

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 1996 Minutes

Document is over 40 pages. Use caution when printing.

1996 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 5](#)
- [November 7](#)
- [October 3](#)
- [June 6](#)
- [May 2](#)
- [April 4](#)
- [March 7](#)
- [February 1](#)
- [January 11](#)

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

1996 No. 525

Oregon State University

December 5, 1996

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm by President Ken Krane. There were no corrections to the minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Committee Reports: Faculty Recognition and Awards, Curriculum Council, and Election Results
- Action Items - The following items were approved: Executive Committee Election Results, Revision to AR 25, Bylaws Change, and two Category I Proposals — "A Graduate Degree Program in Environmental Sciences: The Oregon State Contribution to a Joint-Campus Graduate Degree Program in Environmental Sciences, Studies, and Policy" and "Joint-Campus Graduate Program for Environmental Sciences, Studies, and Policy" [Motion 96-525-01 through 06]
- New Business - A request to change Faculty Senate composition was referred to the Committee on Bylaws and Nominations; a recommendation to President Risser concerning athletic hiring was approved [Motion 96-525-07]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Jenkins, P. Thomson; Oriard, K. Ahearn; and Wander, C. Georgiou.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Boyer, Burke, Calder, Calvert, Chambers, Cheeke, Christie, Cowles, L. Davis, Dodrill, A. Duncan, R. Duncan, Falkner, Farnsworth, Fletcher, Griffiths, Hu, Humphrey, Ingham, Johnson, Leid, Leong, Liebowitz, Lundin, Macnab, McAlexander, McDaniel, Mills, A. Mix, Pacheco, Rathja, Riggs, Rosenberger, Rudolph, Sanderson, Sandine, Savage, Sproul, Stander, Tiger, Torres, and Vuchinich.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; A. Wilcox, President-Elect; T. Doler, Parliamentarian pro-tem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

L. Burns, J. Beck, D. Johnson, N. Wendt, and B. Winner.

noted that calls for nominations for various faculty awards have been sent to the DDD list.

Olson presented a proposed OSU Service Faculty Award, which was included in the Senate agenda, and asked for feedback from Senators. He explained that the proposed award arose as a result of the committee's responsibility to look for conspicuous absences of recognition. The committee realized that a large number of non-traditional faculty are not eligible for other awards since their position does not primarily require teaching and research, but would be eligible for the proposed award.

Senator Delson, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, felt that this award was needed and requested that it be moved forward.

Curriculum Council

Bob Burton, Chair, explained that the Council's time is divided between three activities:

- Policy making
- Undergraduate Program Reviews
- Proposals — Category I proposals for new programs require a preproposal and approval by the Senate; Category II proposals are required for new courses

Burton noted that all Curriculum Council matters can be found on the Web (minutes, forms, proposal status, policies) at:

<http://robertsc.ads.orst.edu/aa/curric/index.htm>

Faculty Senate Election Results

Sally Francis, Committee on Bylaws and Nominations Chair, thanked the ballot-counting committee: Mary Prucha, Hans van der Mars, Mark Kramer, and Janet Nishihara.

Francis announced that Maggie Niess, Professor and Department Chair, Science and Math Education, had been elected President-Elect and that Carroll DeKock, Professor and Department Chair, Chemistry had been elected to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative position.

Committee Reports

Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee

Jon Olson, Chair, explained that this committee spends most of its time considering nominees for awards and

Action Items

Executive Committee Election

Those running for two-year terms were: Judy Burrigde,

Bruce Coblentz, Steve Davis, Irma Delson, Larry Griggs, Barbara McEwan, and Loretta Rielly.

Ballots were distributed and counted during the meeting. Those elected were: Bruce Coblentz (Professor, Fisheries & Wildlife), Irma Delson (No Rank, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences), and Larry Griggs (Associate Professor & Director, Educational Opportunities Program).

Proposed Revision to Academic Regulation 25

Nancy Wendt, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, presented the following proposed clarification and addition (highlighted sections indicate proposals):

Clarification:

AR25.g. Restrictions: *maximum credits applicable toward degree*

Addition:

AR25.g. (6) *Academic Learning Service courses: maximum 15 credits*

The addition was requested by the University Curriculum Committee to limit the number of Academic Learning Service (ALS) courses which can be applied to the baccalaureate degree; the Academic Regulations Committee agreed with their request. Since ALS courses are deemed to be skill-building courses rather than discipline based courses, the intent was to limit ALS courses so that no more than 15 skill-building credits would be applied to the degree and the remaining credits would consist of discipline-based courses.

Senator Gamble, Science, requested the rationale for the decision to limit the number of credits and questioned whether this applied to electives. Wendt responded that the limit does apply to electives. She explained that the rationale for 15 credits is the equivalent of one term and noted there was no limit on the number which could be taken, but only 15 ALS credits would be applied toward a degree.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, expressed concern over skill-building courses vs. disciplinary courses; he felt that disciplinary courses also build skills. He proposed that there be a distinction between transcript visible ALS courses and ALS courses which count for credit. He amended the motion to delete section 6 and substitute "*Academic Learning Service courses count transcript visible but not for a credit.*" He explained that this amendment would require all ALS courses to appear on the transcript but none would count for credit. After Senator Balz, Associated, stated that any course taken by a student for credit is transcript visible, Senator Foster then amended AR25.g. section 6 from "*15 credits*" to "*zero credits*" and add a requirement that they be transcript visible. The amendment was seconded.

In response to Senator Landau, Science, requesting examples of ALS courses, Senator Nishihara, Associated, provided a partial listing: freshman orientation, student

athlete orientation, some EOP courses, critical reading analysis, and leadership courses.

Senator Matzke, Science, felt that many had never heard of ALS courses and requested some background and also asked if there would be an opportunity for other units to implement ALS courses, such as an introduction to computer courses. Burton responded that ALS courses are overseen by Leslie Burns in Academic Affairs and intended to be study skills courses. He noted that the ALS designator was used by other state-system institutions and a decision was made last fall to implement it at OSU.

Senator DeKock, Science, requested a history of ALS courses. Wendt responded that Gary Tiedeman, Liberal Studies Director, reviewed the courses containing the Liberal Studies designator and discovered that many courses did not belong in that category; some were legitimate skill-building courses, but clearly did not belong in Liberal Studies. Tiedeman explained he was charged with streamlining and adding academic authenticity to the Liberal Studies program. He found that many courses which had previously been labeled with a UNIV designator were replaced with a Liberal Studies designator when the UNIV designator was discontinued. Tiedeman enlisted the aid of Walter Loveland, then Curriculum Council chair, whose research discovered an ALS designator at the University of Oregon. The UofO approach was then incorporated at OSU and, at the request of the Curriculum Council, all courses were reviewed and Liberal Studies/ALS determinations were made. In response to DeKock's question, Tiedeman stated that, previously, all Liberal Studies courses were counted for credit.

Motion 96-525-02 to amend the motion was defeated overwhelmingly by voice vote.

In response to a question requesting the number of students who may exceed the 15 credit limit, Balz responded that last year there were probably between 15-20 students who exceeded 12 ALS credits.

Motion 96-525-01 to approve the AR25.g. proposals as originally presented passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Proposed Bylaws Change

Sally Francis, Committee on Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented the following Bylaws proposals (highlighted sections indicate proposed additions):

Article VII: Executive Committee, Sec. 1. Membership: The Executive Committee shall consist of the Senate President, the Senate President-Elect, the Provost and Executive Vice President, or that person's designee, the Immediate Past President as Ex-Officio, and six others elected from the membership of the Faculty Senate. *The elected Executive Committee members shall retain their seats for the remainder of their Senate terms.*

Article IV: Members, Sec. 3. Ex-Officio Members.

The President of the University, the Provost and Executive Vice President, Interinstitutional Faculty Senators, immediate past president, and any Executive Committee member whose term in the Senate has expired shall be Ex-Officio voting members of the Faculty Senate.

She explained that the intent of these proposals was to clarify that Executive Committee members will complete their elected Senate term and that voting privileges are extended to Ex-Officio Senate members.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, proposed a friendly amendment, which was seconded, to insert "Faculty Senate" in Article VII to clarify that it was the Senate seat that was being retained rather than the Executive Committee seat. The amendment would read as follows:

The elected Executive Committee members shall retain their Faculty Senate seats for the remainder of their Senate terms.

Motion 96-525-04 to approve the friendly amendment was passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 96-525-03 to approve the proposals, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Category I Proposals

Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented two Category I proposals: "A Graduate Degree Program in Environmental Sciences: The Oregon State Contribution to a Joint-Campus Graduate Degree Program in Environmental Sciences, Studies, and Policy" and "Joint-Campus Graduate Program for Environmental Sciences, Studies, and Policy." Burton noted that these proposals have undergone extensive review and taken five years to develop. These replace the former Environmental Biology Program in General Science.

Burton explained that, since modifications are anticipated, the Graduate School has agreed to an intensive five-year review.

Senator Coblentz, Agricultural Sciences, felt that there was nothing unique about this proposal and stated that this program was duplicated in other areas. Bill Winner, Botany & Plant Pathology, disagreed with Coblentz and felt that the existing program in Fisheries & Wildlife could not approach the scope or the intent of the proposals, which brings together a synthesis of life science, physical science, and social science.

President Krane reminded Senators that they are not being asked to approve the listed proposed courses nor the actual degree curricula in the proposal since those items will need approval from the Curriculum Council.

Senator Delson, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, highlighted the need for this program by stating that she receives 3-5 calls per week inquiring whether OSU

offers a Ph.D. program in environmental sciences. Winner stated that although the program has not been approved or advertised, he has sent over 100 letters in response to inquiries about a graduate program in this area. He also noted that enrollment in the environmental sciences undergraduate program has increased to almost 300 majors in three years.

Motion 96-525-05 to approve the OSU proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

In response to Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, questioning whether the state-wide proposal has been approved elsewhere, Krane stated that Portland State University and the University of Oregon have already approved their version of the proposal. Provost Arnold noted that PSU already has authorization for a Ph.D. degree, but does not yet have a Master's authorization.

Motion 96-525-06 to approve the joint campus proposal was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Information Items

- New Senator Orientation — Orientation will be held January 9, 1997 from 1:00-2:30 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center Agricultural Leaders Room.
- Faculty Senate Handbook Return — All Senators whose terms end in December are asked to return their handbooks to the Faculty Senate Office to be updated and redistributed to new Senators.
- University Awards — Materials containing information about the following awards have been sent to Deans, Directors, and Department Heads:
 - OSU Alumni Association 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
 - D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award
 - OSU Distinguished Service Award

Nomination materials for the last two awards are due February 7; the deadline for the remaining awards are due February 14.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold congratulated the newly elected officers and Executive Committee members and thanked President Krane and the outgoing Executive Committee members for their contributions.

The Provost's report included the following:

Governor's Budget Recommendations — The budget

proposal includes a continuation of the current service levels plus an investment package. The philosophy used in formulating the proposal referenced the necessity of making investments in schools, roads, and parks to preserve livability and opportunity for the future. The press release accompanying the budget stated that a key to the Governor's plan is to retain extra revenue generated by Oregon's excellent economy and reinvest it in schools, from Kindergarten through higher education.

The higher education elements of the budget takes as its starting point what was budgeted for the 1995-97 biennium, plus inflationary assessments for most parts of the budget, and adds a number of specifically targeted areas for investment. Programmatic elements of the higher ed budget currently supported by lottery funds are shifted to the general fund; in doing so, inflationary increases were not included in those budgets.

The higher ed investment strategy proposes investment of additional revenues. Arnold quoted, "The Governor's recommended budget reflects his commitment to support quality education for Oregonians. All existing campuses and programs are maintained. In all but a few cases, higher education programs are budgeted to stay even with inflation. This includes additional funding to cover extraordinary inflationary increases and the cost of library materials." The proposed \$27 million investment package for higher ed is broken down as follows (dollar amounts are in millions):

- Freeze tuition for resident undergraduates - \$8.5 (Tuition would increase 3.5% per year if not frozen.)
- Fighting fund for faculty salary competitiveness - \$7.5
- Engineering education in the Portland metro area - \$9.0
- Workforce investment for food processing sector - \$1.0
- Scholarships for low income students - \$1.0

The investment opportunities hinge on the ability to direct excess revenues rather than being returned to income tax payers via the 2% kicker. Arnold stated that the proposed investments will require strong external support from constituents.

The Provost cautioned that the system budget is distributed to institutions based on the basic allocation system, of which enrollment is a important element. Even if the state system fares well in the budget process, OSU needs to increase enrollment so our allocation is not reduced.

Arnold noted that the proposed higher education budget is simply a starting point for legislative discussion. However, he felt this was the best starting point in several sessions.

Ballot Measure 47 — Arnold stated that BM 47 creates a substantial impact on local units of government, such as counties which cooperatively support the OSU Extension Service; there is nothing in the Governor's proposed budget which would offset the impacts. He noted there have been some reports of legal challenges to BM 47.

When Provost Arnold opened the floor to questions, Senator Matzke, Science, inquired how affirmative action interacts with Athletics during the hiring of head coaches. Arnold responded that there is a provision within affirmative action rules which allows Athletics to move forward on a "fast track" approach for searches. The basis for those decisions concern avoiding a period of time where there is an absence of leadership in a program area. He noted that Athletics does work with the Affirmative Action Office in the approval of the fast track approach, and the University president is also involved.

Senator Gamble, Science, felt that the fast track approach was not justified and gave examples of several coaches who were not hired quickly.

Senator Woods, Engineering, understood the need to move quickly, but suggested a search committee be utilized for hiring. Provost Arnold noted that the fast track approach to hiring is not limited to OSU; this is a process that is widely employed in athletics hiring.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, expressed the need to have African American coaches considered for vacancies.

President-elect Wilcox stated that he sits on the Athletic Advisory Board, whose charge includes participating in the process of selection of coaches. However, he pointed out that hiring of two coaches in the last year did not include involvement by the Board during the selection process.

Senator Plant, Engineering, commended President Risser on behalf of the faculty, for his efforts in presenting the recent Engineering proposal to the State Board.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane's report included the following comments:

- Recognition and thanks to outgoing Senators, outgoing Executive Committee members (Maggie Niess, John Lee, Russ Dix, and Sally Francis), and outgoing Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative (Mary Alice Seville) for their service to the Senate. He also congratulated the new Executive Committee members and thanked all those who were not elected, but agreed to place their name in nomination.
- Thanks to Thurston Doler for filling in as Parliamentarian.
- A teach-in will be held January 13-24, in conjunction with the Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration. Resource and teaching guides will be available on the Web.
- The Executive Committee is forming a task force to study post-tenure review. He requested volunteers or suggestions of faculty who may be willing to study the issue.

New Business

Faculty Senate Composition

Senator Gamble, Science, explained that he had been approached by a faculty member who expressed concern about the composition of the Senate and felt it should be changed. Gamble stated that originally the Senate consisted of faculty with professorial rank, most without administrative duties. The Senate has evolved to the current composition which includes faculty without professorial rank. Gamble then read the following statement:

I have been requested by a faculty member, who is not a member of the seante, to request the following. The current Faculty Senate is in actuality a University Senate. Therefore, it is proposed that an Academic Senate, whose members shall be professorial ranked faculty and faculty research assistants who do not have formal administrative assignments. I am therefore requesting this proposal be placed on the December 5, 1996 Faculty Senate meeting for action by the Senate.

Gamble noted he had spoken with the faculty member requesting the above and informed him that Faculty Senate composition is currently under consideration and has been a problem for quite awhile.

President Krane explained that, according to the Bylaws, this issue must be referred to the Committee on Bylaws and Nominations and asked for comments or suggestions.

Senator Tiedeman suggested that the words "be created" be placed between "Academic Senate" and "whose members" in the third sentence of the statement. He also requested that the committee expand their consideration to discuss what would happen to this body if the composition were changed as suggested and what the associated consequences of the organization would be.

Krane noted that the Committee on Bylaws and Nominations last year discussed including Faculty Research Assistants in Senate apportionment and decided not to take action at that time. Krane also felt it was not appropriate to exclude No Rank faculty, many of whom have academic duties, as this proposal recommends.

Athletic Hiring

Senator Woods, Engineering, moved the following which was seconded by Senator Gamble:

"The Faculty Senate develop a recommendation to the President to require a search committee for positions in the athletic program.

Senator Landau proposed a friendly amendment, which was accepted, to insert the word "faculty" prior to "positions."

Immediate Past President Sally Francis questioned who would develop the recommendation. Francis proposed a friendly amendment, which was accepted, to delete "develop a recommendation to" and insert "recommends."

Motion 96-525-07 to forward the following recommendation to President Risser was approved by voice vote.

"The Faculty Senate recommends to the President to require a search committee for faculty positions in the athletic program."

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1996 No. 524

Oregon State University

November 7, 1996

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm by President Ken Krane. There were no corrections to the minutes. President Krane thanked Thurston Doler for serving as Parliamentarian.

Meeting Summary

- Committee Reports: Salary Equity Study and Faculty Economic Welfare
- Action Items - The following items were approved: [Motion 96-524-01 through 02]
- New Business - There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Chambers, J. Averill; Hale, R. Foster; Headrick, R. Iltis; Johnson, K. Cheek; Leong, L. Whiteman; Lundy, C. Bell; Mukatis, R. Graham; Pereira, J. Arthur; Ragulsky, K. Smith; Ratchford, E. Hansen; Savonen, K. Kingsley; and Stander, R. Sharp.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Balz, Beach, Bentley, Boyer, Calder, Christie, Cowles, L. Davis, DeKock, R. Duncan, Falkner, Gaines, Griggs, Hu, Jenkins, Knight, J. Lee, Liebowitz, Lomax, Lunch, Macnab, McAlexander, T. Miller, Pacheco, Peters, Riggs, Rudolph, Sandine, Savage, Suzuki, Tiger, Todd, Torres, Tricker, Vuchinich, Woods, Wrolstad, and Zollinger.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; A. Wilcox, President-Elect; T. Doler, Parliamentarian pro-tem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

J. Beck, K. Heath, J. Herzog, and H. Sayre.

Special Reports

Salary Equity Study Committee

Kathy Heath, Salary Equity Study Committee Chair, explained that the committee was appointed by Associate Provost Hashimoto as a result of a report produced in 1993 by the President's Commission on the Status of Women which contained 12 recommendations. One recommendation was to conduct a salary equity study of faculty salaries to identify gender bias; the most recent formal salary equity analysis was in 1972.

Provost Arnold established the Salary Equity Planning Committee to propose a model for a salary equity study of faculty women's salaries. The model contained the following components:

- Comparator Study — 1) statistical analysis (such as multiple regression) and 2) comparator analyses (comparing women/minority faculty with male/Caucasian comparators on a variety of factors.
- Faculty — limited to tenured and tenure-track Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor.
- Purpose — gender-bias.

The Committee's review consisted of a recently completed gender equity study from the University of Wisconsin, national data, and AAUP information. They also developed a series of questions and a draft 1996 Plan and Guidelines for a Comparator Study of Salary Equity for Women and Ethnic/Racial Minorities in the Professorial Ranks which were distributed to Deans and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The draft was then modified based on input received. An external reviewer, Economic Research Services, Inc. (ERS), reviewed the overall plan and method proposed. The plan, which was available at the meeting, was approved by Provost Arnold in October 1996. Heath explained that the Committee chose to vary from the original proposal to include an ethnic/racial minority review.

The analysis shall be conducted at the college/unit level by a Salary Equity Study Committee (SESC) composed of five to seven tenured or tenure-track faculty with professorial rank, with at least one woman and one person of color.

- Each SESC shall receive a list of all faculty in the departments within the college/unit by race/ethnicity, gender, rank, hire date, rank date, date of terminal degree, and annualized salary rate. Each SESC may request and use other data, as it deems necessary.
- Each SESC shall submit to the executive administrator or dean a final report of its salary equity analysis and recommendations. Based on the information provided by the SESC, the administrator/dean shall determine what equity allocation, if any, is appropriate for each faculty member reviewed. The administrator/dean shall provide both the SESC report and his/her own recommendations for equity adjustments to the Associate Provost.
- Once approved by the Associate Provost, each administrator/dean shall notify the appropriate

department chairs/heads of the outcomes and recommendations for their units. Department chairs/heads shall inform individual faculty members of the outcome of the comparator analysis in her/his specific case.

- Informal faculty appeals of the outcome of the comparator analysis would be directed to the Provost. The Provost shall respond to the grievant within 15 days.
- Salary adjustments based on the salary equity study shall be allocated during the scheduled January 1–February 1, 1997 mid-year faculty salary adjustments.

Heath noted that there are 259 white women and 79 people of color to be reviewed during this process. She mentioned that fixed-term faculty are not included in this analysis and stated that the committee presumes that this group will be reviewed at some time in the future.

Heath reminded Senators that 4% of the self-funded 6% salary increase was targeted for equity and other adjustments.

Faculty Economic Welfare Committee

Jim Herzog, Faculty Economic Welfare Committee Chair, explained that the committee is involved in faculty salaries, retirement, insurance programs, and other economic benefits.

During the past year the committee provided input on the IRS 415 resolution and was involved in the implementation details of the optional retirement program. They also were involved in changes to the PERS system as it relates to retirement computations and made salary recommendations which consisted of 4% across-the-board and 2% for merit and inequities.

Items before the committee during 1996/97 include a possible merger between the FEWC and the Retirement Committee, a study of inequities in the optional retirement program which consists of a sizable inequity which directly affects non-vested employees, and inequities in PERS for new employees who are paid over 9 months vs. 12 months. Ongoing activities include monitoring salary-related issues, creation of a Web site to disseminate information to faculty, and possible involvement of issues which may be impacted by Ballot Measure 47.

Senator Landau, Science, suggested that, to help educate the Legislature, it would be useful to have documents on the Web showing that OSSHE faculty are on the bottom of the salary scale.

Action Items

1997 Apportionment Table

OSU FTE in the ranks of Instructor or above, including No Rank faculty and Sr. Faculty Research Assistants, as of October 17, 1996, totalled 1816.448 or 129 Senators which reflects an overall increase of 4 Senators from 1996 (1 Senator = 14 FTE). Motion 96-524-

01 to approve the apportionment table passed by voice vote with no objections.

Faculty Senate Nominations/Elections

Sally Francis, Committee on Bylaws and Nominations Chair, thanked the committee members, Lita Verts, Ray Tricker and Jo-Ann Leong, for their hard work and help in identifying candidates. In response to Francis asking for assistance in counting ballots on December 4, the following Senators volunteered: Hans van der Mars, Mary Prucha, Janet Nishihara, and Mark Kramer.

She then presented the slate of nominees:

President-elect — Nominees recommended were: Maggie Niess (Professor and Department Chair, Science & Math Education) and Sandra Woods (Associate Professor, Civil, Construction & Environmental Engineering). There were no nominees from the floor.

Executive Committee — Nominees recommended were: Judy Burrige (Professor and Staff Chair, Linn County Extension), Bruce Coblentz (Professor, Animal Sciences), Steve Davis (Professor, Animal Sciences), Irma Delson (Head Advisor, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences), Larry Griggs (Associate Professor and Director, Educational Opportunities Program), Barbara McEwan (Assistant Professor, Education), and Loretta Rielly (Associate Professor, Information Services). There were no nominees from the floor.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Representative — Nominees recommended were: Carroll DeKock (Professor and Chair, Chemistry) and Henry Sayre (Professor, Art).

Motion 96-524-02 to approve the nominations as presented passed by voice vote with no objections.

Annual Reports

The agenda contained annual reports from the following committees:

- Instructional Media Committee
- Student Recognition and Awards Committee

Information Items

- Senator Attendance Summaries for 1995/96 were sent to Deans and heads of apportionment units and are also available in the Faculty Senate Office and the Valley Library Reserve Book Room. If individuals are eligible to be re-elected to the Faculty Senate, faculty may view

this report to determine representation received from each Senator during the past year.

- A copy of the "Instructions for Nomination and Election of Faculty Senators" which was sent to heads of all voting units was included in the agenda.

- A memo was included from President Krane responding to recent inquiries regarding the status of ROTC representation in the Faculty Senate.
- Nominations for the 1997 OSU Distinguished Professor Award are due December 2. Contact George Bailey at 737-3164 for information.
- The October IFS recap was sent via e-mail to Senators.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold's report included the following:

Enrollment — The current edition of OSU THIS WEEK contains an enrollment article which shows a decrease of 377 students compared to last fall. He stated that the University is working on the recruitment and retention challenge and noted that there a number of people currently working on this issue.

Post Election Observations — Preliminary counts indicate that ballot measures relating to public employees (BM 41 – compensation reporting and BM 45 – retirement age and benefits) have been defeated by almost 2 to 1 in each case. Measures aimed at government processes (BM 27 – legislative approval of rules adopted by government agencies; BM 29 – ratification of governor's appointees; and BM 46 – requires a majority of registered voters to approve tax measures) also appear to have been defeated by significant margins. Ballot Measure 47, the cut and cap measure, appears to be passing.

Arnold emphasized it was important to remember that voters were discerning among various measures and that BM 47 was, first and foremost, about property taxes. He felt that the issue of property taxes would clearly be on the political agenda for the next legislative session. Arnold mentioned that the consequences of passage of BM 47 for higher education are unknown at this point. He noted that the Legislature will determine if there will be replacement dollars to schools and local units of government which now rely on property taxes, and to what extent; if other revenue sources will be identified or developed; and the distribution of any reductions in existing budgets in order to provide replacement funds.

In contrasting the post-BM 47 with the post-BM 5 environment, he stated there is currently a strong investment philosophy being advocated by the Governor and the recognition of the importance of investing in the future of the State, including education and specifically higher education. There is a wide-spread understanding that higher education has suffered disproportionately from disinvestment and a recognition that reinvestment is a priority during the next legislative session. Because of the uncertainties of the election outcomes and impacts and due to higher education's very strong positioning for investment in the next legislative session, there is no emergency or contingency plan for: targeted reductions, cancellation of faculty salary increases, hiring increases, etc.

(per Dr. Arnold)

Under President Risser's leadership, Provost Arnold stressed that OSU will continue to focus on three goals: 1) developing a compelling learning environment for students, 2) improving the recognized quality of OSU, that is, the stature of OSU nationally, and 3) serving all of Oregon as the campus of Oregon State University. The challenge is to join together in pursuit of these goals.

In response to a question from Past President Francis concerning salary increases, Provost Arnold stated that nowhere in the plan does the term "across-the-board" appear.

Senator Williams, Agricultural Sciences, questioned the possibility of program elimination. Arnold responded that the OSBHE has consistently stated that program eliminations must be avoided at all costs due to the long recovery from the appearance of program instability.

President-elect Wilcox questioned the interpretation of enrollment figures from a budgetary standpoint. Arnold responded that the Chancellor's Office holds back an enrollment reserve and releases the reserve when the institution meets the enrollment target; he doesn't anticipate that OSU will receive the reserve this year. He noted that OSU's budget was prepared with the assumption that the target would be met and the reserve would be received. The consequence of not receiving the enrollment reserve is that OSU emergency reserves would be eliminated.

Senator Griffiths, Science, compared Oregon's population of today with 30 years ago, but noted that enrollment at OSU is about the same as 30 years ago. Arnold felt that current overall enrollment in post-secondary enrollment needs to be factored in, including community colleges which were not present 30 years ago, as well as tracking the high school graduation pattern. Arnold noted there has been an uneven enrollment pattern at OSU and reminded Senators that, at one point, the State Board imposed enrollment ceilings which reduced OSU's enrollment, followed by the passage of Measure 5 and a sharp rise in tuition and program instability issues. He also mentioned that OSU has not been competitive in student recruitment efforts in the past and needs to be more proactive in student recruitment and retention.

Senator Collins, Liberal Arts, reported that OSU's Colleges of Liberal Arts and Science were omitted from an OSSHE document publicizing available disciplines to high school students. She questioned what effect this may have on enrollment and asked how the omission will be handled. Associate Vice Provost Hashimoto stated that they are trying to correct the omission and get information to high schools.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane's report included the following:

- An active and current Faculty Senate Web site is expected fairly soon.

freezes

- In light of Ballot Measure 47, faculty need to have more active representation state-wide and were encouraged to affiliate with AAUP or AOF which can act as spokesperson's on political issues.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:24.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1996 No. 523

Oregon State University

October 3, 1996

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Ken Krane. The minutes were approved after correcting the name of a guest to reflect Mike Kinch rather than Mike Hench.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports: Provost Roy Arnold
- Committee Reports: Instructional Development and Technology Committee and Promotion and Tenure Committee
- Action Items: There were no action items.
- New Business: There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Burridge, B. Smiley; Foster, M. Becker; Headrick, R. Iltis; Hightower, T. Wirth; P. Lee, C. Manuelito-Kerkvliet; Locke, R. Hathaway; Mukatis, R. Graham; Ragulsky, K. Smith; and Schowalter, R. Dick.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bentley, Boyer, Burke, Cheeke, Christie, Cowles, Duncan, Farber, Fletcher, Hu, Humphrey, Ingham, Jenkins, Knight, J. Lee, Liebowitz, Macnab, Madsen, McAlexander, S. Miller, T. Miller, A. Mix, M. Mix, Nishihara, Pacheco, Rudolph, Sandine, Torres, Williamson, and Zollinger.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; A. Wilcox, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

J. Beck, L. Burns, J. Hendricks, Z. Holmes, D. Johnson, and D. Nicodemus.

Special Reports

"Looking Ahead"

To kick off the new academic year Provost and Executive Vice President Roy Arnold shared thoughts about the coming year. He began by noting recent personnel changes:

- Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs — Leslie Davis Burns

- Director of Marketing — Jill Schuster (will begin in mid-October) – the initial emphasis of her work will be on student recruiting
- Vice Provost for Research — Dean Dalrymple is chairing the search committee. Dr. Keller will retire at the end of the calendar year, but is willing to continue beyond December on a 600-hour appointment until his successor arrives.
- International Programs — Dr. Van de Water will assume responsibility for the overall leadership and coordination of the international programs area, formerly included in the Vice Provost for Research and International Programs position. He will also continue as the Dean of the Office of International Education and will serve as a member of the Academic Deans Council.

Arnold stated there are many changes and initiatives within higher education and noted that those changes will build on the current core of OSU. He briefly mentioned some of the change initiatives in the recent past which have impacted OSU:

- The Extended Education initiative is significant in influencing the direction of planning.
- The University AIMS document regarding: 1) Quality; 2) Stakeholder Value; and 3) Diversity.
- Investment Strategies in planning the FY '97 OSU budget: 1) Student Recruitment/Retention; 2) Marketing; and 3) Extended Education. These were targeted for investment since all have the possibility of increasing future revenues.

Arnold referred to a letter from President Risser to Chancellor Cox where he reiterated the importance of the three investment strategies and added the following initiatives relating to the planning of educational programs in partnership with clients and stakeholders:

- Greater flexibility in courses and schedules
- An improved learning environment
- Greater access to OSU programs, including off-campus and the Portland metropolitan area
- Focussing a significant part of OSU's research programs on issues important to the State of Oregon.

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education has also been engaged in a planning process which began in December 1995 and initially consisted of the following task forces: Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education and Research, Community and Economic Development, and Life-long Learning and Professional Development. The task force reports resulted in the Board considering a number of possible actions to achieve the

report recommendations. The Board identified 17 strategies at the June 1996 meeting which are grouped into three areas: 1) Access and Affordability; 2) Economic Linkages; and 3) Other Immediate Initiatives. The strategies were then assigned to Solution Teams whose members consist of individuals from OSSHE institutions and representatives from business and industry.

Arnold mentioned several examples of identified strategies whose themes parallel OSU's planning process or President Risser's initiatives:

- State system and community college capacity, access, transfer, and admissions policies
- Academic schedule and calendar flexibility
- Graduate education and research which focusses on the orientation of graduate and research activities on high priority Oregon initiatives and the investments needed to ensure appropriate capacity in graduate programs in those areas.
- How OSSHE can provide greater graduate education and research capability in the Portland metropolitan area.
- Provide a critical mass in engineering education and research and to raise programs to a national ranking through investment and consolidation.
- Availability of professional development and life-long learning opportunities.
- Faculty and staff salaries — to achieve a level nationally that is competitive on a national basis to attract and retain the best faculty and staff.

Arnold reported that the OSBHE 1997-99 biennial budget request was adopted in July. The request consists of:

- 1) A Continuation Budget, defined as essential program investments to maintain existing OSSHE programs and services.
- 2) Policy Program Option Proposals, which include:
 - a) Unclassified Salary Adjustments (\$45 million for the biennium) described as step 1 in a plan to raise OSSHE faculty salaries to the national average over the next three biennium
 - b) Management Service/Classified Salary Plan
 - c) Freeze instruction fees due to inflation costs built into the continuation budget and to fund salary increases
 - d) Access funding (about \$40 million) in two parts: 2/3 goes toward traditional academic year, on-campus based programs, and 1/3 goes toward non-traditional academic programs
 - e) Instructional Technology (\$20 million) — the feeling is that since students are contributing a substantial amount of money toward instructional technology, the State should provide matching funds
 - f) Targeted Job Growth and Workforce Needs Investment — Program areas identified as possible high demand, high need program areas, such as software engineering, environmental sciences, physical therapy, etc., which needs an additional investment if they are to be offered
 - g) Collaborative partnerships with community colleges, K-12, and with human and criminal justice service agencies of the State of Oregon

- h) State-wide public service investments at OSU — Agricultural Experiment Station, Forest Research Lab, and Extension Service (about \$14.7 million).

The Governor's recommendations are not yet known, but it's felt that his theme will be investing in Oregon's future and he has specifically identified the 2% "kicker" as a source for investment; we must convince the public that this will be a wise investment. Education is at the top of the Governor's list of priorities for investment and defines education as the total sector, which includes higher education.

Arnold then proceeded to focus on OSU program areas which are consistent with OSSHE and OSBHE themes:

- The joint engineering program, with OSU as a lead
- The Business 2+2 program, with OSU as a lead
- Planning for the joint software engineering program with PSU and the U of O
- Planning for the joint physical therapy program with OHSU

Student Recruiting — Arnold noted that the report has been received from the Student Recruiting Review Team which was on campus last spring. As a result of the report, a set of implementation strategies have been developed. He noted considerable staff effort with respect to the strategies including involvement from the Faculty Senate Academic Advising Council and Undergraduate Education Council as well as the Academic Dean's Council.

Student Retention — Dr. Arnold stated that if the attrition rate had been reduced by one-half four years ago, the cumulative effect on OSU's budget would have been \$45 million over that period. This points out the importance of retaining students at OSU; a strong linkage between students and faculty is an important aspect of retention. Arnold noted that the Aims of Quality and Stakeholder Value are interrelated to retention.

Extended Education — The Business 2+2 program and the Energy program will likely involve the use of more business technology in the sharing and delivery of programs. Jon Root and Sandy Woods are spending one-half of their time determining where the specific opportunities are for OSU to be more involved in continuing and distance education, as well as serving the Portland metro area and other areas of Oregon, and the types of infrastructure support necessary to accomplish the identified opportunities. This focus is tied to the access theme and the OSBHE initiative for additional technology funds.

Diversity — Arnold stated that Phyllis Lee and Stephanie Sanford are determining how to redefine the charge and structure of the Minority Affairs Commission. He noted that the State Board plans to begin a review of diversity initiatives of all OSSHE institutions from 1986-1996.

In summary, Provost Arnold mentioned that the issues he addressed have common themes throughout: they start

with the existing base — the quality of the institution and the programs offered; focus on strengthening those programs; expand access and respond to expressed demands and needs of the State; improve our image through marketing; and improve performance. He felt that this provided a unique opportunity for Oregon's higher education to demonstrate its ability to positively and creatively respond to needs and opportunities which have been laid out through the planning process; the ability to do so will be important to justify additional investments relating to the Governors' budget.

Senator Delson, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, commented that the marketing focus seems to be on undergraduate students but she sees the need for a graduate focus also. Arnold agreed that the initial focus has been on undergraduate students, but noted that an emphasis on graduate student recruiting will follow.

Committee Reports

President Krane stated that the Executive Committee felt there was a desire for the Senate to learn more about what its committees were doing and have an opportunity to provide input to the committees. He explained that the number of administrative reports will be reduced each month which will allow time for Faculty Senate standing committees to report.

Instructional Development and Technology Committee

ZoeAnn Holmes, chair, reminded Senators that the committee name had been changed last June from Instructional Media Committee. This committee "reviews and recommends policy concerning instructional technology resources and their application to the teaching/learning process and curriculum change. It assists in planning and advocating for the necessary technology to maximize student learning."

She noted that the most important activity during 1995-96 was to allocate \$50,000 for instructional technology projects. The committee also participated in the process leading to the report from the Planning for Instructional Technology (PIT) Committee.

The committee has been allocated \$300,000 for FY 96/97 to fund proposals and will determine to whom to award the money.

The committee hopes to continue the discussion and identify a possible course of action of evaluating instructional technology. Committee members are concerned that technology be used when appropriate; that not all courses are taught with technology.

They are also planning to review the PIT report, review the action items, and determine how they can assist in carrying out the recommendations. Included in the PIT report's goals were student access to technology and faculty access and implementation of instructional tech-

nology. The PIT report can be viewed on the Web at: <http://www.orst.edu/dept.cmc/pit/index.htm>.

In response to Senator DeKock, Science, Holmes responded that there were no dollar limits on proposals to be funded from the \$300,000 allocation, but urged faculty to be realistic in their requests.

DeKock questioned Provost Arnold as to where the remainder of the Technology Resource Fee is used if only \$300,000 is allocated by this committee. Arnold responded that OSU allocates 3/4 of the fees collected for centrally supported activities, such as e-mail accounts, infrastructure, equipping and maintaining student access labs, networking, and maintaining the network.

Dr. Arnold stated that all students have access to the Web through the student access lab. Holmes noted that although student access is available, students cannot always access the Web during high use periods. She indicated that some periods of the day reflect 100% usage which means that all available lab computers are in use. She also noted that an increasing number of students are accessing the Web via modem.

Senator Landau, Science, requested that the Senate receive a report of the number of sites available for open access labs. Dr. Arnold noted that the demand for technology is the reason for the Instructional Technology request in the budget and matching funds from the State were considered necessary by all OSSHE provost's.

Promotion and Tenure Committee

Duane Johnson, Chair, acknowledged the excellent work of last year's committee, particularly the leadership of Leslie Burns, he reviewed the new Promotion & Tenure Guidelines, and mentioned upcoming activities.

Johnson reported that the P&T Committee observed all dossier deliberations at the University level and carefully tracked the implementation of the new P&T Guidelines and concerns or suggestions for the future. He noted that OSU is now being recognized for its visionary leadership in the development and implementation of the guidelines and that OSU's guidelines are being used as a model for several universities across the country.

He spoke at length about the new P&T Guidelines which provide for evaluation based on the uniqueness of each faculty member's position and the expectations of the department and college. The position description and Candidate's Statement become key elements of evaluation under the new guidelines. Every faculty member should have an updated position description which reflects the percentage or amount of effort directed to Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service. Dossier components include:

- ✓ Scholarship and Creative Activity – An expectation of all faculty; understood to be intellectual work whose significance is validated by peers and is communicated.

- ✓ Candidate's Statement – It should describe how the candidate meets the expectation articulated in the position description.
- ✓ Student Input – Student input on teaching and advising is mandated by the guidelines; letters must be signed to be considered.
- ✓ External Reviewers – Care must be taken in the solicitation of external reviewers; they should be from leaders in the field and not be letters of advocacy but letters of evaluation.

To assist faculty in understanding the P&T Guidelines, Johnson noted that Associate Provost Hashimoto has proposed that the Faculty Senate P&T Committee assist him in conducting a series of brown bag lunches and/or seminars during Winter term. Hashimoto has also visited with many of the deans regarding the 1996 experience and shared specific recommendations for their particular college. Johnson encouraged faculty serving on college or department P&T Committees to have the dean and department heads review the guidelines and expectations with them prior to the committee review of dossiers. The 1996/97 Guidelines have already been distributed to College Deans and Department Heads.

Johnson emphasized that the committee supports a policy of department committees, college committees, and administrative units to return incomplete dossiers to the unit prior to the review at the University level.

Johnson welcomed suggestions from faculty during winter term regarding the committee's attempt to educate the faculty who have concerns about the new guidelines.

President Krane noted that the P&T Committee is one of the most difficult committees to serve on and thanked the committee members for their hard work.

Annual Reports

The agenda contained annual reports from the following committees:

- Academic Requirements Committee
- Committee on Bylaws and Nominations
- Faculty Mediation Committee
- Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee
- Graduate Council
- Library Committee
- Promotion & Tenure Committee

Information Items

- Faculty Senate Elections – The Committee on Bylaws and Nominations is accepting nominations for President-elect, IFS representative and Executive Committee members until October 8.
- Faculty Senate Calendar – The Faculty Senate will meet on the following dates in the LaSells Stewart

Center Construction and Engineering Hall:

November 7, 1996	March 6, 1997
December 5, 1996	April 3, 1997
January 9, 1997	May 1, 1997
February 6, 1997	June 5, 1997

- "Faculty" Electronic Mail List – In an attempt to more quickly distribute information to faculty, and rely less on departments forwarding electronic mail to faculty, the Faculty Senate Office has created a Majordomo "Faculty" mailing list. This list is being originated for Faculty Senate use only.

To subscribe to the list, send an electronic mail message to: *majordomo@mail.orst.edu*
In the body of the message type ONLY:
subscribe faculty

To unsubscribe to the list, send an electronic mail message to: *majordomo@mail.orst.edu*
In the body of the message type ONLY:
unsubscribe faculty

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane's report included the following items:

- He thanked President-elect Wilcox and Vickie Nunemaker for their efforts in organizing University Day, and thanked Senators for bestowing on him the honor of the D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award.
- He had the opportunity to interview Marketing Director candidates and came away with a clear view that marketing, recruitment, and retention are no longer administrative functions, but a function of all who are at OSU and is connected to all activities.
- The Executive Committee will be working with the Committee on Committees to implement some of the recommendations they made in an extensive review of the committee structure last spring.
- Committee Chair Orientation is scheduled for October 17 and 24.
- A letter will be sent to all faculty listing the 26 Faculty Senate committees, including a brief statement of their function, and the e-mail address of the chair. Faculty will be encouraged to make suggestions directly to the committee chairs concerning items for the committee to consider during the coming year.
- The Faculty Senate is currently working with ASOSU to place student members on committees.
- The Executive Committee is discussing the nature of the Senate and who should be included in apportionment. The discussion was partially a result of a request last year from Faculty Research Assistants (numbering approximately 500-600) who requested inclusion in Faculty Senate apportionment. FRA's are currently not included in apportionment, but are included upon promotion to the rank of Sr. Faculty Research Assistant. Krane noted that the standards for

promotion from FRA are applied very unevenly throughout campus. The Bylaws and Nominations Committee reviewed this request last year and decided not to take any action at that time. One of their concerns was that if this large number was added to the Faculty Senate, teaching faculty would be in the minority and most of the Faculty Senate business concerns academic policy and programs. The EC also discussed having both an academic and university senate or having one senate and allowing only certain individuals to vote on academic issues; both ideas were rejected. This issue is complicated by the upcoming change of current No Rank faculty being merged with Management Service staff who formerly did not have faculty rank.

- Krane called attention to four ballot measures to be voted on November 5 which, if approved, would have serious negative impacts on higher education:

Measure 31 redefines the definition of obscenity in Oregon and could have serious impacts on academic freedom and materials used in classes.

Measure 27 requires legislative approval of all administrative rules adopted by state agencies within the Executive Branch, which includes the State Board of Higher Education.

Measure 45 concerns limitations of benefits in the PERS system and would cap retirement salaries at 75% of the final salary amount, make early retirement incentives illegal, and would prohibit payment of medical benefits.

Measure 47 "son of Measure 5."

- Janet Nishihara has replaced Leslie Davis Burns as an IFS representative.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1996 No. 522

Oregon State University

June 6, 1996

For All Academic Staff

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

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports - Paul Risser, and OSU's Web Group
- Action Items - The following items were approved: Proposed list of degree candidates; Category I Proposal to Establish a Ph.D. Degree in Radiation Health Physics and revisions to Standing Rules [Motion 96-522-01 through 04]
- New Business - There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Collier, B. Cusimano; Hightower, T. Wirth; Ragulsky, K. Smith; and Williamson, P. Easley.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bentley, Cheeke, Cowles, L. Davis, R. Duncan, Fletcher, George, Hu, Humphrey, Jenkins, J. Lee, Leid, Leong, Liebowitz, Lunch, Macnab, Manogue, McAlexander, McDaniel, T. Miller, Mills, M. Mix, Nishihara, Pacheco, Rathja, Rosenberger, Rowe, Rudolph, Sandine, Savage, Sproul, Tiger, Torres, Tricker, and Wander.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; A. Wilcox, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

A. Hashimoto, J. Higgenbotham, Z. Holmes, N. Howard, M. Kinch, K. Kingsley, W. Loveland, D. Nicodemus, C. Painter, M. Rice, and L. Risser.

Special Reports

Paul Risser, OSU President

President Risser briefly talked about the state-wide constituents he has met with since coming to OSU five months ago. He proceeded to provide the Senate with a recap of activities in progress or recently completed.

Risser noted that funds were set aside to focus on three topics:

- 1) Marketing OSU — Over 100 candidates have expressed interest in the current search for a senior

marketing person.

- 2) Recruitment/Retention — Three consultants were on campus in late May and are preparing a written report focusing on OSU's recruitment/retention needs.

- 3) Extended Education/Continuing Education — A group of consultants were recently on campus to review the continuing education program. Another individual is looking at extended education/continuing education in a business sense. Personnel changes resulted in a recently completed reorganization of the Extension Service.

Risser reported that the Board's planning process, should be basically completed at the June meeting and is not expected to result in any major reorganization. He did predict there will be recommendations or guidance to form cooperative programs across the state.

A series of issues, including accessibility, the role of education and economic development, and a seamless education process, have emerged from business community participation in focus groups centering on the direction of higher education.

President Risser spoke of the enormous economic impact OSU's research programs have on the entire state. He noted that during the past year OSU attracted about \$138 million of external funding which translates to a research program economic impact of \$600 million in the state; about \$110 million came from outside Oregon.

There is a realization in the state that higher education is becoming more important to the welfare of Oregon. He noted that the governor, the legislature, the State Board of Higher Education, and the business community are all thinking positively about higher education. He felt that the coming legislative session will be important for higher education since the session after that will be impacted by term limits. A compelling argument for legislators to hear is that Oregon State is more efficient, is a progressive university, is changing rapidly, and is listening carefully to the needs of students.

President Risser predicted that 1996 will be a pivotal year where one can look back and see that responsiveness is greatly improved, imaginative programs are working across disciplines, a continuing education program more connected to the University, and connections to community colleges.

Senator Browne, Business, referred to Dr. Risser's prediction of increased responsiveness and questioned

whether passage of graduate programs, which take 2-3 years, will be shortened. Risser stated that no one has been specifically directed to review this issue, but the President's Cabinet has discussed the need to look at responsiveness to graduate programs. He cautioned that decisions need to be made thoughtfully while maintaining processes which do not themselves slow down the process.

In closing, Dr. Risser noted that one of his objectives is to share information with Provost Arnold and President Krane and keep them fully apprised of the direction the University is heading.

Virtual OSU: A Walk on the Web Side

Members of the OSU Web Group (Ken Kingsley, Mike Hench, Claudia Painter, and Bob Baker) provided a visual update of a variety of OSU web pages as well as services offered on the World Wide Web.

Kingsley, Extension and Experiment Station Communications, noted that OSU's web pages are held in high esteem around the country and challenged Senators to accept the assignment of keeping OSU on the leading edge of web usage in the educational environment. He stated that records indicate that the OSU home page alone is accessed about one-half million times per week.

Hench, Valley Library, explained that there really is reliable, useful research on the web and showed a sampling of research reports available. He spoke of an Information Services project which resulted in the creation of a web page called the "Government Information Project" which was funded through a grant and is being recognized around the world. It consists of government documents which have been compiled in a user-friendly and simple-to-use format. Hench noted that another resource available on the web is called SPIN (Sponsored Programs Information Network) which assists in identifying funding for research projects.

Kingsley explained that recruiting students is currently a major usage of the web and that the freshman and graduate student pages are also heavily accessed. Incoming students can take a "virtual tour" of the residence hall rooms. It is hoped that student retention will be increased through more user-friendly methods such as electronic interaction between students and faculty and discussion groups with other students.

Kingsley announced that summer term on-line admissions are being processed and should be available in September for the academic year admissions.

He stressed the need for creation of quality web pages. He also touched on the need for security and confidentiality and the need for training staff who will be developing web materials. He acknowledged that technology support, web maintenance, networking, incentives and motivation of faculty and staff, etc., will be resource intensive.

In response to Senator Burton, Science, it was noted that all students have accounts and can currently access the web. A plan to offer general orientation programs in web training is being considered to familiarize students with the web.

Senator Landau, Science, questioned when administration will add the general catalog, schedule of classes, scholarly activities, etc. Kingsley responded that the catalog is in the process of being placed on the web and that the summer catalog is currently available there.

Senator Matzke, Science, questioned how the materials will be kept current. Kingsley noted that this will be one of the greatest challenges and stressed the need for continuously updating web pages. Matzke also raised the issue of faculty having to buy their own computers to be used for instruction. Kingsley stated that the President's Cabinet has been informed that the technology will require resources.

Painter noted that faculty can create their own web pages, but emphasized that the Web Group must be informed if faculty want the pages to be linked. She also mentioned that the Web Group offers support to departments who are creating web pages.

Action Items

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 3,419 students who are candidates for 3,501 degrees which include: 2,559 Bachelors, 705 Masters, and 237 Doctors. There are 78 students who are candidates for two degrees and two students who are candidates for three degrees. These numbers represent a decrease of 32 students from last year, or less than 1%.

The Class of 1996, OSU's 127th graduating class, has 372 seniors who qualify for Academic Distinction and includes 174 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50-3.69), 108 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70-3.84), and 90 'summa cum laude' (gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 96-522-01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Category I Proposal to Establish a Ph.D. Degree in Radiation Health Physics

Walt Loveland, Curriculum Council Chair, noted that the proposal had received approval from the Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee, Curriculum Council, and Graduate Council; the pre-proposal has been approved by the Academic Council and the OSBHE.

Loveland felt that this should not be viewed as the establishment of a new program since the Radiation

Health Ph.D. has existed in General Science since 1963. This proposal transfers the program to the Department of Nuclear Engineering in the College of Engineering. He noted that there is an unusual demand for this program since no other such program exists in the Pacific Northwest and is only the third West of the Mississippi.

Motion 96-552-02 to approve the Category I as presented was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

President Krane thanked outgoing chair Loveland for his service on the Curriculum Council.

Standing Rules Revision

Al Mukatis, Committee on Committees Chair, presented proposed Standing Rules revisions to two committees.

The revision to the Committee on Academic Standing increased the faculty members from five to seven. Motion 96-552-03 to increase the faculty composition was approved by voice vote with no discussion and no dissenting votes.

The following revisions to the Instructional Media Committee are indicated as additions in the highlighted sections and deletions in the strike-through sections.

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

The Instructional Media Development and Technology Committee reviews and recommends policy concerning centralized instructional audiovisual materials and equipment, instructional development services, operation of campus television services, utilization of community cable television, and participation in interinstitutional televised teaching technology resources and their application to the teaching/learning process and curriculum change. It assists in planning and advocating for the necessary technology to maximize student learning. Included within technology resources are instructional services, training, and distance and extended campus learning opportunities. The Committee shall consist of six Faculty and two Student members, and, ex-officio, the Director or Associate Director of the Communication Media Center, Ex-Officio.

The Committee may appoint technical advisory personnel as needed. These persons will aid the Committee in its work, but will not vote on policy decisions.

Mukatis noted that the Committee felt that the name change would more accurately reflect the current goals and activities. Motion 96-552-04 to approve the above revisions passed by voice vote with no discussion and no dissenting votes.

Annual Reports

The agenda contained annual reports from the following committees:

- Academic Advising Council
- Academic Regulations Committee
- Administrative Appointments Committee
- Advancement of Teaching Committee
- Baccalaureate Core Committee
- Committee on Academic Standing
- Committee on Committees
- Curriculum Council
- Faculty Grievance Committee
- Graduate Admissions Committee
- Research Council
- Retirement Committee
- Undergraduate Admissions Committee
- University Honors College Council

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

- OSBHE May Meeting — The graduate programs in History of Science were approved by the Board and will be on the next consent agenda for final action. He mentioned that OSU has very effectively used the State Board's new program approval process.
- Academic Year Recap — Provost Arnold recapped the year by reviewing issues he brought before the Senate last October.

He reported that enrollment was up this year, but not as much as anticipated. Administration is awaiting receipt of the report from the review team which looked at student recruitment and retention issues.

He noted that searches for administrative positions had been completed: OSU President Paul Risser, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Andy Hashimoto, and Dean of Veterinary Medicine Bob Wilson. He mentioned that the search for the Director of Undergraduate Programs is underway and that Vice Provost Keller has indicated his intent to retire in December which will result in a national search.

- Promotion & Tenure Guidelines — Arnold observed that, after reviewing over 100 dossiers, it was clear that people are paying attention to the new guidelines and are taking time to understand them, particularly in the area of scholarly activities.
- Continuing Challenges — Attention to the University Aims (Quality, Diversity, and Stakeholder Value); recruiting and retention; the OSBHE Planning Process will undoubtedly identify important needs and opportunities; and Proficiency Based Admissions Standards.

In closing, Provost Arnold stated that OSU continues to be a very dynamic institution and he is pleased to be part of it.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane complimented faculty on their efforts in educating the 3,419 degree candidates.

Krane noted that the four finalists for the position of Director of Undergraduate Academic programs are either regular or ex-officio Faculty Senate members and proceeded to introduce them: Gordon Matzke, Sandy Woods, Sally Francis, and Leslie Davis Burns.

President Krane reported on the following items:

- AOF/AAUP/IFS Joint Meeting — The program on May 18 was outstanding with many speakers "in the know" about higher education, unfortunately the attendance was low. In particular, it was stressed that the coming legislative session is a unique opportunity to influence the future of higher education in Oregon. Participants were urged to write to legislators to apprise them of OSU's accomplishments; Bob Bruce asked Krane to emphasize that faculty were allowed to do so, but they need to understand they are acting on their own behalf not on behalf of the University and cannot use OSU letterhead. Krane also reported that there is a \$50 per person tax credit which can be used as contributions for candidates for political office; fewer than 5% of Oregonians take advantage of that credit in election years.
- Diversity Issues — Krane thanked President-elect Wilcox for organizing the May 23 Diversity Forum which resulted in a lively discussion. He noted that it is the intent of the Executive Committee to continue to participate in diversity activities during the next academic year.

A related diversity issue was the consideration of the Minority Affairs Commission becoming a Faculty Senate entity. Krane explained that the Committee on Committees reviewed this possibility and felt that it should remain as an administrative rather than a Senate committee. He noted that this recommendation did not preclude the Senate from pursuing a committee to study diversity issues.

Krane stated that a salary equity study is currently underway which is targeted toward investigating salary equity issues for women and minority faculty. The committee, which consists of Kathy Heath, Alan Acock, Wil Gamble, Ilene Kleinsorge, Kelvin Koong, Sandy Woods, and Kay Schaffer, will report to the administration in January in time for adjustments to be made out of the salary increase money.

- ROTC — Krane recapped the events concerning ROTC representation in the Senate.
 - On November 2, 1995 the Senate approved a resolution condemning the Department of Defense (DOD) policy regarding discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and urged the OSU administration to seek changes in the federal policy by working through Oregon's congressional delegation.
 - A separate motion directed the Committee on Bylaws and Nominations to draft a Bylaws revision requiring Faculty Senate apportionment units to comply with OAR 580-15-05 by September 16, 1996.
 - On December 7, 1995, the Bylaws revision was approved by a two-thirds majority of the Senate.

- Since that time many protests have come from OSU friends and alumni who regard this action as a betrayal of the respect in which OSU ROTC has traditionally been held. It's been reported that some prospective ROTC students are being specifically advised not to select OSU. The Development Office reports that a substantial number of gifts and bequests have been cancelled.
- Krane compared our situation with that of the MIT faculty who are seeking a compromise which would permit ROTC to operate, but under conditions which would guarantee full access to ROTC programs for gay and lesbian students. Although MIT's situation is focussed on students rather than faculty, he felt that a similar compromise could be worked out at OSU. Krane noted he was disappointed in the apparent lack of action on the part of OSU's administration in response to the November resolution, but stated he was personally determined to work through appropriate channels to seek a compromise which would accomplish the dual roles of guaranteeing non-discrimination against faculty and maintaining the status of the OSU ROTC program. Krane recently met with ROTC leaders and the Provost to discuss how to address this issue.
- Krane recently reviewed the contracts OSU has with DOD to maintain the ROTC programs and found several items of interest. In particular, the Naval ROTC contract contains a clause under the commitments the University makes "to include a representation of the Department of Naval Science designated by the professor of Naval Science on all faculty committees whose deliberations may affect the Department of Naval Science." Army and Air Force contracts contain similar clauses. Another clause states that the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right at any time to relieve any officer assigned to the Department of Naval Science. An additional clause commits the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to conform to a non-discrimination policy and to agree not to discriminate in any way in admission to the ROTC program on the basis of race, color, sex, or national origin.
- Krane noted that he would continue to work over the summer toward a resolution to this issue and invited others to join him in seeking a solution.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:55.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1996 No. 521

Oregon State University

May 2, 1996

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 pm by President Ken Krane. There were no corrections to the April minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports: OPEU Collective Bargaining and IFS Efforts to Place Faculty Members on the OSBHE
- Action Items: The following items were approved: Category I Proposal – MEngr in Environmental Engineering; OPEU Resolution; and Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee [Motion 96-521-01 through 02]
- Discussion Item: Diversity Issues
- New Business: Meeting Announcement

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Brumley, E. Brazee; Collins, M. Dempsey; Ragulsky, B. Strohmeyer; Rielly, J. Lee-Smeltzer; Savonen, T. Gentle; and Stevens, C. Kolbe.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Balz, Bentley, Burrige, Cappaert, Coblenz, Cowles, R. Duncan, Ede, Falkner, Farber, Farnsworth, Fast, Foster, Jenkins, Johnson, Jordan, Landau, P. Lee, Leong, Liebowitz, Lundin, Macnab, Marino, McAlexander, McDaniel, S. Miller, T. Miller, M. Mix, Mukatis, Pacheco, Paige, Plant, Riggs, Rosenberger, Sandine, Schowalter, Tiger, Torres, and Wander.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; A. Wilcox, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

R. Gourley, T. Harris, A. Hashimoto, J. Hendricks, E. Lee, S. Longerbeam, W. Loveland, D. Nicodemus, and E. Reynolds.

Special Reports

OPEU Collective Bargaining

Robert Gourley spoke on behalf of OPEU employees at OSU and Jacquelyn Rudolph spoke on behalf of OSSHE.

Gourley noted that an impasse was declared on April 19 and stated that the last and final offer will become the contract unless a strike is called. OPEU is asking the Faculty Senate to agree that the classified employees deserve a pay raise.

Rudolph explained that each OSSHE institution has a representative at the bargaining table. As a result of Senate Bill 271, the State System agreed with OPEU to open negotiations. She noted that appropriations by the Legislature for 1995/97 did not include funds for classified salaries. She indicated that, for the first time, an early retirement incentive plan for classified employees is being considered.

There were no questions for either speaker.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

Leslie Davis Burns, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Representative, reported on the April IFS meeting held at OSU. The May Faculty Senate agenda contained a recap of the meeting which included discussions on distance education, placing faculty members on the OSBHE, and Strategic Planning Task Forces.

Burns reminded Senators that the OSU Faculty Senate approved a resolution in January 1995 favoring appointing faculty members to the OSBHE. The following resolution was passed unanimously by IFS at the April meeting:

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) proposes that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education include the President and Immediate Past President of IFS as ex-officio members.

Burns stated that all OSSHE presidents have been contacted and noted that President Risser is supportive. IFS is requesting legal advice to determine whether legislative action is necessary to appoint ex-officio, nonvoting members to the Board. She indicated that some OSBHE members felt there would be a conflict of interest. Burns will provide progress updates to the Senate.

Action Items

Category I Proposal — MEngr in Environmental Engineering

Walt Loveland, Curriculum Council Chair, presented the Category I Proposal to establish an MEngr degree in

Environmental Engineering. This proposal was approved by the Graduate Council with the condition that it be reviewed by the Graduate Council within three years of initiation. Loveland noted that this non-thesis degree program is aimed primarily at distance learners.

Senator Woods, Engineering, stated that this proposal was a cooperative program with Portland State University which makes it a new degree program.

Motion 96-521-01 to approve establishment of an MEng in Environmental Engineering, as presented, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

OPEU Resolution

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommended approval of the following resolution:

WHEREAS the classified staff at Oregon State University are valued employees who provide essential services to the faculty, without which services the faculty would be unable to carry out their instructional and research duties,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University urge classified employees represented by the Oregon Public Employees Union and the Oregon State System of Higher Education to secure a fair and equitable contract.

Motion 96-521-02 to approve the above resolution passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees

The following individuals were elected as members to Panel B:

John H. Block	Sylvia L. Moore
Michael J. Burke	Jon R. Root
James R. Coakley	Robert C. Sahr
Leslie G. Dunnington	Henry M. Sayre
Gordon E. Matzke	LaVerne Woods

The following were elected as alternates to Panel B:

Patricia E. Aune	Douglas F. Markle
Diane M. Belair	Jeffrey L. Ramsey
Carole A. Crateau	Cherie Rusk
Kermit Cromack Jr.	Michael H. Unsworth
Dennis E. Hruby	Terry Wood

Discussion Item

Diversity Issues

President Krane estimated that about 10% of students participated in the Diversity Days Teach-in during April. Judging from responses received, students were concerned about the incidents of racial harassment and lack of faculty diversity and seemed to be very grateful for the

opportunity to discuss the issues. A sampling of the responses can be found on Gopher by selecting "OSU Information and Services," then "OSU Academic Departments and Colleges," then "Faculty Senate," then "Diversity," then "Teach-in for Diversity Days Comments."

The Executive Committee (EC) has been discussing the possibility of incorporating the Minority Affairs Commission (MAC) as a Faculty Senate committee. After meeting with former MAC chairs, Krane sensed they felt frustration in their inability to put sufficient pressure on deans to effect changes in their colleges. They indicated that the Faculty Senate would do no better than an administrative committee and may do worse. The EC will continue the discussion of exploring roles for a Faculty Senate Diversity Committee.

The EC met with a number of people concerned about diversity issues who are helping to provide direction. One avenue the EC is pursuing is a Faculty Forum on Diversity to be held later this month.

Senators discussed various possible reasons why more faculty did not participate in the Teach-in and made suggestions as to how the Faculty Senate should now proceed to address the diversity issue.

Senator George, Information Services, suggested that if search and screening committees did their job properly when identifying and hiring faculty, a dramatic difference could be achieved in the area of minority hiring.

In response to Senator Hightower, ROTC, asking if the University had diversity goals, Past President Francis stated that each college had a diversity plan.

Senator Strohmeyer, Student Affairs, noted that the MAC had made recommendations to administration and suggested that the recommendations be reviewed to determine if they have been accomplished.

Senator Prucha, Associated, felt that resources provided by OSU for minority recruiting is an embarrassment when compared to institutions across the nation. She also felt that if diversity is going to be identified as an AIM, there has to be a price tag associated for it to be effective. Prucha noted that although central funds are available to fund fellowships and scholarships for graduate students, there is always a lack of names of people of color who are nominated by campus departments. Prucha offered assistance to faculty to help students apply for these funds.

Information Items

The agenda contained the following information items:

- Extension Apportionment — Apportionment for off-campus Extension faculty will not change because Extension faculty who are now attached to academic units are in accordance with the Bylaws since their FTE remains with Extension. Memos to this effect from

Sandy Macnab, OSUEA, and Michael Oriard, Committee on Bylaws and Nominations, were printed in the agenda.

- April Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting recap.
- A letter from President Risser summarizing his thoughts about the future of OSU.
- A document prepared by President Risser concerning reorganization of university development activities.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

Faculty Accomplishments—OSU Distinguished Professor Jane Lubchenco, Zoology, has been elected as a member of the Academy of Sciences. Dr. Larry Boersma, Crop and Soil Science, and Dr. Frank Moore, Zoology, are the 1996 OSU Distinguished Professor recipients. Dr. Arnold conveyed congratulations to the recipients.

OSBHE Planning Process — The OSBHE received reports at the April meeting from the four planning task forces: Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education and Research, Community and Economic Development, and Continuing Education and Professional Development. The Board also received a summary of a series of focus group discussions pertaining to higher education. Arnold characterized the news accounts of the discussions as very "uneven" ranging from a summary of the reports to specific comments, both critical and supportive. Accounts receiving the most attention seemed to focus on critical comments. Arnold's observation was that the critical comments were not consistent with reading promotion and tenure documents or from reports from accreditation teams reviewing programs. He noted that the summaries did contain many positive points.

Phase II will focus on appropriate responses, strategies, and action plans regarding the input received during Phase I.

President Risser's Letter to Chancellor Cox — Arnold's sense of the purpose and timing of the letter, which was included in the agenda as an information item, was that Risser felt it was important that OSSHE institutions be proactive in helping the Board and the State System set the planning direction. This was an attempt to highlight OSU's potential role in program areas that have frequently surfaced in the planning discussion. An underlying motivation was to shift the discussion from downsizing and reduction to opportunities for investment of state funds to better respond to the State's needs, demands, and opportunities. Arnold labeled this correspondence as a "think piece" to stimulate discussion.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane's report included the following items:

- Noted that off-campus Extension faculty will continue as a separate Faculty Senate apportionment unit.
- Indicated he had received several calls from faculty in response to the letter from President Risser referred to by Provost Arnold and noted that it was not the intent to circumvent the Faculty Senate on any issue, rather he emphasized that it was a "think piece" as described by the Provost.
- In reference to negative media articles regarding the OSSHE task forces, Krane sent a message to Chancellor Cox expressing his concern and requested that Cox do what he could to lessen the impact since the articles were read by prospective students, their parents, legislators, donors, etc. Krane found the Chancellor's broadcast message to be reassuring and suggested to Cox that he and OSBHE President Swanson write a joint op-ed piece for the Oregonian stating that this is not the Board's view. Krane encouraged faculty to better communicate to the public what faculty actually do.

New Business

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, announced that the annual joint AOF/AAUP/IFS meeting will be held the morning of May 18.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:26.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1996 No. 520

Oregon State University

April 4, 1996

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 pm by President Kenneth Krane. There were no corrections to the March minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports: Faculty Responsibilities Regarding Students with Disabilities - Stephanie Sanford and Tracy Bentley
- Action Items: The following items were approved: Category I proposals to extend the Masters of Engineering degree program in Manufacturing Engineering to off-campus Boeing sites and to establish a B.S. degree in Biological Engineering; and OSU Distinguished Service Award and D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award recipients [Motion 96-520-01 through 96-520-04]
- New Business: Approved resolution regarding Teach-in for Diversity Day [Motion 96-520-05 through 96-520-10]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Collier, G. Smith; Foster, S. Banducci; Gaines, S. Cleary; Tiger, J. Burt; and Williamson, P. Easley.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Balz, Beach, Burrige, Calvert, Chambers, Cheeke, Christie, Cowles, A. Duncan, Farber, Fletcher, Fox, Hu, Humphrey, Ingham, Knight, Leong, Liebowitz, Lomax, Macnab, Marino, McAlexander, McDaniel, D. Mills, A. Mix, M. Mix, Nishihara, Pacheco, Rielly, Rosenberger, Rudolph, Sandine, Torres, and Zollinger.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; A. Wilcox, President-elect; T. Doler, Parliamentarian Pro-tem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

M. Bothwell, J. Drexler, P. Lindsey, W. Loveland, E. McDowell, J. McGuire, J. Moore, D. Nicodemus, G. Reistad, J. Ringle, A. Velayudhan, L. Verts, and M. Wogaman.

Special Reports

Faculty Responsibilities Regarding Students with Disabilities

Stephanie Sanford, Affirmative Action Director, introduced others on campus who work with her on disability issues: Jeff McCubbin, University Advisory Committee for People with Disabilities Chair; Lita Verts, Special Services Program (SSP) Director; and Tracy Bentley, Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) Director.

Sanford stated that she is the University Compliance Officer with regard to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Affirmative Action Office has general oversight for issues related to disability which include: responding to and ending discrimination based on stereotypes of individuals with disabilities; providing reasonable accommodation for disabled employees; and providing access to the University's facilities, activities, and programs.

Sanford noted that faculty play a vital role in the compliance effort in providing access to students with disabilities. She reported that 230 students have registered with SSD this year, which is almost double the number in 1990; 40 of those students are enrolled in the SSP. She explained that not all students register with the University's services. Some students believe they can participate on campus without needing assistance and choose not to self-identify. There are other students who register with SSD but choose not to ask for assistance in all classes.

There are some general guidelines to be followed when a faculty member is the first contact with a disabled student. The Rehabilitation Act and the ADA provide access to qualified students with disabilities. Sanford stated, "Faculty are not expected to alter course content or change standards in providing access to academic programs." She went on to explain that disabled students have the right to request reasonable accommodation and requests should be responded to. OSU requires documentation of the disability, which is kept confidential, prior to providing services. Confidentiality must be maintained when working with disabled students; the need for accommodation should be discussed privately in an office setting, not when other students are present. Faculty should be particularly sensitive to students with a visible disability to not only include them in classroom activities, but also to avoid singling out the student as someone who either needs additional help or as someone who can speak for others with disabilities.

Bentley explained that the SSD works in partnership with faculty to assist in providing accommodations which will allow the student to show their ability rather than their disability. SSD also assists faculty with classroom relocation to accommodate students with disabilities. She mentioned the three primary services provided by SSD:

- 1) Note Taking Services — During Winter '96, SSD accommodated 298 requests for note takers. SSD needs assistance from faculty to recruit students who will act as note takers, particularly for very technical classes.
- 2) Taped Text — Faculty are informed of the need to have a book on tape as soon as a student has identified the need; it takes 4-6 weeks for the text to be taped.
- 3) Alternative Testing — SSD sends a letter to instructors stating that a particular student qualifies for alternative testing. Since tests vary, instructors may feel that SSD involvement is not necessary and they should contact the SSD Office. SSD services do not have to be used if, after talking with the student, an instructor believes that a proctor is not necessary and can provide a quiet location to accommodate the student. SSD can provide a proctor, a quiet testing site, and readers or writers if necessary.

Assistants can be hired by SSD to accommodate disabled students in laboratory settings when safety issues are involved.

Bentley stressed that their goal is to make it as easy as possible to help faculty comply with the two federal programs.

Senator McEwan, Home Economics & Education, questioned how to help students who go to an instructor and suspect that they have a disability, but are not registered. Bentley indicated that these students should be referred to the SSD Office.

In response to Senator Landau, Science, questioning about the cost of testing, Bentley responded that it is the responsibility of the student to pay for the testing to document their disability. She acknowledged that the cost creates a problem for some students and that there was no funding in place to assist them with the cost. Landau queried as to the possibility of setting up a fund, possibly through a donor. Bentley noted that it may be possible to work out something with Andy Hashimoto, Academic Affairs Associate Provost.

President Krane asked about the possibility of obtaining texts on disk and use a voice synthesizer without having someone actually read the text on tape. Bentley replied that publishers have not been very cooperative in providing texts in that format.

As an aside, President Krane asked Sanford to comment on the University of Texas Law School decision on Affirmative Action. This decision affects racial preference regarding entrance to the Law School. Sanford stated

that a recent issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education covered the issue very well and offered to provide a copy to those who were interested. She didn't feel that it would have an immediate impact on OSU's affirmative action since the mission and policies are very different. She expressed concern about the general direction that the court is heading on the issue of affirmative action.

Action Items

Category I Proposal — Master of Engineering in Manufacturing Engineering at Boeing Sites

Walt Loveland, Curriculum Council Chair, presented a Category I proposal to extend the Master of Engineering degree program in Manufacturing Engineering to three new off-campus sites in the State of Washington at the Boeing Company. He proceeded to present a lengthy history of the proposal.

Loveland reminded Senators that the distance learning program between OSU and PSU was approved two years ago to offer the Master of Engineering degree at Portland area sites. The courses are delivered via Ed-Net using two-way audio and one-way video communications. He noted that the financial aspects of the program are run through the Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education (OCATE). The proposal is to extend the existing program to additional sites utilizing Ed-Net and OCATE. The students would be Boeing employees and Boeing would be paying a fee for program delivery. He noted that this proposal has taken one to two years to get this far due to a number of complex issues, most of which have been solved, including: extending the courses outside of Oregon and entrepreneurial education.

Senators were asked to comment on the differing opinions regarding details of how the proposal should go forward:

- 1) Library assessment — determined that present collections and services are adequate to support the proposal.
- 2) Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee — felt that the budget involving OCATE was acceptable subject to internal adjusting of funding at OSU and the need to draft a Memorandum of Understanding between the various parties.
- 3) Graduate Council — approved subject to:
 - a) prior to implementation date, the Department of Manufacturing Engineering presents evidence of delivery of the program through one-way video two-way audio as the exclusive delivery mechanism.
 - b) excluding language relating to OCATE as a financial mechanism for accomplishing proposal.
- 4) Curriculum Council — received the above differing financial recommendations and proceeded to seek advice from Academic Affairs, Associate Provost

Hashimoto instructed them to take the recommendation from Budgets and Fiscal Planning as the definitive statement with regard to the fiscal aspects of the proposal.

Loveland noted that, after they received the instructions from Hashimoto, Academic Affairs reviewed the suitability of whether OCATE is an appropriate delivery mechanism for the proposal and concluded that it is appropriate for OCATE to handle the financial aspects. Provost Arnold commented that OCATE is an established entity of the State System to provide access, particularly by industry, to educational programs offered by OSSHE institutions, specifically in engineering and computer science related fields. Although the focus was initially in the Portland Metro area, the industry has grown outside that area. He noted that the Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering (OJGSE) was another OSSHE initiative which has broadened collaborative program offerings to include other discipline areas within engineering and computer science. All of the OJGSE planning is based on OCATE being the delivery mechanism.

Loveland explained that the Curriculum Council was troubled by the recommendation by the Graduate Council concerning the exclusive delivery mechanism. The Curriculum Council felt the recommendation represented serious negative connotations for the curriculum in general and Loveland recounted these specific concerns:

- 1) The focus of curricular matters should be on the outcome of instruction and not the method of delivery.
- 2) Each instructor should have the intellectual freedom and responsibility to select the method which is appropriate for their students.
- 3) Faculty in this program have found that the use of methods of technology other than two-way audio and one-way video have proven effective.

After much discussion the Curriculum Council finally approved the proposal without either of the conditions noted by the Graduate Council.

There were two additional factors reported by Loveland:

- 1) There has been an experimental implementation of the delivery of courses at Boeing for two years via the taped tutor method. Ed-Net was delivered to the Portland Metro area which was then video taped and sent by bus to Boeing where tutors were available periodically to advise students about material.
- 2) On March 15, 1996, the Boeing Company issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for this program with a deadline during the week of April 8. There are three probable bidders: Washington State University, Georgia Tech, and OSU/PSU collaboration. Loveland excerpted portions of the RFP:
 - delivery technology to be used is not specified, but states that Boeing has used several methods successfully, including: tutored next day video tape, real time broadcast TV, compressed video, etc.

- Fall '96 start date with at least two sites and 60 students.

Jack Drexler, Graduate Council Chair, addressed the delivery method concern by explaining that policies passed by the Council state that, at a minimum, distance education will be delivered via two-way audio and one-way video with the intent being to create a minimum level of interaction between the faculty and students. He noted that this minimum level of interaction has not taken place for the courses delivered to Boeing via the taped tutor method.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, questioned who will make delivery decisions for these courses. Loveland responded that the proposal states that the primary mechanism of delivery will be Ed-Net. He noted that the question was whether the word "exclusive" should be retained or whether options for delivery should be allowed. He outlined two factors which should be taken into consideration: are the appropriate facilities available and do students prefer the taped tutor method since these courses are offered at 4:00 or 4:30 PM and are taken by professional engineers with family responsibilities who may not be available at that time.

Leslie Burns, IFS Representative, noted that the policy was passed in 1993 when Ed-Net was the available electronic delivery method. She questioned whether the Graduate Council was considering reviewing the guidelines in light of new instructional technology. Drexler responded that the policy needs to be reconsidered and noted that a joint Curriculum Council/Graduate Council Task Force has been formed to review all policies related to electronic delivery.

Senator Miller, Agricultural Sciences, expressed the opinion that the minimum capability is not required to be used if there are superior methods available. Drexler pointed out that the two-way audio, one-way video does provide the opportunity for interaction between faculty and students.

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned how students are selected, what are the criteria for success, and who grants the degree. The diplomas will state both PSU and OSU. Loveland explained that the student applications are collected by OCATE and sent to the OSU Graduate School for evaluation. As to the criteria for success, Loveland stated that some students wish only to learn specific material and have no intention of receiving degrees. For other students, he assumed that success will be measured in the usual ways as far as number of students successfully completing degrees. He noted that the program will receive an extensive review.

Ed McDowell, Manufacturing Engineering, who is the academic program director for the proposed program noted that the criteria for success is the same as for students on the OSU campus since Boeing students are responsible for the same exams, labs, and homework and are graded in the same manner. Provost Arnold noted that method of delivery is the issue before the

Senate since the degree program has already been approved.

President Krane clarified points being considered in the proposal: students will register for courses with OCATE; OCATE collects the fees and sends the allotted portion to the department with OCATE retaining the remainder; and the department budget would be reduced by whatever amount is received from OCATE for this program.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, questioned the concerns the Graduate Council had with OCATE. Drexler stated there were a number of concerns including:

- the amount of revenue being returned to OSU
- the proposal reviewed by the Council indicated that graduate students would be paying \$161 per credit hour which is less than fees paid by in-state graduate students — two weeks ago the amount changed to \$293
- between 32-36 students taking the courses but, as of December when it was reviewed, only two students had applied to OSU and been admitted to the Graduate School
- also in December, 1/4 of the students in that program had gpa's below 3.0

In response to Oriard asking if questions had been resolved, Drexler responded negatively in the area of revenue returned to the department and positively to the tuition increase. However, Drexler added that the Graduate Council has not met since that information was received.

Senator Woods, Engineering, felt that issues concerning OCATE and revenue is not as important as setting precedence in the way in which education is delivered to distance learners.

Senator Matzke, Science, felt that since the program is already being taught and the Senate is being asked to approve expansion to additional sites that it wasn't a big issue and moved that the proposal be approved; motion 96-520-01 was seconded.

Several Senators spoke in support of the program by citing the need for extended education and stating that this was a site change only and not a change in the academic program.

Senator DeKock amended the motion to state that it be reviewed by the Graduate Council after two years; motion was seconded. Motion 96-520-02 to have the Graduate Council review the program after two years passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Senator Gamble questioned the amount of discussion and complexity surrounding this proposal given a site change. President Krane explained that this involved an extension of OCATE's mission since their authority is to deliver courses in advanced technological education to

Washington County and the proposal is for Washington State. He also noted this represents OSU's first effort in distance learning beyond the State of Oregon and there is concern that the program will deteriorate into a taped tutor program which is not what is desired by the Graduate Council.

IFS Representative Esbensen moved the question; motion seconded. Motion 96-520-03 to move the previous question passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Motion 96-520-01 to approve the proposal as presented by the Curriculum Council passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Category I Proposal — Establish a B.S. Degree in Biological Engineering

Walt Loveland presented a Category I proposal to establish a B.S. degree in Biological Engineering in the department of Bioresource Engineering, jointly offered by the Colleges of Engineering and Agricultural Sciences. This proposal involves a graduate department which wishes to extend their offerings to include an undergraduate program. The degree will focus on bioprocess engineering and the curriculum will be accredited by ABET.

He noted that the proposal calls for no new resources and stated this was because the department has been anticipating this program and has had two new hires, with a third in progress.

Loveland called attention to the client involvement in the development of this proposal, which meets one of President Risser's challenges to find ways to involve clients in developing curriculum.

The Curriculum Council urged approval of this proposal which has been approved by Budgets and Fiscal Planning and Kerr Library, and OSBHE has approved the pre-proposal. Motion 96-520-04 was made to approve the proposal; motion seconded.

Senator Delson, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, expressed concern at the absence of courses in the major core involving ethics and questioned whether there had been discussion regarding this issue. Loveland responded that the Curriculum Council questioned this and other proposals that lack those courses and, when asked why they can't include those courses and raise the graduation requirement back to 204 hours, they are told that there are advantages to graduating students sooner and they will abide by the minimum 192 hour graduation requirement. Joe McGuire, Bioresource Engineering, noted that the department recognizes the importance of teaching ethics and stated that bioethics is included in the two-term series called Bioprocessing Engineering, as well as being incorporated into the sophomore level, Introduction to Biological Engineering.

Senator Stevens, Agricultural Sciences, felt it was not feasible to approve a proposal which allows only 3 credit hours of electives. Loveland noted that the small number of electives is regrettable, but also occurs in other engineering programs. He mentioned there are opportunities for students to take more credits to round out their education and reminded Senators of the prior Senate vote to reduce the number of credit hours in order to reduce the amount of time students spend at OSU. Senator Rathja, Engineering, stated that 3 credits of electives is within the norm in engineering programs at OSU. Senator Landau spoke against the proposal since he felt that the reduction of credits from 204 to 192 does not provide an adequate education for students in this program.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, questioned semantics of the proposal title and questioned whether that was considered. McGuire stated that Bioresource Engineering was an accurate descriptor for activities in the department, but not for the degree program. Biological Engineering was considered the only choice due to national institutes and associations using the name. He also mentioned that this is thought of as a natural evolution of the inherent discipline and, on the national scale, bioengineering implies that it is biomedical engineering.

Senator Gamble, Science, expressed the need for lower division biology.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, felt that if students were carefully advised in the selection of prospective courses in the Baccalaureate Core, it may be possible for them to take lower level biological science courses and environmental ethics. President Krane noted that both the Baccalaureate Core Committee and Curriculum Council have strongly resisted any approved curricula dictating choices within the Baccalaureate Core.

An advisor from Science felt that, after reviewing the proposal, not many OSU students could survive the curriculum. McGuire responded that the curriculum is no more difficult than chemical engineering.

Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, questioned the shift in resources for funding support and asked what is being lost due to the shift. Hashimoto responded that there has been a reallocation within the department in anticipation of this program.

Motion 96-520-04 to approve the establishment of a B.S. degree in Biological Engineering passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Information Items

- Annual Reports of Committees/Councils Due - Faculty Senate Committee/Council chairs are reminded that Annual Reports are due for the Senate's information. The May and June Senate agendas will include written reports both with and without recommendations for Senate actions.

- Committee Interest Forms - Committee interest forms are due back in the Faculty Senate Office on April 15.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold's report included the following items:

- Emphasized continued focus by the University on issues raised during the successful March 13 boycott. He felt it would be a mistake to let the momentum drop and encouraged all units to continue to focus on issues and identify ways to continue to learn and grow.
- A series of meetings with deans and administrators have taken place in preparation for the 1996-97 budget process. One aspect centers around using some of the central carry-over funds to invest in areas which have a high probability of allowing OSU to increase funding, including: program specific areas resulting in new students to OSU; marketing; recruitment, retention and diversity; and extended education. As an aside, Arnold announced there would be a visiting team on campus in May to review recruitment and retention efforts and provide advice to better those efforts.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane's report included the following items:

- Thanked Professor Emeritus Thurston Doler for filling in as Parliamentarian.
- Reminded Senators of the opportunity to participate in the College of Agricultural Sciences Summer Field Tour.
- Urged Senators to encourage colleagues to volunteer for committee appointments.
- Requested nominees for an OSSHE sponsored "Critical Thinking Summit" who are involved in undergraduate teaching.

New Business

In an effort for the Faculty Senate to take an increased activist role in promoting diversity, President Krane presented the following resolution on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. He mentioned that the Faculty Senate and administration are discussing the possibility of turning the Minority Affairs Commission into a Senate diversity committee. Krane explained that this was just a beginning for the Senate and encouraged faculty to work together to "expand the faculty's role in countering racism and other forms of overt and subtle discrimination." He noted it was appropriate to discuss this issue on the anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

**Proposed Resolution Regarding
Teach-in for Diversity Day**

WHEREAS the Faculty of Oregon State University share the concern of the students that acts of racism are abhorrent anywhere in society but especially on a University campus, and

WHEREAS the Faculty should take the leadership in creating a climate that encourages and celebrates human diversity,

BE IT RESOLVED that Wednesday, April 10, 1996 shall be designated as Teach-in for Diversity Day, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that on April 10 at least 15 minutes of every class period be devoted to discussions of issues of human diversity and how all members of the University community can work together to create a safe and welcoming environment.

Past President Francis moved that the resolution be approved; motion was seconded.

In the event this resolution is approved, Krane reported that he has been working with Phyllis Lee to formulate guidelines for faculty to help them ease into the subject with their students and provide discussion questions.

Senator Lunch proposed a friendly amendment to include both Wednesday and Thursday, April 10 and 11. The Executive Committee accepted the friendly amendment.

Senator Landau expressed concern that the resolution did not state that it was voluntary. Krane stated the intention was for faculty to participate voluntarily. Landau also questioned the ethical appropriateness of introducing political subjects into other defined curriculum. Krane responded that the teach-in is intended for faculty to facilitate a discussion on the subject rather than teach it.

In response to Senator Tiedeman questioning if this was solely under the authority of the Senate or if the body would be seeking support from the administration, Krane stated that he would like it to be a Faculty Senate action. He also mentioned that the President's Cabinet is aware of the proposed action and strongly support the effort.

Senator Griggs, Associated, expressed concern about the lack of discussion within the Senate regarding diversity issues. He suggested that the Senate set aside a specific time to allow all faculty to engage in a discussion of whether diversity is supported at OSU.

In response to a question asking whether an expert could be available for faculty to speak with prior to discussing the issue with their students, Krane noted that the idea is show that faculty are concerned about these issues and start a dialogue with their students, not to bring in an expert to lecture. Senator Gamble felt that this was a delicate issue and, if not handled properly, could be counter-productive.

Senator Paige, Liberal Arts, supported the sentiment, but felt that the idea was very problematic since some faculty may feel that this is an infringement of academic freedom. She also felt that it serves to trivialize what has occurred at OSU by thinking it can be addressed in 15 minutes.

Past President Francis agreed that this one action could not solve the problems associated with diversity, but supported the resolution and felt that this was a beginning.

Senator Hale was concerned that participation by some faculty and non-participation by others will send a conflicting message to students.

Senator Paige noted that not all faculty are well informed about the issues and suggested a series of voluntary workshops with individuals who are qualified to discuss the issues.

Senator Michel, Student Affairs, expressed the sentiment that he was glad it was voluntary and would be willing to participate in the Teach-in and hope that students would recognize that he is not an expert in the area.

Senator Lee, Associated, stated she had spoken with President Krane and acknowledged initial reluctance to the idea. They discussed possible questions which could be used to begin a dialogue with students and indicated that they considered these to be thoughts on how to "create a campus environment which would be conducive to safety in learning and living and working together." The real issue is to identify what type of environment is expected at OSU.

Senator Manogue, Science, welcomed the resolution as an opportunity to raise the issue in science-related courses. Conversely, she was concerned about emotions from students and how to deal with it and asked Senators to think about another way to accomplish the same goals without attaching a short time restriction.

Senator Tiedeman felt there was a greater loss potential in not doing anything. He also mentioned that the operative term in the resolution is "discussion" and the intent is not to have instructors pose as experts in the field. He supported the motion and offered the following amendment which was seconded:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that on April 10 and April 11 at least 15 minutes of every class period be devoted to discussions ~~instructors in all OSU classes be encouraged to provide opportunity for discussion~~ of issues of human diversity and how all members of the University community can work together to create a safe and welcoming environment.

Associate Provost Hashimoto felt it was not important to get closure in a particular class, but to allow students to contemplate the issues throughout the day which would, hopefully, result in a change in perspectives.

Motion 96-520-06 to approve Senator's Tiedeman's amendment passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Senator Paige proposed an additional amendment, which was seconded:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that on April 10 and April 11 instructors in all OSU classes be encouraged to provide opportunity for discussion of issues of human diversity the recent racial incidents on campus and how all members of the University community can work together to create a safe and welcoming environment.

Senator Gamble felt that the resolution was too volatile for OSU. Senator Paige felt that recent incidents should be discussed. Senator Gamblé felt that the intent was to establish rapport and choosing a volatile statement was not the way to do that.

President-elect Wilcox stated that diversity is a University AIM and, as such, instructors should be able to introduce the issue as a discussion item in a classroom setting to gauge student perceptions. He spoke against the amendment since it is more restrictive.

Senator Griggs expressed the opinion that it is difficult to lead a student discussion when faculty have not discussed the issues. He posed the question of why instructors would want to discuss this issue with students if it hasn't yet been discussed within departments. One Senator responded that faculty in his unit have regularly spoken about diversity in a group setting.

Senator Brumley, Information Services, felt it was a personal opportunity for faculty to engage students in discussion.

Motion 96-520-08 to refer to a committee the amendment which would delete "issues of human diversity" and insert "the recent racial incidents on campus" was seconded.

Senator Michel was opposed to postponing the resolution. He felt that the resolution would provide a starting point. Senator Manogue felt this issue was too important to postpone.

Senator Gamble moved the previous question, which received a second. Motion 96-520-09 to close debate to refer the amendment passed by voice vote.

Motion 96-520-08 to refer the amendment to the Executive Committee and be reconsidered at the May Faculty Senate meeting was defeated by voice vote with some votes in favor.

Senator Tiedeman felt that the amendment would have expectations for faculty to know full details of the recent incidents.

Motion 96-520-07 to approve the amendment was defeated by voice vote with no votes in favor.

Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, felt that there was no consensus or clear direction for faculty and felt that faculty could not adequately convey the care and concern called for in the resolution. He hoped that there was another approach which could be arrived at. Senator Landau strongly supported Hale's position.

Senator Gamble moved the previous question, which was seconded. Motion 96-520-10 to close debate on the full resolution passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 96-520-05 to approve the amended resolution, as it appears below, passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes:

WHEREAS the Faculty of Oregon State University share the concern of the students that acts of racism are abhorrent anywhere in society but especially on a University campus, and

WHEREAS the Faculty should take the leadership in creating a climate that encourages and celebrates human diversity,

BE IT RESOLVED that Wednesday, April 10, and Thursday, April 11, 1996 shall be designated as Teach-in for Diversity Day, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that on April 10 and April 11 instructors in all OSU classes be encouraged to provide opportunities for discussions of issues of human diversity and how all members of the University community can work together to create a safe and welcoming environment.

Executive Session

Patricia Lindsey, Faculty Recognition and Awards Chair, presented information on the nominees for the OSU Distinguished Service Award and the D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award; all nominees were approved by the Senate. Names of the OSU Distinguished Service Award recipients were forwarded to the Provost; the awards will be presented at Commencement. The D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award will be presented at University Day on September 16. Names of the recipients are to be kept confidential until officially announced by the University at a later time.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1996 No. 519

Oregon State University

March 7, 1996

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Kenneth Krane. There were no corrections to the minutes.

Meeting Summary

Special Reports — Student Affairs, Larry Roper; Copyright Law, Caroline Kerl, Mark McCambridge, and W. Lee Schroeder

Action Items — Approval of Faculty Forum Paper Guide lines and a resolution condemning prejudice [Motion 96-518-01 through 02]

New Business — There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Balz, R. Reiley; Burton, R. Schori; Gaines, R. Rainey; Knight, M. Verhoeven; Ragulsky, B. Strohmeier; Savonen, T. Gentle; Suzuki, J. Engel; and van der Mars, K. Heath.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Burrige, Calder, Cowles, L. Davis, Farnsworth, Fletcher, Foster, Fox, Headrick, Heidel, Hightower, Hu, Johnson, J. Lee, Leong, Liebowitz, Locke, Logandran, Lomax, Macnab, Manogue, Marino, Matzke, McAlexander, McDaniel, Mills, A. Mix, M. Mix, Pacheco, Plant, Randahawa, Rielly, Riggs, Rosenberger, Rudolph, Sandine, Savage, Tiger, Todd, Torres, Vuchinich, Williams, Wrolstad, and Zollinger.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; A. Wilcox, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

P. Brady-Glassman, A. Hashimoto, G. Keller, C. Kerl, K. McCreight, S. Sanford, and L. Schroeder.

Special Reports

Student Affairs Update

Dr. Larry Roper, Vice Provost for Student Affairs, reported on Student Affairs. Due to a desire to speak about recent racial incidents, Roper spoke only briefly about Student Affairs as a unit.

A Student Affairs organizational chart listing the eight units which report to his office was available at the meeting. Those units are: Career Planning and Placement, Dean of Students, Financial Aid, Memorial Union and Educational Activities, Recreational Sports, Student Health Services, University Counseling and Psychological Services, and University Housing and Dining Services.

Roper wanted faculty to be aware of the following:

- University Counseling and Psychological Services is available to offer consultation services to faculty. Although they cannot reveal whether they are seeing a particular student, they can provide support to determine what the appropriate response would be to help that student.
- Student Health Services is attempting to be much more assertive in presenting their services. They have or will be meeting with deans, advisors, and other faculty groups to promote their consultative role and better enable faculty to refer students to them.

Roper explained that 50 Student Affairs staff recently voluntarily attended a meeting to begin a long-term planning process to find ways to define standards of service. Hopefully, this will allow Student Affairs to determine their relationship to the core values of the university and identify specific initiatives to be educationally purposeful. He encouraged teaching faculty to become involved in the process and to contact him for details.

Roper then turned his attention to the recent racial incidents on campus and, in response to a question about the planned student boycott, asked April Waddy to address the issue. Waddy explained that the purpose of the All OSU Student Boycott, scheduled for March 13, is to reduce racial tensions on campus prompted by recent incidents including defacing of posters, verbal and threatened physical abuse of some students, and numerous race incidents occurring in off-campus living organizations. Students are aware that faculty cannot cancel classes, but ask that students who participate in the boycott not be penalized.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, questioned the magnitude of the problem. Roper explained that students and faculty are aware of different problems and felt that there are perception differences, some of which are based on life experience differences. He posed a question to educators asking them how to help people understand the experiences of people who might be different than themselves.

Senator S. Miller, Agricultural Sciences, asked if OSU was a racist institution and if Roper's perception was that OSU has been non-responsive. Roper felt that OSU is very responsive and has done more than many other places in Oregon. He also felt that having the issue raised is healthy, but whether benefits are realized depends on how it is dealt with. Roper responded that certain students should be asked what they feel are the outcomes of their interaction with the university to determine whether OSU is racist.

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned whether the university has documentation of events that have been aimed toward people with respect to ethnic background. He also asked if there are students who perceive they are not being properly treated and what measures are in place to deal with the issue. Roper stated that complaints have been registered with various offices and committees on campus. Roper responded to Gamble that recent events could not be classified as an intensified frequency of events; he felt it was a general pattern of behavior on campus.

IFS Representative Burns questioned what faculty could do to help the situation in addition to not penalizing students during the boycott. Roper responded that students want someone to talk to and are finding that they don't have the tools to relate to people of different cultures. He encouraged faculty to expose students to diversity and create cooperative learning situations.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, questioned whether data was available which would compare the frequency of incidents at OSU with other campuses. Roper answered negatively and stated that the data available is spotty.

President-elect Wilcox questioned which aspects of student conduct regulations was being applied in the case of the two white students harassing a black student on campus. Bill Oye, Coordinator of Student Conduct, responded that there are a number of regulations in the Student Conduct Code which would address concerns. He noted that the specific language is "harassing or threatening behavior" and conditions to be considered include offensive physical contact which would provoke a violent response and property damage which seems to be motivated by bias.

Dean White, Health & Human Performance, questioned whether OSU was experiencing an increase in incidents or an increase in awareness of the incidents. Oye responded that the actual incidents reported are low. He noted that the numbers rise to a more accurate level when students feel comfortable that the university will be responsive when an incident is reported. Recent reported incidents may be a result of students having confidence in the university handling the situation rather than accepting the incidents as being a part of the community.

In response to Senator Landau, Science, questioning whether the boycott was officially sponsored, Roper stated that it was sponsored by the students.

Senator Browne, Business, felt that a few of the Student Affairs units have not reacted to the needs of students or potential employers. He asked what was being done to shift the focus. Roper responded that Career Planning and Placement is one area where new technology is being installed which will revolutionize the recruitment process. The system, which will be available to students 24 hours a day, will have the ability to develop resumes, check on the status of applications, and review information about employers. The system will be installed this Spring and tested for capacity, and become operational in Fall '96.

Copyright Law

Caroline Kerl, OSU Legal Advisor, Mark McCambridge, Director of Business Services, and W. Lee Schroeder, Chief Business Officer reported on the current legal status of duplication of copyrighted materials.

Schroeder spoke about duplication of packets used in classrooms and how they interact with the copyright laws, printing, and marketing. He reminded Senators about the "Fair Use" ruling in the Kinko's case several years ago which stated that copyrighted items could be copied for individual use but mass quantities could not be copied and sold or made available. He announced that OSU has decided to require copyright searches to be handled through OSU Printing and Mailing Services, who would also print the materials, and the materials would then be made available to students through a private vendor selected by OSU as a result of a Request for Proposal (RFP).

Kerl spoke about a recent case involving the Michigan Document Services, who prepares course packets similar to Kinko's, which was heard by the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals and, surprisingly, rendered a decision opposite to that of the Kinko's case. She noted that the case will be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. She stated that OSU will not follow this decision and gave the following reasons:

- The Court held that copying up to 30% of a document was considered to be fair use — which is quite beyond standards used up to this point.
- Oregon is in the 9th Circuit Court District and that was a 6th Circuit decision and not considered to be law in the 9th Circuit.
- It was a 2-1 decision and does not follow the limited trend in the area of fair use.
- The ruling does not cite either of the two recent cases involving fair use. Both of the other cases are much more restrictive regarding fair use.

McCambridge explained that an RFP was issued by the OSU Contracting Office in March which requests a vendor to provide the service of selling course packets produced by OSU Printing and Mailing Copyright Clearance Center and defines that the vendor must be located on a piece of commercial property within one block of

the OSU campus boundary. Other than the shift from the OSU Bookstore Copyright Center, McCambridge didn't feel that much change would be experienced. He noted an advantage to the new procedure would be that requests could be sent via campus mail to Printing and Mailing and, hopefully, within six months requests could be transmitted electronically.

Senator Gamble stated that the copyright policy has been in effect for some time and questioned the rationale behind limiting the marketing to one vendor. McCambridge responded that the one vendor issue is driven by the cost of the product to the student. He noted that administration did investigate the possibility of providing every packet to every vendor who wished to market them, but that would result in copy overruns to make packets available to multiple vendors and the additional cost would be passed on to the students. Gamble did not agree with the rationale and stated that the instructor can limit the number of copies to the number of students in the course.

IFS Representative Burns asked how much lead time is needed to obtain copyright permission for documents. McCambridge responded that the average is 2-3 weeks per item.

Senator DeKock, Science, questioned the issue of quality assurance in the areas of printed materials and service to students. McCambridge replied that control is maintained over materials printed by OSU employees and the Office of Business Services will ensure that the quality of service to students in the form of sales will be maintained as outlined in the contract.

In response to Senator Gamble questioning what benefit is received by the University from this arrangement, Schroeder stated that it is a way to control risk and ensure that copyright permission is correctly obtained.

Senator Stevens, Agricultural Sciences, clarified that OSU Printing and Mailing Services would provide copyright clearance and copy packets which would then be transferred to the selected vendor for sales and distribution. In response to Stevens not understanding how this process eliminates risk if OSU provides copyright clearance, Schroeder stated that OSU can assure the process of the copyright clearance activity.

Schroeder responded positively to Past President Sally Francis questioning whether bookstores can respond to the RFP. In response to Francis asking whether faculty members can continue to take their materials to off-campus vendors, Kerl reminded Senators that the proposal adds protection for faculty. She felt that faculty could not be stopped from using off-campus vendors once the program is implemented, but it would be difficult for her to defend a faculty member who may be sued for copyright violations when the university has an on-campus copyright service.

Senator Browne felt that convenience to students was important and questioned why the contract couldn't just

be given to the OSU Bookstore so students could purchase all materials in one location. McCambridge stated that, specifically, Corvallis business owners have a real concern about not having competition in any decision OSU makes and noted there was no difference between the Bookstore and the Book Bin. Issuing the RFP is an attempt to drive the cost down since it defines the mark-up amount allowed for each packet.

In response to Senator Gamble's point of information, Kerl stated that she knows of no OSU faculty member who has been sued for copyright violations.

Senator Collins, Liberal Arts, questioned the fees charged for copyright searches and how the fees are distributed. McCambridge stated that the copyright fee is specifically charged to the course packet, not equally distributed among all course packets.

In response to Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, questioning the sales of packets, McCambridge stated that the university does not have a facility to sell packets.

Senator Mukatis, Business, asked if there was information available from other institutions who are handling the process in this manner. McCambridge felt that more institutions have instituted the process as OSU is proposing. Kerl noted that the U of O has used this process for a number of years.

Senator Gamble questioned the duration of the RFP. McCambridge replied that the RFP reads one year with an additional two year provisional renewal.

Senator Stevens encouraged administration to withdraw the RFP and let the market prevail. He felt that students would gladly pay an additional 25¢ at the OSU Bookstore rather than stand in a separate line at a separate establishment. He stated that he wants administration, rather than himself, to explain to students why they must purchase packets at a separate establishment. Schroeder stated that the additional cost would be much in excess of 25¢ if it was necessary to print 200 copies to have the 100 required copies available.

Faculty Forum Paper Guidelines

President Krane presented the following proposed revisions to the Faculty Forum Paper Guidelines, which were last approved March 7, 1968. He explained that the revisions were a result of a submission which appeared to be outside the guidelines.

Guidelines for Faculty Forum Papers

1. Name of publication and publisher: "OSU Faculty Forum Papers" published by the Oregon State University Faculty Senate.
2. Preparation of manuscripts: Each manuscript submitted for publication:

- a. Must be submitted by a faculty member who is part of the Faculty Senate apportionment group.
- b. Should not exceed a reasonable length. A six page limit is suggested.

3. Submission of manuscripts:

- a. Manuscripts should be submitted to the Faculty Senate Office.
- b. Manuscripts should be submitted in electronic form, either by e-mail or on a computer disk in a format compatible with the Faculty Senate Office's word processing system.
- c. All submissions must be accompanied by a printed copy signed by each author and including each author's campus address and electronic mail address.

4. Review of manuscripts: Editorial review shall be done to assess the appropriateness of the submission and any potential legal problems associated with its publication. By publishing the paper, the institution may be required to share legal responsibility with the author for the published material. Manuscripts shall be reviewed as follows:

- a. Each manuscript will be read by the Faculty Forum editor, who shall be designated each year by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- b. The editor, at his or her discretion, may select at least one additional faculty member, preferably with expertise in the area in question, to read the manuscript. The editor may also submit the paper directly to the Executive Committee for its advisement if the content is in question.
- c. If reviewers suspect possible legal problems, the editor may suggest revisions to the author and/or may seek additional legal advice.
- d. If disagreements between the author and the editor cannot be resolved, the paper will be referred to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for further action. If the Executive Committee decides against publication, the author will be so advised.
- e. The Executive Committee, or a representative thereof, shall review the final version of the Faculty Forum Paper prior to publication.

5. Publication and distribution:

- a. Publication will be distributed by electronic mail to all Faculty Senate members and to Deans, Directors and Department Heads with a request to route to all faculty.
- b. Printed copies will not be distributed but will be available for review in the Faculty Senate Office and in the Kerr Library Reserve Book

Room.

- c. The following disclaimer will be included on every Faculty Forum Paper:
Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.

Senator Landau queried whether the Executive Committee had considered including under item 5. that the publication be available as part of the OSU Home Page. Krane noted that the Faculty Senate is in the process of developing a home page which would be linked to the OSU Home Page which would contain items such as this.

Senator Hale questioned what Faculty Forum Papers were. Krane replied that they were submissions written by a faculty member for distribution to other faculty members. He then encouraged faculty to prepare and submit a paper on any subject.

Senator Mukatis questioned whether the author of a Faculty Forum Paper relinquished copyright rights upon submission. Krane noted that OSU is the publisher, but wasn't sure who had copyright rights.

Motion 96-519-01 to approve the proposed guidelines passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Information Items

- Committee Interest Forms will be distributed after Spring break and will be due back in the Faculty Senate Office on April 15.
- A recap of the February Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting was included in the agenda.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold condemned recent racial incidents and labeled them "very inappropriate" and "unacceptable behavior." He noted these acts were "disappointing" and "unfortunate" as they relate to several institutional goals and initiatives. He mentioned the external image created which does not recognize the internal efforts and progress which has been made. The institutional response to the recent incidents has been more broadly based than has been observed with past incidents. He noted that more concern and commitment to values and principles of the worth and dignity of all individuals has been expressed. Arnold referred to the recent talk by Anita Hill who stated she chooses to view these incidents as a cry for help on the part of individuals. Arnold's perception of her message was that OSU is presented with an opportunity to view these incidents as "teachable moments" and "learnable moments" for all. "The university is all of us," he stated. "We ARE the university." He felt there were opportunities to learn and to grow in understanding from situations such as these. These situations present an opportunity to reach out and support students, to serve

as advocates for them, and to individually challenge inappropriate behaviors when observed personally. These situations should also remind everyone to practice positive human relations skills on a regular basis.

He reminded faculty that they have the opportunity to participate in an investment of faculty development in the Difference, Power and Discrimination Program which represents a commitment by OSU "to a principle, to a practice, to an expectation for the learning experiences for students." He noted that, although a very small proportion of faculty have taken advantage of this opportunity, those who have participated have indicated that it has been a very positive faculty development experience as it relates to their teaching in general and how they relate to students.

Arnold challenged faculty to think of ways to reach out and support the student boycott. Although he could not officially sanction a cancellation of classes, he urged faculty to be sensitive to the concern of students and supportive of the underlying issues being raised.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane's report included the following items:

- Reminded committee/council chairs of the March 12 meeting regarding distance learning and student representation.
- Encouraged faculty to consider volunteering for positions on committees when the form is received.
- Announced that Provost Arnold has officially convened the Faculty Consultative Group to consider program reallocations and redirections within the Extension Service.
- Senator Gamble moved to include in the minutes President Krane's entire statement condemning prejudice, which was seconded; motion 96-518-02, passed unanimously. The statement follows:

Acts of racism are particularly abhorrent wherever they occur in our society, but particularly reprehensible on a university campus which should be a place of free and open inquiry, where we can challenge one another's most cherished beliefs and in turn be challenged by those whose ideas and backgrounds differ from our own. When racism, sexism, homophobia, age discrimination, religious intolerance, xenophobia, or discrimination against disabled individuals appear on our campus, we are ALL diminished as individuals, but especially in our role as teachers and students.

I thought for awhile about bringing a resolution before you this afternoon — sort of a feel good resolution that would send us all home tonight feeling better about taking some positive action — but I decided that wouldn't be appropriate.

Instead, I call upon you leaders in your respective academic units to redouble your efforts to root out and help to eradicate this scourge. The actual form that your actions may take are up to you — perhaps meetings of faculty, staff, and students in your unit might be appropriate to simply air these incidents, discussions in your classes, renewed efforts to recruit and retain students and faculty of color, more frequent invitations to colloquium and seminar speakers from underrepresented minorities, and so forth. Those of you who came through school in the 60's, like I did, can probably think of many, many examples of how these incidents can be responded to.

Each of you as faculty members serves as a role model and mentor to your students. Sometimes we forget that this act of mentoring must go beyond our individual professional expertise. By displaying an open attitude that encourages and celebrates diversity, and by acting personally to promote diversity on our campus, you can by example show our students the differences between inclusive and intolerant behaviors.

And as we learned in the 60's, "All politics is local," and local really means at the departmental level. This is an appropriate place for each of us to take some positive action. I urge you to reflect on this issue and to act within your academic units, to consider how we as faculty can contribute to creating a more welcoming environment for our increasingly diverse student body, and to work together to establish a campus where, to paraphrase Dr. King, one is known not for the color of one's skin but for the power of one's intellect.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:33.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1996 No. 518

Oregon State University

February 1, 1996

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 pm by President Ken Krane. There were no corrections to the January minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports - Honors College, Jon Hendricks; and Athletics, Bob Frank and Dutch Baughman
- Action Items - Approval of Parliamentarian [Motion 96-518-01]
- New Business - None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Dodrill, T. Gentle; Pereira, G. Pearson; Tiger, R. Hathaway; van der Mars, K. Heath; and Williamson, P. Easley.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Balz, Boyer, Burrige, Calvert, Christie, L. Davis, DeKock, Delson, R. Duncan, Falkner, Farber, Hightower, Hu, Ingham, Jenkins, Knight, Liebowitz, Lomax, Lunch, Marino, McAlexander, McDaniel, McEwan, T. Miller, Mills, A. Mix, M. Mix, Pacheco, Paige, Prucha, Rathja, Rosenberger, Rudolph, Sandine, Savonen, Suzuki, Torres, Tricker, and S. Woods.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; T. Wilcox, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

B. Becker, B. Frank, A. Hashimoto, J. Hughes, L. Roper, and L. Schroeder.

Special Reports

Honors College

Jon Hendricks, Honors College Director, reported on the current status of the University Honors College. Hendricks noted that, beginning in 1997, graduating Honors College students will receive an honors baccalaureate degree. Russell Dix, Registrars Office, is working with the Honors students to design graduating regalia unique to the College.

The Honors College, with assistance from the University Honors College Council, admitted 255 students last fall, with about 22% representing protected minority categories.

Approximately 20% of those admitted come from out-of-state; there are 10 international students. Colleges which constitute the highest student representation are: Science, Engineering, Liberal Arts, and Business.

The program is designed to support students in any major across campus, in a small class teaching format (limit of 20 in lower division and 12 in the upper division), with instruction from faculty. The College is funded to support about 30 courses per year, in addition to courses offered by four visiting appointments. About three-quarters of what is taught parallels the Baccalaureate Core. Students are required to schedule a 15 minute advising session prior to the beginning of each term to obtain the course CRN's. The Honors College is in search of coursework which is representative of the campus. Hendricks urged faculty to "Take advantage of the opportunity to work with some of the best and the brightest."

Students can select from two tracks in the Honors College, the Scholar or the Associate. The Scholar Track, designed for lower division students, asks students to take the Honors version of a Writing II class, 12 hours of parallel baccalaureate core courses, as well as completing the requirements of the Associate Track. The Associate Track, designed for upper division students, requires four one-hour colloquia, Intro to Thesis, a capstone experience, elective hours, and a mentorship opportunity. The student credit hours go to the department whose instructor is teaching the course. Hendricks explained the three I's required for Honors coursework: Interdisciplinary, Intercultural, and Integrated. These principles are also considered when reviewing admission applications.

Honors students are involved in a number of activities, including a Flag Football game at the University of Oregon with the Clarks Honors College, hosting a Brain Bowl with the U of O's CHC, and Anita Hill's visit on March 4 and 5. They have also organized an Honors College Student Council and an Honors Newsletter.

The Honors College Office is located in 229 Strand Agricultural Hall. Space in the basement of Strand will be renovated to include a student lounge and a 10 station computer classroom.

Response to the Honors College has been very favorable. Hendricks noted that 5,800 Honors brochures have been requested; there are only approximately 145 slots available for Fall 1996. He urged faculty to encourage good students to apply for admission to the Honors College.

Athletics

Dutch Baughman, Athletic Director, and Bob Frank, NCAA Faculty Representative, presented a report on intercollegiate athletic issues.

Bob Frank began by addressing issues which were discussed at the recent NCAA Convention. Academic standards for freshman and qualifications for eligibility was a major topic. The old standard was a 2.0 gpa and 700 on the SAT or 17 on the ACT. In the last three years, a sliding scale was adopted which allowed a higher gpa with a lower SAT score. This was viewed as a compromise between those who wanted higher standards and those who objected to standardized tests. At the heart of this discussion is individual institution's perceptions of their different missions. There is no unanimity on the question of the use of test scores and what entrance requirements should be for student athletes. Efforts to change the legislation this year was defeated.

Another issue concerned a problem with junior college transfers who meet institutional admissions standards, but have credits that don't meet the requirements of a specific program, so they can't meet the requirements to maintain eligibility. Changes were proposed to adopt tougher standards for junior college transfers in football and men's basketball. Delegates mandated that these student athletes not be eligible for competition in the first year unless they have met existing requirements and completed at least 35% of the course requirements in the students' specific degree program. Frank noted that all the proposals were developed in consultation with community and junior colleges.

There were a number of pieces of legislation introduced concerning financial aid. There was general sympathy to provide assistance to student athletes by allowing them work and earn a specific amount during the school year, but delegates were concerned about oversight for the proposed legislation. There was also concern that student athletes would feel pressure to work while competing and maintaining academic requirements. A proposal concerning need-based financial aid was defeated which would have required institutional aid to be awarded beyond the value of tuition, fees, and books based on the student athlete's demonstrated need according to federal methodology. Frank noted that a number of financial aid officers spoke in opposition to this proposal. Frank also mentioned the issue of student athletes arguing that they should be paid.

Frank reported that student athlete graduation rates continue to be high. The OSU freshman graduation rate for fall 1985 to Spring 1989 was 55%; the mean of all 107 Division I institutions was 59%; and for large public institutions it was 56%. The graduation rate for OSU student athletes who come in as freshman and complete their eligibility is 95%, Stanford graduates 93%, and Berkeley graduates 83%. OSU's graduation rate has been consistent for about five years and is due to the concerted effort on the part of the staff in the Athletic Department as well as campus support services staff.

Dutch Baughman reported that the issue receiving the most attention at the convention concerned restructuring the entire NCAA. Previously each institution had one vote at the convention. Under the restructuring plan, three groups have been formed: a Management Council, consisting of faculty athletic representatives, athletic directors, and senior women administrators; a Board of Directors, consisting of university presidents; and an Executive Committee made up of members of the Board of Directors. A conference meeting will now take place prior to the convention where delegates will discuss how they would vote on issues under consideration at the convention; the vote would then be carried by the Management Council for a decisive action. In the past, Divisions I, II, and III met together and voted on issues affecting the other divisions. Under the new plan, each division will meet independently at the convention and will only vote on issues affecting their particular division.

Also voted on was the issue of NCAA compliance with rules and regulations. Baughman noted that coaches and administrators who violate NCAA rules have been able to move on and continue operating in the same manner from school to school. Legislation was passed stating that if a charge of unethical conduct is brought before the NCAA involving a current or former member of an athletics department staff, that the unethical conduct charge will be charged to the individual, whether or not they are still employed at the institution where the violation occurred. If an individual is charged with unethical conduct and chooses to be employed elsewhere, the employing institution will be responsible to the NCAA to show cause as to why they would attempt to hire an individual who has this charge carried with them.

Baughman was asked by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to address the issue of religion in OSU athletics which have been documented in recent news articles and rumored on campus.

- Baughman referred to a recent *Oregonian* article in which he was quoted during a Fellowship of Christian Athletes meeting and stated that he was not aware that anyone from the media was present which would have alerted him that it was a public meeting.
- He reported that he has hired 89 of the approximately 99 full-time athletic department staff members over the past seven years. Of the 89, he can verify that there are eight who have some religious faith. Baughman discounted the rumors that, during the hiring process, he asks a prospective employee what their religious conviction is. He stated that religious faith has no bearing in the hiring process.
- Another rumor involves the notion that student athletes do not participate unless they are Christians. He stated that there are many benchmarks which must be measured up to in the Athletic Department, religion is not one of them. He finds it ludicrous to think that someone would believe that student athletes compete based on religion and not athletic ability.

Baughman was also asked to address issue of the

athletic budget. He noted that seven years ago a \$3.2 million budget deficit was inherited; the deficit now stands at \$2.2 million with \$150,000 being paid annually toward the interest on the debt. The deficit has been reduced through fiscal management of the department. Between the years 1992-95 the OSBHE placed an expenditure freeze on the OSU Athletic Department. At the end of that time period the Athletic Department received a letter of commendation from the State Board thanking them for staying within the limit, even with inflation. The department has voluntarily chosen to impose the same limitation on themselves this year. Baughman referred to the salary issue addressed by Provost Arnold earlier, by stating that any salary increases in his department will be totally self-funded.

Senator Matzke, Science, questioned how much of the balanced budget is a result of general fund expenditures. Baughman responded that a sum of money is available from the Chancellor's Office to state institutions, to be used at their discretion; the support to the Athletic Department is around \$1 million.

In response to Senator Gamble, Science, asking if there was a protocol by which hiring is accomplished in the Athletics Department, Baughman stated that the process was strictly in accordance with Affirmative Action.

Senator Landau, Science, expressed concerns about religious issues which were not addressed. The first concern dealt with coaches or students feeling that they can't voice complaints about religious activities for fear that their careers would be over. He also objected to having coaches, which have faculty status and are colleagues, lead prayer in public facilities, while on state time, as part of their job. He felt this was inappropriate in a state university. Landau questioned whether Baughman knew that prayer was being led and encouraged by coaches and whether he condoned that practice. Baughman stated that there are no mandatory prayers in athletics. He also commented that there are processes outside of the Athletic Department which an individual could choose to take advantage of to lodge a complaint anonymously if they were fearful of retaliation. Baughman admitted that he knew prayer was occurring in the football program, but did not know if prayer occurs in other athletic programs, although he did note that he had been told that it does occur among the student athletes. Baughman has asked the football coach to cease praying with athletes. He assured faculty that he annually reviews documents and seeks counsel to determine what is allowed under Church and State laws and what he, as an agent of a state university, is permitted to do.

Action Items

Approval of Parliamentarian

Motion to approve Trischa Knapp as Parliamentarian for 1996 was passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Information Items

- Faculty Awards Deadline — The agenda listed February 15 as the deadline for nominations for nine awards to be presented at University Day on September 16.
- Faculty/Sabbatical Housing List — The listings for Faculty/Sabbatical Housing kept in the Faculty Senate Office are available on GOPHER. If a faculty member is coming to OSU, GOPHER can be accessed to determine if there is housing which meets their needs; faculty members who are going on sabbatical can also list their homes as rentals. After accessing GOPHER, select "OSU Information & Services," then select "Faculty/Sabbatical Housing List." The following menus will appear from which to choose: Rentals Available, Roommates, House Sitting, Housing Needed, and Sale. The rental listing is organized by number of bedrooms.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

- OSBHE Planning Process — The four Board appointed committees are in Phase I, or the assessment phase, which considers the status of the current environment and the current situation within OSSHE. The committees are very active, with three of the four committees requesting specific information from OSU. Phase 2 will identify what higher education should be doing and will be the most important phase.
- President Risser's Initiatives — President Risser presented the following three broad challenges to faculty during the January Faculty Senate meeting. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has been asked to discuss how OSU should approach the challenges using a widely participatory model. 1) Learning experiences designed for students developed in true partnership with clients; 2) Create a climate that is both supportive and encouraging of cross-program involvement by faculty who would be recognized and rewarded for contributions made anywhere at the University.; and 3) Collaboration with other institutions of higher education, within as well as outside of OSSHE institutions. Where appropriate, OSU would play a key, lead collaborative role. Due to anticipated joint ventures, this point relates to the planning process.
- Current Budget Process — Most biennial budgets begin with guidelines which are developed by the Executive Branch and issued to agencies. The budget is then modified by OSBHE, upon recommendation from the Chancellor's Office, then issued to individual institutions with an opportunity to provide responses in the form of possible approaches to be taken. The current process is more centrally driven by thinking within the State Board and system-wide priorities. A central theme carried over from the previous biennium is the issue of productivity. The productivity assumption built into the budget was with an express purpose

of indicating that OSSHE was willing to increase its productivity money to allow for faculty salary increases in this biennium. Arnold noted that, institution-wide, productivity hasn't changed very much; many people feel that it must be budget-driven for changes to occur.

- OSU Salary Plan for this Biennium — The State System's theme throughout the legislative process included issues of faculty retention and the Higher Education Efficiency Act. The Legislature identified money to be made available to support general salary increases (3%) throughout State government with \$52 million earmarked for that purpose. Toward the end of the legislative session, the course of action was changed due to the court decisions affecting the PERS ballot measure which required the State to continue funding the PERS contributions. The dollars earmarked for salary increases were diverted back into the budget to contribute toward the 6% PERS contribution. The \$52 million represented 70% funding of the 6% contribution. The Legislature allowed only OSSHE to receive some funding (3%) for compensation for faculty salaries. The 3% funding for faculty salaries, coupled with a significant decrease in general fund monies, provides an arguable point as to whether the salary increase was actually funded. Partial offsets to various budgets were provided by additional tuition revenues and fees and lottery funds. In order for dollars to be added back into the system, OSSHE had to agree to self-fund salary increases during this biennium. There was an understanding that the intended use of add-back dollars was for retention with strong attention to issues of merit in the distribution of those dollars. Individual plans then went before the State Board for approval, which considered the plans as a combined plan for the entire biennium. The approved plan for OSU provided for the following: Year 1 — 3% for fully satisfactory service; Year 2 — at least 2/3 of the 6% adjustment on January 1997 will be distributed on the basis of merit. There is no language which limits the number of faculty who could receive merit adjustments.

Tony Wilcox, President-Elect, questioned how the self-funding process operates. Arnold responded that there is a need to refocus thinking about budget planning by thinking about investment opportunities, particularly with centrally held carry-over dollars, that have the potential to increase to revenues in the future. In the past, higher education has not been allowed to carry-over money to the next biennium, but more flexibility was allowed with the implementation of Measure 5. Areas of investment for carry-over dollars which have been identified are: student recruitment and retention, marketing, and Extended Education. Deans and other administrators are now meeting to discuss the continuing emphasis on productivity and self-funding as it relates to the funding of salaries. OSBHE guidelines stated that there would not be major program reductions to fund the salary increase.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, expressed concern over departments whose budgets consist primarily of salary costs, which translates to lost positions when self-funding

is required. Arnold responded that a high proportion of budgets are salary related and involves an issue of balance within the unit.

Senator Mukatis, Business, questioned the status of the early retirement plan in relation to funding raises and increasing productivity. Arnold stated that a number of units expect that faculty will take advantage of the early retirement plan, which entails a front-end cost, with savings occurring only if some positions are not filled. Decisions to fill positions may be made based on productivity issues.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane reported on the following items:

- Distance Learning — Krane noted that distance learning means many different things to different people, from video courses delivered directly, to courses on the World Wide Web, to courses delivered via the Internet. He quoted from two recent articles in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and stressed the importance that faculty don't remain passive in the area of distance learning, but encouraged faculty to be active partners in considering ramifications involved. He also noted that technology should be evaluated and appropriateness decided based on the pedagogic value and the effects on student learning. Krane has asked several Faculty Senate committees to begin a series of discussions concerning impacts of distance learning in their respective areas. Krane will periodically give progress reports to the Senate as the discussions proceed.
- Reminded faculty about the February 15 deadline for faculty award nominations. He noted that many department chairs or award committees seek out qualified candidates, but cautioned that they not act as a filter or inhibit nominations in any way. The nominations are open and any faculty member is eligible to submit award nominations directly to the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee.
- If a Senator's name is missing from the sign-in sheet outside the Senate meeting, contact the Faculty Senate Office at 737-4344.
- He reported a recent action by the State Board allowing employees to use frequent flier miles as they choose, unless mandated by the terms of a grant or contract.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:48.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker

Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1996 No. 517

Oregon State University

January 11, 1996

For All Academic Staff

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Sally Francis. There were no corrections to the minutes.

Francis noted that the past year had been extraordinarily productive, as well as extremely challenging, and re-capped some of the issues that were brought before the Senate: Ballot Measure 8, Collective Bargaining, OSU presidential search, public employees strike, Extended Education model, Minority Affairs Commission Report, Financial Information System, Intercollegiate Athletics, Curriculum Council proposals, Honors College, Ethnic Studies Program, Academic Regulations changes, Committee on Committee recommendations to revise Standing Rules, Bylaws changes, and Promotion & Tenure revised guidelines. Francis challenged faculty to continue to accept the right and responsibility to share in the governance of the university and remain courageous and strong toward that commitment.

She thanked Provost Arnold and President Emeritus Byrne for their commitment to faculty governance and their active participation in Senate activities. She welcomed President Risser and looked forward to a positive relationship to further the mission and goals of OSU. She also was particularly appreciative of Past President Michael Oriard, Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant Vickie Nunnemaker, and to President-Elect Ken Krane and members of the Executive Committee for their hard work on behalf of all OSU faculty. President Francis then declared Ken Krane installed as President.

While thanking Francis for her service, President Krane stated that many successful activities during the past year were the result of her leadership and initiative and noted that she had maintained a sense of "fairness, steadfastness, and equanimity that have been inspirations to those of us who have worked closely with you." Krane presented her with a Myrtlewood plaque with the following inscription:

Sally Francis

*Oregon State University Faculty Senate President
1995*

*In appreciation for her leadership and dedicated service
to the faculty of Oregon State University.*

*The art of progress is to preserve order amid change
and to preserve change amid order.*

- Alfred North Whitehead

President Krane then asked the newly elected members of the Executive Committee (Cheryl Jordan, Don Reed, Ken Williamson), President-Elect Anthony Wilcox, and IFS

Representative Leslie Burns to stand and declared them installed. After asking the newly elected Senators to stand, he also declared them installed.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports - OSU President Paul Risser
- Action Items - There were no items for the Senate to act on.
- New Business - There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

A. Duncan, T. Gentle; Gupta, C. Biermann; Kramer, L. Pribyl; Rielly, J. Root; and Williamson, P. Easley.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Boyer, Burrige, Calder, Christie, Cowles, L. Davis, R. Duncan, Farnsworth, Fletcher, Griggs, Ingham, J. Lee, P. Lee, Leid, Liebowitz, Lundin, Lundy, Macnab, Marino, McAlexander, McDaniel, T. Miller, Mills, M. Mix, Pacheco, Paige, Prucha, Rathja, Riggs, Rosenberger, Rudolph, Tiger, Torres, Tricker, Vuchinich, and Wander.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Krane, President; T. Wilcox, President-Elect; T. Knapp, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

M. Abels, M. Brouwers, T. Chandler, P. Douthit, A. Hashimoto, K. Heath, M. Matzke, D. Nicodemus, C. Pratt, B. Strohmeier, G. Thompson, M. Wagener, and D. Wasil.

Special Reports

Dr. Paul Risser, OSU President

The focus of Dr. Risser's initial conversation with faculty challenged them to rethink and change the way OSU currently does business.

Risser noted that the Faculty Senate has a reputation of being particularly effective on campus, but also is widely regarded in Oregon as one of enviable quality. He assured the Senate that he wants that image to continue. He urged faculty to think of ways the Faculty Senate can be involved in processes. He will work toward assuring

that the Senate's opinion on issues is prominently held during the coming year.

Risser went on to talk about things he feels are important for him to do and laid out topics for faculty to address.

He noted that a great deal of talk about reorganization state-wide has resulted in four OSSHE task forces: life-long learning and professional development, graduate studies and research (chaired by John Byrne), undergraduate studies, and economic development. He felt that the task forces would probably result in recommendations about program changes, but didn't feel that institutional organizational changes would likely occur.

Marketing — He felt that OSU is regarded even stronger outside of the State and recognized the need to have a coherent program to market OSU within Oregon. He indicated that a consultant has proposed a series of suggestions and ideas and felt that this was an important topic.

Student Recruiting and Retention — Enrollment management is working in this area, but additional effort needs to be focussed. He noted there is a need to develop a good synergy between unit and central activities related to recruitment and retention.

Extended Education — Risser felt that OSU has made a number of steps toward Extended Education, notably the conceptual design. He noted there is a group working toward implementing policies and programs.

He emphasized that all three are areas which will involve Senate participation and all have money set aside for investment during the next budget process.

Risser urged faculty to think about the next three topics in very different ways than they may be used to and expressed the need to harmonize activities since the three are related. He noted that organizational charts and existing authorities frequently come first when thinking about issues. Risser felt that OSU has a unique opportunity to approach issues differently by focussing on performance rather than organizational charts. He felt it's important to continually find ways to increase the participation level on this campus. He also noted the need to focus on what people actually do, not on what they have the authority to do. The only way to be successful is to be ingenious, to improvise, to experiment, to try and not be penalized, but rather encouraged, to do so. He spoke about the mistrust in higher education institutions and noted that leaders must be allowed to lead, with leadership at all levels. When considering the following topics, which he feels are the three most important steps which could be taken by OSU, think about the following: what is trying to be accomplished in terms of performance, how to include more people in terms of what they do rather than what their authority is, how do we encourage innovation and improvisation, how we harmonize ideas being worked on, how to let a large number of people exert leadership, and whether it is the right thing to do.

1) Learning experiences and outcomes developed in partnership with clients — Risser would like to be able to say, perhaps in as early as six months, that academic degree requirements and learning experiences are developed in direct partnership with clients. This would require a very different set of skills, behaviors, and interrelationships between people than exist today. Rather than challenging the Senate to find ways to do this, Risser asked for suggestions to identify ways of working together to address the topic.

2) Work without penalty — Risser spoke about a model where faculty in every unit would work without any administrative or budgetary penalty and could work across campus regardless of discipline. He suggested having a portion of every faculty member's salary attached to the individual rather than to a unit; this may require a sophisticated accounting approach to relate performance to resources. This would affect budgeting and the organization of academic, research and outreach activities.

3) Collaborative state-wide programs — Risser stated that OSU should develop cooperative academic programs with other higher education institutions in Oregon. He acknowledged that a few programs now exist cooperatively with some institutions, but challenged faculty to think in terms of a seamless education process which involves OSU with every other higher education institution in the State of Oregon, including community colleges. He urged faculty to think about the needs of students.

Risser stated that he doesn't underestimate what he suggested and acknowledged that no university has addressed the above topics in a successful way, but feels that OSU is in a position to do so.

He noted that all faculty have a responsibility to play some role and each has a responsibility to lead. He recognizes that one of his responsibilities is to clearly articulate directions in which to move. He felt that the above would not be possible in most universities, but feels that OSU's successes during difficult times has poised it to accomplish what others can't. He also noted that the recently revised Promotion & Tenure guidelines should be a model for campuses across the country, in his opinion.

Senator Burton, Science, questioned the use of the term 'clients.' Risser responded that students are both clients and products, but challenged faculty to think of them in different ways and find more effective ways of thinking about them.

Senator Matzke, Science, felt that faculty move fairly easily between units and questioned whether Dr. Risser has posed this suggestion to the Deans. Risser responded that the end result needs to be considered rather than thinking first about the structure; he will speak with the Deans. In response to Matzke asking if there will be a change in the administrative structure, Risser stated that

we need to focus first on what needs to be accomplished, then decide on the structure.

Senator Landau, Science, applauded Risser's efforts but questioned the wisdom of cutting academic budgets to fund various activities since he felt that academics is the most important factor. Risser emphasized that there should be no ambiguity on the importance of academics. He noted he would be in Bend the following day meeting with about 200 representatives from across the state and would try to build support which will result in legislative support to fund higher education activities from outside the university rather than from within unit budgets. He also suggested that there may be ways to organize the university which would reallocate more resources to academics and be more efficient in accomplishing other activities. He noted that time and energy requirements will be enormous.

Senator Reed, Science, cited the example of OHSU becoming a public corporation and questioned whether Risser sees OSU also becoming a public corporation. Risser responded that is probably not a direction OSU would want to follow.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, felt that the changes suggested today may be the type of message that the legislature wants to hear and could potentially be an opportunity for Risser to plead the case of higher education. Oriard questioned how hard Risser was planning to work the legislature. Risser responded that his continual connection with the governor and legislature is absolutely important.

Risser ended his conversation with the faculty by emphasizing that OSU has an opportunity to do something as a group; there is no such thing as 'we' and 'they.' He noted that the ideas he presented during the meeting had not previously been discussed with other groups since he feels that the leadership will come from the faculty.

Information Items

- 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 Provost

Provost Arnold congratulated the newly installed officers, Executive Committee, and Senators and thanked Sally Francis and the outgoing Executive Committee members and reported on the following items:

- He noted this is a time of change with the beginning of a new year and several new administrators: Dr. Paul Risser, OSU president; Dr. Tim White, Health & Human Performance Dean; and Dr. Andy Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. He also reported that

the search for a Veterinary Medicine Dean has been narrowed to three finalists.

- OSSHE Planning Process — The process evolved from a discussion concerning restructuring, with the intensive portion of the process expected to last six months, beginning in December 1995. Arnold noted that the task forces, referred to earlier by Dr. Risser, are composed of a mixed membership with OSBHE members, OSSHE faculty, students, and community members. The first 90 days will be devoted to an internal assessment (where is OSSHE today?) and an environmental assessment (what external forces should OSSHE be responding to?). The second phase will focus on where OSSHE should be in terms of vision and strategic direction. The third phase will target specific action plans and include organization and structure. Arnold agreed with Risser's earlier comments that the focus will be at the program level and greater opportunities for interinstitutional and collaborative activities rather than on combining institutions.

Arnold reported that Governor Kitzhaber has indicated to the Chancellor and the Board that he intends to provide leadership to discussion of education in total: K-12, community colleges, and higher education. Serious discussion is scheduled to begin shortly after the special session and will focus on a truly seamless education.

- OSU Budget Process/Concept of Investment — Arnold noted that OSU has historically had a tendency to focus on specific details too early in the process rather than thinking more broadly about patterns of investment. As a result of focus group meetings last fall, a consistent message concerning investment in the future resulted in recognizing the need to focus now on those areas of investment that have the greatest opportunity to enhance our revenues in the future. Arnold reminded faculty that the self-funding proposition has a modest impact in this biennium but becomes greater in the next biennium. It's important to start now to generate a stronger flow of revenue to help offset the impact. A proposal is to use some of the carry-over dollars as non-recurring investments in key areas (marketing, recruiting, extended education) to generate revenue in the future. Arnold noted the need to meet enrollment targets, which we did not do this year and which resulted in the loss of \$1 million at OSU. He emphasized that investment will only occur after broad participation of strategies has been developed.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Krane's report included the following items:

- Congratulations and thanks to the newly elected and retiring members of the Faculty Senate, Executive Committee, President-Elect, IFS representatives, and Sally Francis, in particular. He also thanked President Risser for spending time with the Senate.

- President Krane noted that he looked forward to assistance from the faculty during the coming year. He is also looking forward to many possible challenges during the year, including: program reductions, funding salary increases, the possibility of an off-spring of Measure 5, lingering uncertainty of Measure 8, OSSHE restructuring, implementation of new Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, a concerted state-wide effort to secure faculty representation on the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, and continuing enhancement of diversity of the OSU community.

Krane then read a passage from Jane Smiley's book *MOO*, a satire on academic life at a major land grant university. Noting the humorous elements in the passage, Krane was also fearful that some perceptions of the university do partially ring true. While Smiley's views of faculty collegiality and shared governance don't fit the OSU model, Krane stated that he looked forward to continuing our successful faculty governance model and looks forward to working with faculty in the coming year. He urged faculty to forward suggestions and criticisms directly to him.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:20.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant