P. Primak, C. Rusk, S. Schulte, B. Shepard, and S. Wagner.

Special Reports

Bernice Sandler

Dr. Bernice Sandler, Senior Associate at the Center for Women Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., spoke about "Integrating Women Into Academic Life."

Sandler talked about the 'chilly classroom climate' towards women and cited several examples: women are more likely to be interrupted than men; women receive much less eye contact; men are asked for their opinion while women are asked factual questions; and people are more attentive when men speak.

She noted that although most overt behavior is gone, such as prohibiting women from entering law school or medical school, it is still difficult for women faculty members to get promoted. The pattern, which has not changed in the last 25 years, is that women faculty are still less likely to achieve the rank of professor than men; the higher the rank the fewer the women.

Frequently, men have limited experience with women as colleagues and tend to confuse social and professional roles. Some men can better relate to women as wives and mothers and, rather than acknowledging a woman's professional role, they may focus on her appearance or ability as a parent.

She explained that women may be viewed as less competent since they speak differently than men and tend to have their speech devalued for several reasons: they speak more softly, more politely, more hesitantly, more deferentially; they use a lot of qualifiers; they turn a statement into a question; and they apologize frequently. Women who learn to speak more convincingly and confidently, however, are often called 'bitches' while men are considered to be 'assertive.' Society has now learned that women's speech does have value; the hesitant, more open speech encourages others to participate in discussions. Men should learn to speak in a female way, in some instances, so they don't come across as authoritarian and so dialogue is encouraged.

Sandler made these suggestions for ways to increase self-confidence in female students: praise them more;

give them positive feed-back; and make them aware that women as a whole have less self-confidence so they don't feel they are alone.

When asked what are the characteristics of successful women, she responded that it partially depends on what is internal for a particular women and noted that it's helpful if she has had male mentors. Other factors include the ability to laugh, to determine why you failed at something and how to correct it, to talk with other people when things go wrong, and to understand and talk about the barriers women are up against.

She concluded with the following quotation, "And they shall beat their pots and pans into printing presses, and weave their cloth into protest banners. Nations of women shall lift up their voices with nations of other women, neither shall they accept discrimination anymore." She noted that, "Women are learning the politics of change and the politics of power; and the campus, the nation and the world will never be the same."

Dutch Baughman and Bob Frank

Dutch Baughman, Athletic Director, and Bob Frank, OSU's Institutional Representative, spoke about the recent NCAA meeting and specific issues affecting the OSU Athletic Department.

Bob Frank began by talking about graduation rates of student athletes who entered OSU during the 1986/87 academic year. The overall graduation rate is: freshman, 52%; student athletes, 47%; and transfer students, 79%. (Transfer rates include the percentage of transfer student athletes who graduated within six years of the entering class to which they were assigned.) Graduation rates for those exhausting eligibility who entered during 1983-84 through 1986-87 was 95%, which was the highest in the PAC-10.

OSU has the best record in the PAC-10 for graduation of black student athletes. For the period 1983-1986 graduating black student athletes averaged 56% while white student athletes averaged 53%.

Frank mentioned that the NCAA passed a proposal to review academic legislation passed in recent years to determine whether the cumulative effect inadvertently disadvantages some groups, such as minority students.

Frank reported that the following items have received attention by the NCAA: 1) Gender Equity – He noted that the passage of Bylaw 2.3 establishes a principal of gender equity in the NCAA's Principals of Intercollegiate Athletics; 2) Financial Aid – Legislation was adopted to prepare proposed legislation for need based financial support (financial need is no longer the basis of award-

ing athletic scholarships); and 3) Federation – Member institutions feel the need to vote on legislation that directly affects them so that Division II and III institutions are not voting on legislation affecting Division I institutions.

Dutch Baughman reported that the NCAA has created a new process which all member institutions are required to adhere to once every five years. The process ensures that the governance of the athletic department is situated squarely within the University's mission and values. If an institution is declared to be uncertified, they would lose opportunities for NCAA funding. OSU has volunteered to be one of the first to undergo the certification process. The Athletics Department staff does not conduct the review and individuals participating in the process must be campus-wide. The final report will be submitted to the NCAA which will determine whether the institution is certified, certified with conditions or non-certified. Baughman asked that a Faculty Senate ad hoc committee be formed to review the final report. Prior to completion of the report (hopefully this Spring), a Peer Review Team will be on campus to review the document to ensure completion.

OSU is currently involved in a random audit being conducted by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) which determines whether OSU is in compliance with the guidelines of Title IX. Annually, there are 10-11 institutions selected for the random audit across the nation. Baughman anticipates that the review will be completed within three months. The review is very specific to 12 areas of operation within the department, including financial aid. Preliminary findings show that OCR concerns expressed in 1990-91 have been improved upon, as well as mutual areas of concern.

Baughman also addressed the concerns of the Black Coaches Association (BCA):

- They have rallied to support the notion that black student athletes are being discriminated against with regard to NCAA changes (effective in 1995) in initial eligibility.
- Declares underrepresentation of blacks in the leadership of the National Association of Basketball Coaches which involves six full-time white people.
- Declares underrepresentation at the decision-making level of the NCAA – the top 12 positions are all white people.
- They feel disadvantaged because the current rules restrict the amount of time a coach may recruit a prospect.
- They feel that the time allowed to get to know student athletes is very restrictive since contact time is limited to 20 hours per week.
- They feel that more black female coaches should be coaching women's basketball rather than a majority of white males.

Baughman noted that the BCA is both well funded (with about \$350,000 in the bank and additional pledges of \$275,000) and well organized, as well as dedicated to their cause. They have a governing board and have hired a consulting team and two companies involved in analysis. The issues they are concerned with will need to be resolved; they won't just go away.

Baughman reported that the PAC-10 has created a task force to work with the BCA and talk about the issues and problems rather than talking to the BCA about preventing a boycott. The PAC-10 has adopted a policy of holding an institution responsible for all costs which occur as a result of their team participating in a boycott, which includes: gate receipts, concessions, parking, etc. OSU will not honor a boycott because they prefer to take a proactive manner in dealing with the BCA.

Senator Lee, Liberal Arts, referred to the *Playboy* photographer who was in town last fall and noted that several campus groups asked the Athletic Department to deal with the situation in terms of the PAC-10 affiliation and questioned what was done. Baughman reported that it was discussed at the PAC-10 Conference and OSU was surprised that they were the only institution that was concerned. There was only one other institution that was aware of this type of activity in their community. A formal statement was sent to *Playboy* stating that this activity is not appreciated; no response has been received.

Leslie Davis Burns

Leslie Davis Burns, Faculty Productivity and Workload Task Force Chair, explained that the goal of the group is to provide feedback and information to Provost Arnold by mid-February. The plan is due to the Chancellor in March.

The following is an outline of the Chancellor's directive to institution president's in preparing their "Plan for Academic Productivity and Educational Reform."

- Ambitious in reach and scope
- Relate to campus mission
- Mixture of elements - inter-institutional initiatives and campus-specific initiatives
- Emphasis on undergraduate experience - must be linked to legislative and public concerns
- Some focus on graduate education
- Measurable outcomes - plans must include both means to measure productivity outcomes and specific quality indicators
- Involvement of campus - participation from campus community in the planning stages
- Rewards and incentives - what changes will be made to encourage outcomes

With the aid of several overheads, she reviewed issues the group is studying:

Planning Assumptions - Resources

- Fewer state dollars and faculty FTE for the same number or more students
- Resources will be necessary for faculty development opportunities in learning new technology

Planning Assumptions - Strategies

- Pressure to increase students' access to courses
- Pressure to move students through the system faster
- Outcomes of productivity must be assessed and must be measurable

Planning Assumptions - Faculty

- Faculty will be expected to do their jobs differently - for some, this may mean increased teaching
- A rethinking of faculty qualifications may be needed to achieve productivity goals
- Changes in incentives and reward structure must accompany changes in expectations of faculty

Planning Assumptions - Students

- Student demographic characteristics will change
- Preparation of students coming to OSU will be different in the future - partly due to K-12 educational reform
- How students learn will be different in the future, which will affect how faculty teach

Draft Plan - Short-term Goals

- Unit productivity plans - productivity can best be handled at the unit level
- Courses and curriculum - Academic Affairs will look at lower enrollment courses, internal course duplication, etc.
- Recruitment and retention initiatives - increased attention to these issues
- Faculty Roles - proposed plan would recommend position statements defining expectations be developed, exploring and increasing use of peer review of teaching and studying the recognition and award structure
- Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs - this individual is studying overview of policies and the undergraduate academic programs
- Undergraduate Education Council - several groups are discussing this proposal which would look at policy and other implications for undergraduate education

Draft Plan - Intermediate Goals

- Community college linkages - studying degree programs, transfers and sharing campus facilities
- Instructional technology - looking at both on-campus and distance learning
- "First-year" type program for new students - intensive orientation to improve retention of students
- Honors College - proposal is now in the works toward full implementation

Draft Plan - Long-term Goals

- Exploration of mastery learning approaches - implement the concept of student productivity to move students through the system faster
- Critical review/elimination of lower priority programs - result of financial considerations

Senator Leklem, Home Economics and Education, questioned what was meant by 'elimination of lower priority programs' and how are decisions made. Burns responded that there is a document containing the criteria and process to eliminate programs. The decisions involve the Faculty Consultative Group and Faculty Senate. Provost Arnold added that the Academic Structure Report recommended looking critically at programs offered by focusing on limited demand courses and deal with issues of quality.

Senator Mukatis, Business, questioned whether we were going to continue to look at lower priority courses on a continuing basis. Provost Arnold responded that the Academic Structure Task Force noted that some programs had been eliminated, but OSU has not undertaken a critical review of programs, with a focus on quality elements.

Senator Gamble, Science, noted there are some faculty who are engaged in only research and asked how these positions relate to productivity and budgets. Burns responded that the emphasis of the plan submitted to the Chancellor will be on undergraduate education with a slight focus on graduate education. Although research information will not be forwarded to the Chancellor, individual unit plans will include research, if appropriate.

In response to an observation from Senator Gamble about an implication that faculty are not doing all they can, Burns noted that the Task Force realizes that faculty are working hard. She commented that the assumption is that faculty will be expected to do things differently, not necessarily more.

In responding to a question asking if the Faculty Senate would vote on the final document, President Oriard noted that it is coming from central administration, with input from faculty, and would not be voted on by the Senate. Provost Arnold remarked that the OSBHE will have final approval of all plans submitted.

Action Items

Category I Proposal

Cheryl Jordan, Curriculum Council Chair, presented a Category I Proposal to rename the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Health to M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Public Health. She noted that the proposal had been approved by the Graduate and Curriculum Councils. She commented that the primary reason for the change is to more accurately convey the course and research content of the degree.

Motion 94-500-01 was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold's report included the following items:

- Noted, with appreciation, the participation of Bernice Sandler in meetings throughout the day. He felt her presence was helpful in raising issues which need to be openly discussed.
- Productivity Issues - Needs to be greater faculty discussion and involvement, such as occurred earlier in the meeting. He mentioned that the issue is not new since it was covered last year in the local newspaper and by a legislative visit to campus. Two important principles emerged from the two previous task forces and are embodied in the response coming from the current task force: 1) the issue should be productivity and not workload, and 2) it is best dealt with at the unit level.
- OSBHE January Meeting - There was a good deal of discussion about moving toward the use of a proficiency-based admission standard for admitting students into higher education; this is directly in response to K-12 educational reform. The Board also approved the OSU Center for Salmon Disease Research.
- Budget - Provost Arnold spoke at the January meeting about a \$15 million system-wide impact for the current biennium which has now been resolved to be a \$12 million reduction in expenditures. Four categories were identified as areas where savings would be realized (these are system-wide numbers, not OSU specifically). 1) \$4 million from administrative support areas; 2) \$5 million from instructional productivity; 3) \$1 million of additional BARC savings; and 4) \$2 million from early retirements made possible by a health insurance subsidy program. Arnold noted that, "Every attempt will be made to minimize any direct impacts on academic unit budgets in trying to generate these savings between now and the end of the biennium."

It is still unknown when guidelines will be issued for 1995-97. OSU is in the process of updating all programmatic information with consultation from the Deans. The budget process has been simplified so each Dean or appropriate administrator will meet with Arnold and Lee Schroeder who will then set up options for OSU's response to the Chancellor's Office. During the process, the guidelines will be discussed with the Deans, administrators and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. If it appears that elimination of tenured faculty is necessary, the formal program review process would be engaged and would include the Council of Academic Administrators and the Faculty Consultative Group. Following this stage, a response for discussion will be forwarded to the OSBHE. The current intent seems to be that responses will be fairly general rather than programmatic specific, they will heavily emphasize the revenue side, and perhaps generically look at issues of productivity.

- Recruitment and Retention - OSU was at the low end of the enrollment corridor this year which makes it important to increase enrollment to stay within the corridor. If we fall below the defined corridor, funding will be significantly reduced by the Chancellor's Office. On the positive side, registrations for Beaver Open House are up 62% from last year and current admissions data is also ahead of last year.

Senator Cowles, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, asked for comments on the PERS proposals. Arnold noted that there is an effort being made to put the PERS issue to a vote. He observed it's unfortunate that state employees continue to be beat up on and felt that state employees across all agencies need to become more proactive and some external leaders need to be engaged to counter the negative images. Arnold noted there are pockets of opposition, such as AOF, working to prevent the PERS issue being placed on the ballot and suggested the need for these groups to develop networks and work together rather than individually. Arnold reminded faculty that if this issue is placed on the ballot, as a public employee, you cannot comment on or work to defeat it during work time. Senator Mukatis questioned legal challenges on the basis that it is not an appropriate measure for the ballot. Arnold responded that discussion of this nature is occurring and, should such a measure pass, there would be a legal challenge.

Information Items

- Faculty Awards Summary - A summary of Faculty and Staff University Awards (both nomination and application), including eligibility, deadlines and contact person, is now available on GOPHER. After accessing GOPHER, select "OSU Information and Services," then select "Faculty and Staff Awards."
- Faculty/Sabbatical Housing List - The listings for Faculty/Sabbatical Housing, maintained in the Faculty Senate Office, are now available on GOPHER. After accessing GOPHER, select "OSU Information and Services," then select "Faculty/Sabbatical Housing List." The following menus will appear from which to choose: Rentals Available, Roommates, House Sitting, Housing Needed and Exchanges.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard reported on the following items:

- Honors College - The proposal is nearly completed in the form of a Category I. Since the proposal is not coming from a college, the Executive Committee will review it, refer it to the Curriculum Council, then submit it to the Faculty Senate for approval
- Undergraduate Education Council - The Executive Committee is responding to the proposed council.
- Redefining Scholarship - This term refers to the different kinds of things that faculty do at OSU and the need to have a reward structure that match those differences. A result of this effort will probably be to redefine criteria for promotion and tenure.
- 2010 Advisory Panel - Members of this panel, which is considering various models for higher education in Oregon, will meet with invited OSU and community individuals on February 14 in the LaSells Stewart Center. Observers are welcome, but may not participate.
- March Faculty Senate - Joy Hughes, Associate Provost for Information Services, and Mel George, University Librarian, will speak to the Senate in March.
- Budget - Noted that OSU's budget will likely be general rather than specific, so the Faculty Consultative Group will probably not be involved. However, he was pleased that Provost Arnold mentioned that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would be involved early in the budget discussions.
- Information Dissemination - President Oriard urged Senators to disseminate information from Faculty Senate meetings to fellow faculty colleagues.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:07.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1994 No. 499

Oregon State University

January 6, 1994

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Carroll W. DeKock. There were no corrections to the December minutes.

President DeKock thanked the following individuals: Vickie Nunnemaker for her effective assistance; the Executive Committee for their hard work and advice - retiring members: Janet Nishihara, Laura Rice, Tony Wilcox and continuing members: Bill Lunch, Terry Miller and John Morris; Kathy Heath, past president, for her skill and grace; Provost Roy Arnold and Associate Provost John Dunn who met with the Executive Committee each week. DeKock felt fortunate that faculty at OSU have the ear of the administration and thanked President Byrne and Provost Arnold for the excellent cooperation received by the Senate.

Outgoing President DeKock turned the gavel over to Michael Oriard and declared him installed as Faculty Senate President.

President Oriard presented Past President DeKock with a Myrtlewood plaque bearing the following inscription:

*Carroll W. DeKock
Oregon State University
Faculty Senate President, 1993*

*Given in appreciation for all his efforts
to promote true community at Oregon State University.*

*There are three kinds of lies:
lies, damned lies and statistics.
- Mark Twain*

President Oriard asked President-Elect Sally Francis, incoming Executive Committee members Leslie Davis Burns, Jo-Ann Leong, and Beth Strohmeyer and IFS Representative Larry Curtis to stand and declared them installed. He then asked all new Senators to stand and declared them installed.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports were presented by: Senator Cliff Trow and Representative Tony Van Vliet
- Action Items - The following items were approved: Parliamentarian; Category I proposal to establish an interdisciplinary graduate minor in Earth Information

Science and Technology; revision to requirements for graduation with academic distinction; revision to No Show Drop (AR9); and revision to procedure for changing from A-F to S-U grading. [Motion 94-499-01 through 94-499-08]

- New Business - There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Drexler, S. Martin; Headrick, T. Knapp; Hogue, P. Corcoran; Orzech, R. Daniels; Scheuermann, P. Ratchford; and Strohmeyer, C. Graham.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Akyeampong, Beatty, Bell, Cowles, DeAngelis, DeYoung, Deboodt, Esbensen, Glenn, Hardesty, Humphrey, Ingham, Kiaei, Logendran, McDaniel, Miller, Pacheco, Plant, Pyles, Rivin, Robbins, Rosenberger, Rossignol, Rulofson, Sherr, Snyder, Strik, Vuchinich, and Williams.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Oriard, President; S. Francis, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

B. Becker, J. Hughes, D. Johnson, C. Jordan, D. Nicodemus, B. Shepard, C. Smith, M.L. Spruill, M. Yamamoto, and N. Wendt.

Special Reports

Higher Education After Defeat of Measure 5

Senator Cliff Trow and Representative Tony Van Vliet spoke to the Faculty Senate about higher education from a legislative perspective.

Representative Van Vliet explained that the reinvention of government began in 1980 when they tried to gain effectiveness of agencies and competition for scarce funds among state agencies began. He noted that if you take into consideration adjustments for inflation and population, the State of Oregon's purchasing power is less today than in 1979. The general fund budget for FY 93-95 is \$60 million less for higher education with \$31 million of those dollars being replaced by lottery funds.

On the plus side, research money helped to offset the loss, but dramatic tuition increases caused an access problem for some students.

Senator Trow reminded faculty that higher education emerged from the last legislative session with a better budget than was originally thought possible, in part due to lottery dollars. Additional general fund dollars were also added to the governor's budget in the amount of \$20 million to help with the access problem, to reinstate some student services and to buy some academic services. The tuition increase resulted in students paying 40% of the instruction cost rather than the previous 25% which put student tuition in Oregon the highest on the West Coast. Trow stated that the next legislative session will be a crucial time for higher education.

After reviewing projections for FY 95-97, Representative Van Vliet felt it will be a "test of endurance" for the budget committees. The latest requirement of Measure 5 grows from \$1.566 billion to \$2.841 billion - the difference is the shortfall the budget will face. If all state agencies and schools were cut equally, K-12 would lose \$600 million and the remainder of state budget's would lose \$300 million. If schools are held harmless, the remaining budget's will need to be cut 23%. It currently takes \$8.3 billion to run state government, but there will only be about \$7.1 billion in revenues received which results in about a \$1.2 billion shortfall. Other disturbing items to factor in include:

- A possible SAIF payoff from the early 1980's which could run as high as \$68 billion.
- No resolution of whether PERS will come out of the PERS additional income or the general fund, which could range from \$9 to \$50 million.
- The State has also been targeted for several lawsuits from nursing home and hospital cases.
- The Oregon Health Plan, over \$200 million, will have to be funded.

Van Vliet encouraged faculty to be in the forefront to correct the public's misconceptions about higher education.

Senator Trow noted that, in comparison to budget problems during the 1980's, the Oregon economy is doing reasonably well which may translate to some additional revenue. Trow urged faculty to be more active in the Association of Oregon Faculty since it is a crucial group involved in the decision-making process. It's also time to be very conscious of elections and candidates for office.

There are three legislative committees looking at higher education: 1) Representative John Schoon is chairing a committee which will look at reform activities; 2) Representative Carolyn Oakley is chairing a House Education Committee concerned with the public school sector and Community Colleges, in particular the implementation

and assessment of the Public School Reform Bill 3565; and 3) Senator Catherine Webber will chair a committee to look at reforming higher ed. Senator Trow has been appointed to this committee.

Representative Van Vliet reported that the general feeling is that public education is not what it should be and should probably be replaced by a form of private education. After studying college records of Oregon legislators, Van Vliet found that 16 have no college experience, 43 hold Bachelor's degrees from public institutions (29 from Oregon) and 31 from private institutions. Of those holding advanced degrees from public institutions, 12 were from Oregon, 11 were from outside Oregon; from private institutions, 11 were from Oregon and 10 were from outside Oregon. Van Vliet finds it difficult to understand why higher education has such a tough time with their budget given the number of legislators who hold degrees.

Van Vliet suggested that the public must be educated on these issues: 1) the quality of education is directly related to the amount of funds available; 2) there is a relationship between class size and quality of teaching; and 3) as accessibility becomes more of an issue, more people feel that private institutions are the solution - this perception needs to be corrected.

Senator Trow expressed thanks to Representative Van Vliet for the service he's given us and to the State of Oregon and noted that it's been a pleasure working with him and he'll be missed.

Trow paid tribute to the Student Lobby for the immense help they have provided to educate legislators on higher education issues. Due to term limitations, new legislators will need to be educated quickly.

Van Vliet remarked that Oregon State government is more efficient and effective than other states' governments, but the perception is wrong due to some very vocal individuals.

Senator Holmes, Home Economics and Education, questioned what two tasks, in addition to joining AOF, would they ask of faculty. Van Vliet replied that two common misconceptions need to be addressed: 1) that faculty members have a lot of free time and 2) that the quality of education is not good. Trow replied that all faculty need to do their own job as well as they can to avoid productivity criticism and to be a more effective citizen by being involved, knowing what the issues are, who the candidates are and what the strategies are. After you have informed yourself, reach out and educate others.

IFS Representative Wilcox commented on Oregon's tax hell and the unsavory position higher ed is put in when competing for dollars with K-12 and corrections and asked how to correct the shortfall. Van Vliet stated that

other agencies are not bashful about going after money and the attention is focused on finding other solutions. When they realize that they can't easily cut higher ed, then other alternatives are considered. Trow noted that faculty should be concerned enough about what they are doing that the public will be impressed with higher ed.

When asked by Wilcox what they thought about Oregon's tax ranking, Trow felt it was a misperception deliberately placed by people who have an ideology against government and public services. He noted that for most people, Oregon is not a tax hell.

Report from the Executive Office

Provost Arnold's report included the following items:

- Congratulated the newly elected Faculty Senate members and officers. He also acknowledged Past President DeKock for his effective leadership during the last year.
- Introduced Dr. Joy Hughes, Associate Provost for Information Services, who began working at OSU on January 3.
- Noted the input and comments from Representative Van Vliet and Senator Trow as well as President Byrne's comments at the December Faculty Senate meeting.
- Budget - Administration knows very little more than when Dr. Byrne spoke to the Senate in December. What is known is that there has been continuing conversation between OSSHE and the Department of Administrative Services.

There have been no transmissions to or from the Chancellor's Office regarding specific guidelines for the preparation of 1995-97 budget proposals. Administration continues to anticipate that strategies with an emphasis on additional revenue resources through our own initiatives will be necessary, e.g. very aggressive approaches in student recruitment and retention. It is also anticipated that higher ed will be asked to respond to the continuing theme of productivity.

- Expects to submit OSU's plan for academic productivity and educational reform to the Chancellor's Office by March 1994. An interim report, submitted to Vice Chancellor Clark in December, outlined basic parameters which are anticipated to be included in the plan:
 - Summary of things that have happened to this point in time which either qualitatively or quantitatively can be legitimately claimed as educational reform or increases in productivity.
 - Short range elements included a strong emphasis on recruitment and retention.

- Expectation that each unit (level of colleges, departments and academic programs) would be asked to develop productivity plans with a timetable included in the March report.
- Intention to focus on intensive review of lower enrollment courses and internal duplication which may exist across various departments and colleges in terms of how effectively instructional resources are being utilized.
- Role and investment of educational technology will be a feature of the plan.
- Shift greater responsibility of learning process to students.
- The 2010 Advisory Panel is scheduling sessions on OSSHE campuses and members of the committee will meet at OSU on February 14. They will work with an invited group of approximately 60 individuals consisting of faculty, students, community members, and public education personnel. OSU faculty will include the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, faculty groups which have been working on these issues and a mix of department heads. In response to Senator Davis, Agriculture, Arnold replied that Les Swanson, OSBHE Vice President for Planning, would be the 2010 Chair.

Action Items

Approval of Parliamentarian

Motion 94-499-01 to approve Trischa Knapp, Speech Communication, as Parliamentarian passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Category I Proposal

Cheryl Jordan, Curriculum Council Chair, presented a Category I proposal to establish an interdisciplinary graduate minor in Earth Information Science and Technology (EIST). The Curriculum Council felt that several issues should be brought to the attention of the Senate: the proposal was well documented in the areas of implementation and administration of the minor and appears feasible; the minor would serve the needs of graduate students; the proposal documents an increased interest among graduate students in this area; the proposal would not require new or additional facilities, FTE or courses. Jordan noted that the proposal was approved by both the Graduate Council and the Curriculum Council. She mentioned that the program was jointly sponsored by Bioresource Engineering, Civil Engineering, Forest Resources, Forest Science and Geosciences.

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned whether students are, basically, in this program since the courses already

exist but not receiving the minor designation. Jon Kimerling, EIST Coordinating Committee Chair, responded that the courses are offered but no one is receiving credit for the program.

Motion 94-499-02 to approve the EIST interdisciplinary graduate minor was passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Academic Regulation Changes

Court Smith, Academic Regulations Chair, presented three recommendations for Senate approval. NOTE: Highlighted areas indicate additions and strike-through areas indicate deletions in the following sections containing the proposals.

Requirements for graduation with academic distinction

C. Graduates who have ~~been in attendance at Oregon State for at least two regular academic years and~~ achieved GPA's placing them in the lowest division (GPA's 3.50 to less than 3.70) graduate "cum laude," those in the middle division (GPA's of 3.70 to less than 3.85) graduate "magna cum laude," and those in the highest division (GPA's of 3.85 and above) graduate "summa cum laude."

Smith noted that prior to 1992 students received either "high" (minimum 3.25 GPA) or "highest" honors. After raising the GPA and instituting the above distinctions, those honored in 1992 dropped from 25% to 13% and in 1993 it dropped to 12%.

In an attempt to simplify things, the academic requirements for graduation were changed to state that students would graduate with only the OSU GPA. Since some students qualify to graduate with honors using only the OSU GPA, but don't meet the attendance requirement, the Academic Regulations Committee recommends that the attendance requirement be deleted. If this change had been in place last year, an additional 18 students would have graduated with honors which would raise the rate to 12.5%.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, questioned if this was an unintended consequence of the earlier GPA change. Smith replied that it was a consequence of requiring that just the OSU GPA be calculated.

Senator Gould, Science, questioned how many courses were involved for each of the 18 students who would have graduated with honors if the change had been in place in 1993. Barbara Balz, Registrar, responded that each student graduating from OSU must take a minimum of 45 credits at OSU.

Bruce Shepard, Academic Affairs, didn't feel it made sense to have a separate residency requirement to

graduate with honors.

Motion 93-499-03 to revise the above requirements passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

No Show Drop (AR 9)

c. If it is anticipated that the demand for enrollment in a given course will exceed the maximum number that can be accommodated, the department offering the course may designate it in the Schedule of Classes with the "NSHD" (no-show-drop). A student who is registered for such a course who attends no meetings of the course during the first five school days of the term ~~may~~ ~~will~~ be dropped from the course ~~at the option of~~ ~~by~~ the instructor, unless the student has obtained prior permission for absence. If such action is taken, the instructor will send written notice through the department to the Registrar's Office, which in turn will notify the student that the course has been dropped from his or her schedule. Students should not assume they have been dropped unless they receive notification from the Registrar's Office. No fee will be charged.

Smith explained that this change is at the request of the Academic Requirements Committee since the current procedure results in a large number of petitions. It also results in abuse by departments who list every course as NSHD.

In response to a question from Senator Davis, Engineering, Smith replied that it is likely that instructors will have to report some type of attendance if the class is listed as NSHD.

Senator Lee, Science, commented his class sizes range from 50-150 and he feels the change is completely unworkable from a faculty point of view.

Senator DeKock, Science, expressed concern that all responsibility is placed on the faculty member and no responsibility on the student and questioned whether this had been discussed. Smith responded that the general philosophy of the committee is that it is the student's responsibility of knowing where they stand. However, in this case, there needs to be communication between the department and the student concerning enrollment.

Senator Gamble questioned the rationale of restricting the policy to five days. Sharon Martin, Academic Regulations Committee member, explained that the wording pertaining to five days has been in existence for quite some time.

In response to a question from Senator Seville, Business, Smith responded that the NSHD policy is used on a per-course basis and does not have to be used department-wide. Martin mentioned that each department has the option of using NSHD, but is not required to use it.

IFS Representative Wilcox, asked if there would be benefits for increasing access to filled courses. Balz responded that waiting lists are not always successfully used. The current system maintains a waiting list, but there is no way to contact a student once a vacancy occurs. Waiting lists are easier to control when registration is on a given day, but are very difficult to control when it encompasses two months.

Senator Verts, Associated, felt that the regulation was written with ambiguous language. Martin commented that, unfortunately, students don't read the regulations completely.

Brian Clem, ASOSU President, questioned whether international students have a more difficult time interpreting regulations. Senator Dix, Associated, responded that the majority of the petitions come from lower division students who are new to higher education and are basing their decisions on one word, "may" or "will." Smith suspected that many faculty, as well as students, have not read all of the regulations which makes it necessary to have a system that is conceptually as clear as possible.

Senator DeKock moved the previous question, motion seconded. Motion 94-499-05 to move the previous question was approved by voice vote with several dissenting votes.

Motion 94-499-04 to approve the above revision to AR 9 passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.

Procedure for changing from A-F to S-U grading (AR 18)

(c) A student must obtain the approval of his or her academic advisor or dean in order to elect to be graded on an S-U basis in any course required in his or her major field. (Definition of courses which constitute the major field is the prerogative and responsibility of the department in which the student is majoring.)

Smith noted that the current rules are inaccurate since there are some minor requirements which require students to take graded courses. The objective is to encourage students to seek advice when changing from A-F to S-U grading since it could impact major and minor programs as well as future professional applications they may make.

Senator Stevens, Agriculture, found this proposal to be distasteful and encouraged its defeat.

Clem was initially opposed to the proposal, but after research, didn't feel it would hurt students since they currently need a stamp to change to S-U.

Martin noted that not all courses can be taken S-U and not all courses are so designated in the catalog. This

proposal would protect the student from potential problems at graduation time.

Senator Rathja, Engineering, questioned what would happen to a student who changes majors. Smith responded that the student would have to retake the course if it had been taken on an S-U basis when a grade was required. Rathja noted that many employers required grades and it's a problem for students changing majors if they have S-U graded courses.

Senator Gamble was not opposed to the proposal but was concerned about creating an atmosphere where students expect to be protected from beginning to end. They have to be taught to think and check protocol.

Balz commented that this is a process which can't be accomplished over the phone if students are required to get an advisor's approval.

Senator Leklem, Home Economics and Education, questioned whether it was the intent to allow the student to go to the Dean if they choose to not see their advisor. Smith felt that it reflects the procedure for various colleges since some colleges obtain approval at the college level and some don't.

Senator Leklem moved to amend the motion by striking the words "or dean." Motion 94-499-07 was seconded by Senator Lunch.

Clem felt that this amendment would make the regulation stricter since they could no longer just get their request stamped, but would have to meet with an advisor.

In response to a question about the intent of the motion, Smith responded that the current wording addresses only majors and the intent was to encourage students to also receive correct information for minors and program shifts.

Senator Leklem questioned whether the implication was that the person stamping the request should be aware of all the fine points. Smith replied that it gives the student a recourse if someone has stamped the request giving them permission.

Senator Zaerr, Forestry, commented that the concept is to protect the student but he believes that students learn by taking responsibility for themselves and was not in favor of the proposal. Smith stated that the committee was not trying to protect students from making mistakes but felt that the current wording was unclear.

Question was called for and seconded. Motion 94-499-09 to stop debate and vote on the amendment was approved by a show of hands.

Motion 94-499-07 to amend the motion by deleting "or dean" was rejected by a show of hands.

Motion 94-499-06 to approve the revision to AR 18, as printed above, passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Information Items

- Continuing Senators were asked to contact the Faculty Senate Office if they would like their Faculty Senate Handbook updated.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Oriard shared some thoughts for the coming year. He was struck by the fact that major changes are coming and, in the face of those changes, faculty must somehow forcefully emerge as the voice of education, not just higher education. Some of the changes, or transformations, will come very quickly and include:

- OSU becoming a more entrepreneurial university when faced with more budget cuts.
- Proposals for an Honors College and Ethnic Studies Department.
- A Productivity Task Force which includes language pertaining to educational reform and productivity which have come from the outside, not from faculty.

He noted that change is not necessarily good and it's up to faculty to be leaders, or at least sharers, in determining policies and to try to create good out of the changes.

Oriard sensed that those outside the university considering education reform are tending to think of faculty as a force of resistance. There may be some truth to that, but they are profoundly wrong if they think that the decisions affecting faculty can be made without faculty input.

He felt that the Faculty Senate's role exists in two areas: external and internal. Internally, he has been thinking about how the Senate has not been so good at truly representing fellow faculty members whether it's in bringing their concerns to the Senate or in the area of informing them of Senate proceedings. He is considering a one-page easily digestible periodic publication from the Faculty Senate to all faculty which will lay out issues affecting the Senate and faculty. He also commented on the power and effectiveness of the Faculty Senate which is located in its committee structure. He encouraged the widest possible participation on the part of faculty on Senate committees.

The external role he's thought about will somewhat echo Senator Trow's and Representative Van Vliet's earlier comments. While at an AAUP meeting, he learned of an External Relations Committee at Indiana University. A committee of this sort might monitor the media and routinely respond to misinformation and misperceptions

that were spoken about earlier. He has been struck by the fact that the faculty is more credible than administration or the Chancellor's Office. This type of committee might also establish liaisons with other education groups, alumni groups, and community and business groups.

He noted that, although the Legislature is not in session, faculty need to position themselves for the next session and next round of budget cuts.

Oriard announced that there will be a Faculty Forum with Chancellor Bartlett on January 20. This meeting was requested by the Chancellor to give him a chance to hear concerns from OSU's faculty.

He reminded Senators that the February 14 meeting with members of the 2010 Advisory Panel will be by invitation only, but faculty should follow the proceedings of this group.

President Oriard concluded by saying that Senate sessions and committees need to be as focused as possible.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:10.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant