

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 1997 Minutes

**File is over 60 pages. Use caution when printing.**

## 1997 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 [faculty.senate@oregonstate.edu](mailto:faculty.senate@oregonstate.edu) or 541-737-4344 for more information.

**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.**

- [December 4](#)
- [November 6](#)
- [October 2](#)
- [June 5](#)
- [May 1](#)
- [April 3](#)
- [March 6](#)
- [February 6](#)
- [January 9](#)

| [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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » December 4, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 534

December 4, 1997

### For All Faculty

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

### Meeting Summary

- *Special Report:* Intercollegiate Athletics
- *Committee Report:* Election Results
- *Action Items:* Executive Committee Election and Category I proposal, Modification of an Instructional Program Leading to the Professional Doctorate in Pharmacy [Motion 97-534--01]
- *New Business:* None

### Roll Call

#### *Members Absent With Representation:*

Hathaway, M. Mellbye; Leichti, C. Brunner; Pereira, B. Burton; Rose, D. Haase; and Wander, C. Raab.

#### *Members Absent Without Representation:*

Ahearn, Calvert, Christie, Collier, Cowles, Daniels, DeKock, Farnsworth, Field, Fisk, Fletcher, Fritzell, Heidel, Hu, Ingham, Jenkins, Jones, Jordan, Kellogg, Leong, Lomax, Longerbeam, McAlexander, Miller, A. Mix, Neumann, Oye, Plant, Primak, Prucha, Rathja, Rielly, Savage, Sproul, Tiger, van der Mars, and Williams.

#### *Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

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

#### *Guests of the Senate:*

L. Burns, G. DeLander, S. Francis, S. Sahyun, and L. Schroeder.

## Committee Report

### Faculty Senate Election Results

Ken Krane, Ballot Counting Committee Chair, reported that 966 ballots were returned, or about 30% of eligible voters. Robin Rose, Associate Professor in Forest Science, was elected President-elect and J. Antonio Torres, Associate Professor in Food Science and Technology, was elected as the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative.

Krane thanked those who agreed to candidacy and thanked Tracy Bentley, Irma Delson and Rebecca Sanderson for counting ballots.

## ACTION ITEMS

### Executive Committee Election

Candidates for two-year terms were: James Foster, Mark Kramer, Phyllis Lee, Gordon Matzke, Mary Prucha, and Sandra Woods.

Ballots were distributed and counted during the meeting. Those elected were: James Foster (Professor and Chair, Political Science), Gordon Matzke (Professor, Geography), and Sandra Woods (Associate Professor, Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering).

## Category I Proposal

Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented the Category I, Proposal for the Modification of an Instructional Program Leading to the Professional Doctorate in Pharmacy. Burton explained that the proposal is for a four-year professional program leading to a doctorate in Pharmacy which will replace the present baccalaureate degree. He noted that OSU is one of the last Pharmacy colleges in the country to change their program to the standard for certification.

In response to Senator Gamble, Science, Gary DeLander, Pharmacy, stated that by the year 2000, all Pharmacy graduates will be required to obtain a Pharm D, in accordance with the College of Pharmacy's accrediting body; the baccalaureate degree will no longer be an option. In response to Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, Delander stated that this is not a doctorate in Philosophy degree and is not considered to be a graduate degree.

Motion 97-534-01 to approve the Category I proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## Special Report

### Intercollegiate Athletics

Lee Schroeder, Interim Athletics Director, updated the Senate on a variety of athletics related issues.

Schroeder reported that former softball coach, Vickie Dugan, brought suit against the institution and Dutch Baughman which resulted in a \$1.27 million award based on sexual discrimination, available resources, and hiring of a replacement. The Attorney General's Office is reviewing the magnitude of the award, which may result in reducing the award, and they are considering the advisability of an appeal. He noted that the settlement will be made by the State Risk Management Division and future OSU assessments by the division will be influenced by the amount of the final settlement.

Schroeder indicated that mid-January is targeted as the time period for forwarding Athletic Director recommendations to President Risser from the 16-person screening committee. There were over 50 nominees, 27 applications were submitted, and 12 of those appear strong on paper. There is no closing date for the search and the committee will continue to meet weekly. Finalists will be brought to campus to meet with various groups.

Schroeder felt that FY '93 was the beginning of significant changes in the Athletics budget, with the debt reaching about \$600,000. He noted that they were well under the authorized debt limit of \$2.75 million at that time. Prior to 1993, the debt hovered between \$100,000 and \$200,000. From 1993 to 1997 the debt grew to \$5.3 million. Finance & Administration was alerted to the budget figures in May and a financial consultant was retained to assess the situation. He explained that there were problems with consistent reporting of data and large expenditures. The debt has grown the most in two years due to declining revenue.

He listed the following as sources of revenue: athletic games (ticket sales, TV, and PAC-10 Conference including shared receipts and the NCAA basketball tournament, as well as about \$160,000 each time an OSU game is televised); Sports Action Lottery (\$750,000, or 33% of the lottery funds available); and incidental student body fees (\$875,000). Gifts are also a major source of income to the operating budgets, specifically for scholarships. The purpose of the Beaver Club is to raise money for student athlete scholarships. There is a separate major gift effort which assists with facilities projects. In addition, OSU budgets about \$2 million to support Intercollegiate Athletics. Game receipts for FY 96 and FY 97 were down from the past due to declining ticket sales from football and basketball.

As with most units on campus, payroll and scholarship account for the largest expenditures, equalling about \$9.5 million out of a \$16.5 million expenditure budget. Other expenses include staging events, team travel, training table, and uniforms.

He explained that the budget was in good shape in 1989 but, since that time, scholarships have drained the budget; the difference between cost and revenue is about \$2 million per year. The Beaver Club annually contributes \$1.75 million to support scholarships.

Schroeder reported that there is a plan to get Athletics out of debt completely by mid-FY 2003. The basis for the plan is that they will continue, except for this year and next year, with the costs that they now have. The plan for the current year expenditure budget is \$1 million below expenditures for last year. An additional \$1 million cut is planned from operating expenses during next year. He felt that the revenue sources available to develop the five-year plan have been conservatively estimated and the additional revenue (from TV contracts) has been allocated to debt reduction. The plan can only be successful if other revenues continue at their current levels. He felt that some sports programs, such as basketball, are headed in the right direction to help with the deficit.

He explained that OSU is about one quarter million dollars short of scholarship money for women's sports, which is necessary for OSU to solve gender equity issues. For the first time since 1982, the Beaver Club Executive Board has authorized an increase in its giving levels which should generate enough money to meet gender equity requirements. He emphasized that

all student athletes on scholarship generate revenue for the institution. Schroeder encouraged all faculty to join the Beaver Club.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, stated that most searches conducted at OSU are required to have certain reporting, accountability, and diversity characteristics, as well as required paperwork, etc. He questioned whether these standard characteristics applied to the Athletic Director search. Schroeder responded affirmatively and stated that a NAPO packet was submitted to Affirmative Action, advertising occurred, and he felt that all procedures for a normal search were being followed. Foster then asked if one could expect the pool to reflect the demographic population that this university serves in terms of gender makeup and ethnic diversity. Schroeder felt that the pool will reflect those who choose to apply; they can't control the makeup of the group. Senator Matzke, Science, stated that, if the pool doesn't reflect what you are looking for, an additional step is to specifically target those who do reflect the desired makeup. Schroeder indicated he felt this was a suggestion he could take and that they were trying to generate a diverse pool. He also felt that the advertising was placed in publications which did target specifically for this position.

Senator Brumley, Information Services, questioned the practices which allow a unit to overspend and what is being done to avoid the problem in the future. Schroeder indicated that past practice has been to use the Financial Management System which was reconciled 13 times per year and the President's Cabinet received an overview of budgets. It was up to each unit to stay within the budgeted amount. There were some checks and balances, but not a continuous oversight of the whole institution. The Financial Information System (FIS), begun in 1995, allows units to identify real time income and expenses and gives the institution the ability to review all units. Until last year, individual cost centers were expected to be accountable. A lack of oversight resulted in budgets for two units being in deficit and oversight is now being implemented.

Senator Gamble, Science, related that the athletic budget used to be reviewed by the Athletic Board and an accounting firm reviewed the accuracy of the report. He noted that each coach was responsible for their own budget. He questioned who makes the final decision as to the dollar amount allocated to each program and how does the system he described compare to what exists now. Schroeder felt that the differences are that central control has not been exerted strongly enough and that demands for funding has changed dramatically. OSU's \$16.5 million budget is the lowest expenditure budget of anyone in the PAC-10, and we are competing with those in the \$30-35 million range.

In response to Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, Schroeder attributed the increased spending to the number and cost of scholarships and the need to provide gender equity. The deficit increased about \$4.7 million over the last two years. Cornell questioned how many staff are paid from the \$9.5 million budgeted for salaries. Schroeder responded there are about 120 employees and about 350 athletes on full or partial scholarship account for \$3.6 million. Cornell also questioned where the \$1-2 million cuts will come from over the next two years. Schroeder stated that 6% across the board was determined and will come from each of the 20 cost centers in the department. They are attempting to accomplish the cuts without loss of jobs or scholarships.

Senator Williamson, Engineering, referred to the debt limit of \$2.75 million and questioned what happened when the limit was exceeded. Schroeder knew of no penalty, but stated that the unit just pays more interest.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, referring to the lawsuit, questioned that amount currently paid into Risk Management and how a settlement of \$1 million will affect OSU's future assessments. Schroeder responded that the loss experience is figured over a five-year period, so OSU will feel the impact over three biennia of whatever settlement is reached. He thought that OSU now pays around \$2 million per year, which covers tort liability and property damage for the whole institution. Bob Durringer, Business Affairs Director, noted that the current rate reflects the effect of the Industrial Building fire from several years ago.

Schroeder spoke about two other Athletic searches currently underway. The Sr. Woman Administrator position, vacated by Robyn Sharp in August, is on hold since the candidates wish to know who the Athletic Director finalists are before they commit to coming to OSU. The Financial Manager search has resulted in a strong candidate pool and is nearly completed.

In response to Senator Tate, Science, questioning the revenue from games, Schroeder provided the following breakdown:

- home ticket sales - \$2.6 million
- away games - \$500,000
- television - \$3.7 million
- parking (football) - \$50,000
- Beaver Club - \$1.75 million

In response to a question from Senator Morris, Science, Schroeder stated that Athletic Director candidates have been told that confidentiality will be preserved up to the time that finalists are announced.

Senator Manogue, Science, questioned how the budget would be in the black by cutting \$1 million below last years budget. Schroeder agreed that they won't be in the black with this measure, but added that there is additional revenue from PAC-10 TV and bowl games that will further place them in the black. He noted that the debt could grow in the current year.

## Information Items

- **New Senator Orientation** - The orientation will be January 8, 1998, preceding the regular Senate meeting, in the Valley Football Complex.
- **University Awards** - Materials for the following awards are now available and can be obtained from the Faculty Senate Office; nomination materials are due March 6: OSU Alumni Assoc. Distinguished Professor Award  
Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award  
Dar Reese Excellence in Advising Award  
Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award  
OSU Outstanding Faculty Research Assistant Award  
OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award  
Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award  
D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award  
Information is also available for the OSU Distinguished Service Award; nomination materials are due February 6.
- **Senate Handbook Return** - Senators whose terms end in December are asked to return their Faculty Senate Handbook to the Faculty Senate Office so they can be updated and redistributed to new Senators.
- **January Meeting Location Changed** - The Faculty Senate will meet in the Valley Football Complex on January 8 at 3:00 PM.
- **Martin Luther King Jr. Celebration** - Teach-in - The celebration, "Makin' it Right: Going Beyond the Dream," will take place between January 12 and 23. Faculty are asked to participate in any kind of intellectual exercise with their students that would educate and stimulate thought about the celebration. For more information, contact Linda Paschke at 737-6370 or Phyllis Lee at 737-4381.
- **Student Appointments to Faculty Senate Committees/Councils** - Faculty are asked to help identify students who are interested in serving on Faculty Senate committees/councils. Anyone interested in serving on the following committees/councils should be referred to the Faculty Senate Office for additional information.  
Academic Regulations Committee  
Academic Requirements Committee  
Academic Standing Committee  
Baccalaureate Core Committee  
Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee  
Committee on Committees  
Curriculum Council  
Library Committee  
Student Recognition and Awards Committee  
Undergraduate Admissions Committee

## Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold's report included the following items:

- **Recognition** - Congratulations to the newly elected Faculty Senate officers and Executive Committee members and thanks to those completing terms in leadership roles. He also thanked the outgoing Senators.
  - Thanks to faculty members who volunteered to participate in the OSU Odyssey program and he noted that feedback has been positive and that their contributions are appreciated.
- **Administrative Searches** - Orcilia Zuniga Forbes, Vice President for University Advancement, will begin January 1, 1998.
  - Dr. Wilson C. "Toby" Hayes, Vice Provost for Research, will begin full time on May 1, 1998, but he will begin phasing into the job in January.
  - Dr. Gretchen Schuette has been appointed Dean of Distance and Continuing Education.
  - On the basis of the recommendation from the search committee, none of the three candidates were selected to fill the Dean of Engineering position and the search process will be continued.
  - A committee has just been appointed to conduct a search for the Dean of Pharmacy.
  - Balz Frei has been named the Linus Pauling Institute Director.
  - Dr. Bill Baird has been selected to direct the Environmental Health Sciences Center.
- **OSBHE Actions** - The proposal for the Environmental Sciences Master and Doctoral program was approved by the Board to be placed on the January consent agenda.



- The Business One proposal was approved by the Academic Council and will be presented to the Board in January.
- Two pre-proposals have been submitted and discussed at the Academic Council and at the Board: 1) a change in programs in Speech Communication from a Speech Communication major with two options (Speech Communication and Theatre Arts) to identifying both as separate academic majors, has been endorsed by the Board to be brought forward as a full proposal via the Curriculum Council and Faculty Senate; and 2) a Masters in Business Information Systems proposal resulting from legislation requiring the completion of a fifth year to be eligible for the CPA exam.
- **Funding** - The Chronicle of Higher Education recently reported that OSU State funding increased by 18%. Arnold emphasized that the information used in the report focused only on State general funds and didn't identify lottery funding for the Forest Research Lab, Veterinary Medicine, OSU Extension Service, and Agricultural Experiment Station. He explained that the budget process this year shifted lottery funds for higher education (\$12.6 million) back to the State general fund which accounted for the reported increase.
- **Initiatives** - An OSSHE Budget Allocations Principles Think Group has just been appointed to determine how tuition and state general fund resources be allocated among the OSSHE institutions. OSU has assembled a Think Group, chaired by OSU Vice Provost Andy Hashimoto, to propose principles OSU would want to advocate for with respect to how the OSSHE resources for higher education are distributed. The group members are Tony Wilcox, Maggie Niess, Bruce Sorte, Paul Farber, Jeff Arthur, Sally Francis, Vic Trembley, Gordon Reistad, Ken Krane, Christine Spikes, Kelvin Koong, John Parker, Jon Root, Allan Mathany, Lee Schroeder, and Matt DeVore.
- There is an opportunity for department heads and chairs, and others they may wish to designate, to attend two workshops to determine involvement, options and how to develop partnerships in relation to: 1) the concept of planning curricula with constituents and, 2) OSU Statewide.

Senator Foster questioned the decision to reopen the search for the Engineering Dean. Arnold responded that meetings with Engineering faculty and three very different candidates brought to light expectations of the type of person to lead the College. In early January, the Provost and the search committee will host a collegewide meeting for purposes of discussing the screening criteria and expectations.

## Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Wilcox reported on the following items:

- BUBB is moving forward to implement domestic partner benefits in January.
- The two remaining Faculty Senate task forces, Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness and Post-tenure Review will complete their work in 1998.
- He noted that budgets have dominated this year.
- He expressed appreciation for the work of the outgoing elected Faculty Senate representatives: Steve Esbensen, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative; Ken Krane, immediate past president; and Cheryl Jordan, Don Reed, and Ken Williamson, Executive Committee members.
- He welcomed to the Executive Committee, Jim Foster, Gordon Matzke, and Sandy Woods, as well as Robin Rose, President-elect. They join Maggie Niess, Irma Delson, Larry Griggs, Bruce Coblentz, and Wilcox.
- He commended those Senators completing their term for their service to their unit, to the faculty-at-large, and to the institution.

## New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:53.

*Respectfully submitted: Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » November 6, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 533

November 6, 1997

### For All Faculty

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Anthony Wilcox. President Wilcox thanked Robert Iltis for serving as Parliamentarian. There were no corrections to the June or October minutes.

### Meeting Summary

- *Special Report:* Curt Pederson
- *Action Items:* Approval of 1998 Apportionment Table; Faculty Senate Nominations/Elections; and Ballot Counting Committee Formation [Motion 97-533-01]
- *New Business:* None

### Roll Call

#### *Members Absent With Representation:*

Acock, A. Zvonkovic; Collier, G. Smith; Graham, J. Drexler; J. Lee, B. Burton; Leichti, C. Brunner; Neumann, D. Champeau; Schowalter, D. Myrold; van der Mars, B. Cusimano; and Wander, C. Raab.

#### *Members Absent Without Representation:*

Balz, Burke, Cheeke, Christie, Cowles, Dodrill, P. Farber, Farnsworth, Fletcher, Frank, Fritzell, Hathaway, Hu, Ingham, Jenkins, Johnson, Jones, Kellogg, Leong, Lomax, Madsen, Manogue, McAlexander, Miller, A. Mix, G. Pearson, Prucha, Putnam, Randhawa, Rodriguez, Savage, Tiger, Torres, and Williams.

#### *Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

T. Wilcox, President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian protem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

#### *Guests of the Senate:*

L. Burns, K. Butcher, J. Corbett, S. Francis, A. Hashimoto, and D. Johnson.

## SPECIAL REPORTS

### INFORMATION SERVICES

During the introduction of Mr. Pederson, President Wilcox announced he had appointed a Senate committee to investigate the Information Services deficit and provide input to the expenditure reduction proposal.

Curt Pederson, Associate Provost for Information Services, talked about the deficit in Information Services (IS), the proposal to reduce expenditures, and fielded questions.

Pederson explained that IS was able to accumulate such a large deficit, in part, because there was an overall IS budget for the entire unit. One measure which has been taken to reduce the likelihood of this occurring again is that each unit within IS will have their own budget for which they are responsible.

Pederson reported that IS is on track with their expenditure reduction plan. One area that has received a lot of attention is the elimination of the modem pool, which costs OSU about \$200,000 per year to operate. He explained the need to manage access for OSU use, but also noted that there are other services available in the community that individuals could subscribe to for access. The reduction plan is still in the discussion phase and a committee, headed by Chuck Sears, has been formed to study alternatives.

He also reported that he is working with Caroline Kerl, Legal Advisor, on an acceptable use policy.

Senator Drexler, Business, questioned how this deficit could have gone undetected for two years. Pederson responded that



there were a few flags raised, but the magnitude of the problem was not understood.

Senator Gamble, Science, asked where does one begin to recover the \$5.7 million deficit. Pederson replied that it's necessary to research the background, find facts, and propose changes which include: developing a plan to be followed by managers and an oversight committee, laying off some employees, reducing expenditures, and not renewing some contracts.

When questioned about proposals to cut into services needed by students and faculty, particularly in the library area, Pederson noted that 85% of the yearly \$15 million IS budget is dedicated to firm commitments. The library received a disproportionate amount of the cut because it has the largest amount of discretionary money; the book purchasing budget is part of the discretionary amount.

In response to Senator Coakley questioning how to answer students who can't get access to computing facilities, Pederson explained that there are currently 200 modems and seven lines available and the cost to add additional access is prohibitive. He noted that the modem pool is available, but there are peak times when it is difficult to access. He emphasized that the modem pool will not be discontinued without alternatives. Pederson has requested that an accounting of student fees be prepared to determine usage. He felt it was necessary to have more student and campus involvement to ascertain how technology fees are and should be used.

In response to Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, asking about alternatives to modems, Pederson indicated that there are local internet providers who could be contracted with to provide services. Daley also questioned whether the money spent leading to the deficit was productive. Pederson stated that the money was not frittered away. The spending resulted in student upgrades, wiring dorms for computer access, developing web services, and paying for highspeed electronic access. As a result of improvements to the infrastructure, OSU was recognized as number one in a benchmark study.

In response to the proposal to reduce the library budget, Senator Gamble felt that the library is the most important thing on this campus - it is the heart of any solid university.

Karyle Butcher, Valley Library, reported that the library will experience cuts in staff, services and supplies, and the monograph budgets to help reduce the IS deficit. She related that the book budget would have been cut this year whether or not there was an overexpenditure since electronic services are cutting into the library budget.

Additional factors negatively impacting the budget were Ballot Measures 5 and 47. She noted that student help and supplies and materials account for the largest portion of the budget. Butcher explained that the State budgeted for a 10% increase to OSSHE libraries, which amounted to \$257,000 for OSU. However, this money was allocated directly to the deficit reduction plan and not available to use for new materials. The library has applied for \$135,000 from the Technology Resource Fee fund. Another consideration to reduce expenditures and move more money into the monograph budget would be to not fill staff positions next year.

The Valley Library is looking at ways to achieve joint purchasing which may involve joining the ORBIS Consortia. Participation would allow them to request materials from 12 other institutions that currently belong to the system. The money to join would come from an endowment fund.

Senator Krane, Science, urged protection of monographs and serials and delaying other IS projects. Butcher responded that there is a \$100,000 endowment for journals, but that only the interest can be used.

Senator Williamson, Engineering, felt there was a justice issue involved since the library didn't cause the deficit, but they're being required to repay the largest amount. Butcher agreed that this was true, but the library-and their budget-combined with other units as a result of the KPMG recommendations a few years ago. They are now being told that, as a part of IS, they are part of the unit that caused the deficit and must help to repay the amount.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, expressed the feeling that technology is providing services for which a fee can be charged, and generating revenue that way would be preferable to reducing the library budget.

## ***ACTION ITEMS***

### **APPROVAL OF THE 1998 APPORTIONMENT TABLE**

For the first year, Faculty Senate apportionment was determined by a combination of 75% FTE and 25% student credit hour and a cap of 132 Senators was imposed.

OSU faculty FTE in the ranks of Instructor or above, including Professional Faculty, Research Associates, and all Faculty Research Assistants as of October 23, 1997, together with student credit hours apportioned to individual units, resulted in 23.21 FTE/Senator and 16,079 SCH/Senator.

Motion 5339701 to approve the apportionment table passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

## **FACULTY SENATE NOMINATIONS/ELECTIONS**

Ken Krane, Bylaws & Nominations Chair, presented the slate of nominees for elected positions:

President-elect - Nominees recommended were: Robin Rose (Associate Professor, Forest Science) and Ken Williamson (Professor, Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering).

Executive Committee - Nominees recommended were: James Foster (Professor and Chair, Political Science), Mark Kramer (Professional Faculty, Associate Director of Communication Media Center), Phyllis Lee (Professional Faculty, Director of Office of Multicultural Affairs), Gordon Matzke (Professor, Geography), Mary Prucha (Professional Faculty, Coordinator of Graduate Services, Graduate School) and Sandra Woods (Associate Professor, Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering).

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Representative - Nominees recommended were: Jonathan King (Associate Professor, Management, Marketing and International Business) and Antonio Torres (Associate Professor, Food Science and Technology).

There were no nominations from the floor for any position; the nominations for each position were declared closed.

Election materials for Presidentelect and the IFS representative will be sent the week of November 10 to all eligible voters and the Executive Committee election will be determined by Senators during the December 4 Senate meeting.

## **BALLOT COUNTING COMMITTEE**

In response to President Wilcox requesting a Ballot Counting Committee to count Presidentelect and IFS representative ballots, the following volunteered: Tracy Bentley, John Morris, and Rebecca Sanderson. Ballots will be counted at 1:30 on December 3 and results announced at the December 4 Faculty Senate meeting.

## **ANNUAL REPORTS**

The following annual reports were included in the agenda:

- Promotion and Tenure Committee
- Student Recognition and Awards Committee

Reports still outstanding from the 1996-97 academic year are:

Academic Advising Council - Linda Johnson, Chair  
Academic Standing Committee - Marianne Vydra, Chair

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A recap of the October IFS meeting was distributed via email.
- Included in the agenda was a summary of Senator representation by apportionment unit for 1996/97. Representation summaries by individual Senator is available for viewing in the Faculty Senate Office, the Valley Library Reserve Book Room, or from the heads of all apportionment units.
- Senator nomination and election instructions have been sent to the heads of all apportionment units.
- The January 8, 1998, Faculty Senate meeting and New Senator Orientation will be held in the Valley Football Center.

## **REPORTS FROM THE PROVOST**

Associate Provost Hashimoto represented the Provost and reported on the following items:

Search Updates:

- Vice President for University Advancement - Orcilia Zuniga Forbes will begin January 1.
- Vice Provost for Research - The university is currently in conversation with Dr. Toby Hayes.
- Engineering Dean - Three candidates are being interviewed.
- Director of Athletics - The search committee has been announced.

Student enrollment and its impact on budgets -

Hashimoto compared 1996 and 1997 enrollment figures as of week 4:

\* Enrollment Category \*

New Admits (High School): +160; +8.8% (Total = 1,984)

New Admits (Transfers): 204; 10.2% (Total = 1,790)

Other: +343; +2.5% (Total = 10,353)

1997 Total: 14,127

\* Class Designation \*

Undergraduate: +388; +3.5% (Total = 11,484)

Graduate: 44; 1.7% (Total = 2,571)

FirstProfessional: 1; 1.4% (Total = 72)

1997 Total: 14,127

\* 1996-97 Enrollment \*

Term	FTE	% of Fall FTE
Fall 1996	12,343	100
Winter 1997	12,007	97
Spring 1997	11,129	90
Average	11,826	95.8

**Fall 1997 FTE = 12,708**

Hashimoto noted that increased enrollment equates to increased budget allocations and reminded Senators that one student is equal to \$8,600.

In response to Senator Krane asking if there was a way of knowing whether unsuccessful applicants to the University Honors College are coming to OSU or going elsewhere, Hashimoto indicated it would be worthwhile to track this information.

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, noted that there needs to be more effort put into improving graduate student enrollment. Senator Woods, Engineering, also felt that faculty need to be encouraged to promote graduate students.

## REPORTS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Wilcox reported on the following items:

- One of the initiatives presented by President Risser related to curricular review and involved reviewing majors and minors. The intent was to involve practitioners or external advisory groups in reviewing program curricula. The Department of Chemistry has recently completed this type of review and will be sharing their process during upcoming sessions to help other units with their review. It is not intended that units universally perform a major curriculum overhaul.
- The Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee Chair has been added as a member of the Athletic Advisory Committee.

## NEW BUSINESS

Bill Oye, Student Affairs, made available a handout dealing with the topics of 'Academic Dishonesty,' 'Classroom Disruption,' and 'Civility and Honesty.' This was a followup on a previous report to the Faculty Senate.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:08.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

| [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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » October 9, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 532

October 9, 1997

### For All Faculty

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 pm by President Anthony Wilcox. Approval of the June minutes was postponed until November.

---

### Meeting Summary

- *Special Report:* President Risser and Provost Arnold
- *Action Items:* Bylaws revisions regarding Senate inclusion and apportionment determination and a Category I Proposal: Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (through Business-ONE) [Motion 97-532-01 through 03]
- *New Business:* None

---

### Roll Call

#### *Members Absent With Representation:*

Ede, R. Schwartz; Lunch, C. Simin; McAlexander, B. DeYoung; M. Mix, D. Clark; Neumann, J. Schindler; and Schowalter, D. Barofsky.

#### *Members Absent Without Representation:*

Acock, Brumley, Burke, Cheeke, Cowles, Farnsworth, Field, Fletcher, Hathaway, Heidel, Hu, Huyer, Klein, Levine, Lundin, Madsen, G. Pearson, Rathja, Rodriguez, Savage, Tiger, and Wander.

#### *Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

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

#### *Guests of the Senate:*

B. Becker, P. Easley, S. Francis, L. Burns, A. Hashimoto, L. Maughan, A. Marks, A. Mathany, M. McNamara, A. Morey, J. Mosley, R. Rainey, J. Root, S. Sanford, M. Sher, T. Scheuermann, J. Schuster, G. Stephenson, S. Tenney, B. Thorsness, R. Wess, and B. Wilkins.

---

## SPECIAL REPORTS

### PRESIDENT RISSER AND PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT ARNOLD

President Paul Risser spoke about the direction of the University and changes to be undertaken and Provost and Executive Vice President Roy Arnold presented status reports on a number of issues.

President Risser noted that OSU has had some wonderful successes recently: private gifts are up by 15% over last year and the number of donors increased by 10%; current enrollment numbers reflect an increase of 320 students over last year at the same time; freshman retention rates increased from 75% to 81%; and, because the sophomore and junior retention rates are also up, the overall retention rate has increased from 84% to 87%.

Risser commended the efforts of the admissions, recruiting, and orientation programs, marketing efforts, as well as individual faculty members, which combined to increase the student retention rate.

He stated that the environment in the State of Oregon towards higher education is changing rapidly. There is talk of restructuring the State Board, which requires approval by the legislature. In the next 18 months an enormous amount of time will be spent in positioning OSU and other state institutions to increase funding from state sources. Risser felt that the only way to increase this funding is to gain support from legislators and the business community by operating the university efficiently, visibly meet the needs of our users, and successfully market OSU.

President Risser prefaced his proposed changes by noting that they may be surprising, they may be considered slightly unreasonable, and some may wonder if the changes are even possible.

Risser set out three goals: 1) making sure that we provide the most compelling learning experience for students and faculty and staff as an organization; 2) seek to be Tier I quality in every dimension whenever possible; and 3) treat the state as the campus of Oregon State. He stated that it is the faculty and the faculty governance system that will make these goals possible.

He emphasized that the changes are not a directive from administration. The following are suggested actions that need to be taken by the faculty and the faculty governance system to accomplish the above goals. He felt that a fairly heroic effort will be needed from all involved and noted that many will need to think and act differently, including the Faculty Senate.

He outlined the following five steps needed to be taken by the faculty and Faculty Senate:

1. In the next 60-90 days, each department needs to reevaluate every major and minor program, in collaboration with a panel of practitioners, to ascertain whether they meet the purpose and have the content to allow our students to be successful. The Faculty Senate and Dean's Council should provide guidance to academic units.
2. Spend the following 60 days looking at how learning experiences are packaged. Risser encouraged changing the thinking from one-hour courses taught by one person to multi-term, multi-faculty member participation. The Senate needs to work with the Provost's Office and all administrative support units to ensure that, within 60 days, we can functionally go about having "a very rich schedule which is infinitely more flexible than it is today."
3. The spring term issue of OSU Statewide should quadruple the number of the fall term entries. Quadrupling entries can be accomplished by increasing the locations and quantities of courses offered rather than quadrupling courses. Offerings through OSU Statewide should be as complete as possible to meet the needs of our constituents.
4. Take advantage of opportunities to communicate how OSU's research increases the economic strength of the state and improves its human welfare.
5. In the next 60 days, identify a budgeting process that "recognizes the goals we're trying to achieve and which makes decisions based on our successes in meeting those goals." The process needs to be a cooperative effort by the Faculty Senate and academic deans.

Risser noted that he outlined a very specific and very ambitious set of steps, however, he feels these goals are possible. He stated that no university has undertaken what he outlined in the time frame suggested, but that it can happen under the leadership of the Senate, for which he has great respect. The benefits to be gained by successfully completing these steps are: 1) OSU will become a coherent and focused organization; 2) OSU will be viewed as an extraordinarily responsive university; and 3) the budget process will demonstrate a university which is really accountable for its actions. All of these actions combined will present to the State of Oregon an unparalleled argument for increased resources.

Provost Arnold's segment of the presentation contained components of the goals and direction proposed by President Risser.

Arnold updated the Senate on six ongoing administrative searches and appointments:

- 1) Information Services - Since there was a keen sense of urgency and a need move forward to identify leadership, Arnold requested approval of a waiver of search due to the following reasons: 1) there were discussions statewide and nationally that have implications for how OSU will be positioned to be an active, visible and leading participant, and it's important to be actively represented; and 2) recent budget problems necessitated the need for strong leadership and management. The then State of Oregon Chief Information Officer for the Department of Administrative Services, Curt Pederson, made it known he intended to leave that position, and OSU quickly made contact with him; Pederson started work at OSU in early August.
- 2) and 3) The Vice President for University Advancement and the Vice Provost for Research are both in continuing search modes. Neither position was filled during the initial search and additional individuals are being considered. A candidate is currently on campus to be interviewed for the Vice President for University Advancement position.
- 4) The search committee for the Engineering Dean has worked over the summer and advanced a set of recommendations for candidates to be interviewed.
- 5) Dean Ohvall, Pharmacy, has announced his intent to retire in June. Arnold met with Pharmacy faculty to discuss initiation of the search process.
- 6) The Director of Athletics search is currently involved in a series of meetings in five locations across the state to determine the characteristics desired in the person selected. A screening committee of eight individuals, including faculty, staff and



student representatives, will be appointed. In reference to a recent media article, Arnold stated that Lee Schroeder, Interim Athletic Director, does not intend to be a candidate for the position.

Turning to budget issues, Arnold explained that OSU's 97/98 budget allocation was impacted by low enrollment figures. The BAS model is still in place, but has been modified in two areas: 1) the corridors have been reduced in size - OSU's was 500 students (plus or minus) and is now being defined as 1.5% of the three term average of student FTE, which is just under 200 students; and 2) the budget is for this year only rather than a biennial budget; higher enrollment this fall could impact the budget for next year.

A proposal to deal with the Information Services overexpenditure has been shared with the Executive Committee and other Faculty Senate committees for their input. The proposed recovery plan components consist of the instructional technology fee, general fund support, and self-supporting activities. The plan outlines bringing expenditures back within budget, and below for a time, to recover the deficit situation. Steps being implemented to avoid this situation in the future include regular and systematic budget reviews on a monthly and quarterly basis for all parts of the institution.

Arnold mentioned continuing efforts in several areas:

- Marketing, aimed at recruitment, retention and enrollment, is currently being field tested.
- There have been reviews of the entire university advancement function and, specifically, of the Alumni Association, involving external parties which will result in development of a strategic plan.
- Need to systematically identify specific opportunities for Extended Education and OSU Statewide that OSU can uniquely fill, or can fill in partnership with other institutions.

In response to Senator DeKock, Science, questioning the thinking behind restructuring courses, Risser indicated that some topics don't need to be taught in a lecture format (they may be more effective when taught via the Web), or some may be better taught in a group discussion rather than a large lecture format. There is a need to break away from the traditional format and allow students to learn in different ways.

Senator Gamble, Science, asked how the initiatives proposed by Dr. Risser and the guidelines set forth by the legislature and Chancellor relate. Arnold responded that the initiatives are very consistent with the direction the State Board has taken.

Senator Williamson, Engineering, questioned how faculty will be rewarded for their efforts. Risser responded that the fifth step relates to the allocation process which will further goals and reward successes.

Senator Barofsky, Agricultural Sciences, was disturbed by the vision presented for the university, which he sees as very narrow and focused and reduces OSU to a colossal training school. Risser responded that Barofsky's conclusion may have been drawn from today's discussion, but reminded Senators that this builds on a sequence of steps beginning with his University Day address which focused heavily on the core competencies. He assured Senators he is not implying that OSU go toward a technical or vocational school approach.

Senator Budd, Engineering, inquired concerning the quality of incoming students. Risser stated that qualified applicants for the Presidential Scholarships are up to 860 from 600 last year and qualified applicants to the University Honors have increased by 25%.

Senator Matzke, Science, applauded the forward thinking, but was concerned about budget issues, in particular, with proposals such as the Category I proposal to be voted on later in the meeting. Arnold observed that courses supporting on-campus programs include both tuition and general fund support. Arnold also addressed the counting of student credit hours earned both on-campus and through distance and continuing education as they relate to the budget. He noted that the State Board will now allow institutions to recognize all students who are served by whatever means.

President Risser thanked the Senate for the opportunity to discuss these issues and felt that the Faculty Senate has the opportunity to make many things happen in many ways.

## ***ACTION ITEMS***

### **BYLAWS REVISIONS**

Sally Francis, Task Force on Senate Membership Chair, outlined the task force report and presented proposed bylaws changes affecting Senate inclusion and apportionment determination.

Francis thanked the task force members for their efforts, and Vickie Nunnemaker and Kathy Meddaugh for their assistance in preparing the report.

She explained that the general question before the task force was to consider the structure and size of the Faculty Senate. They sought to create a Senate that would serve the best interests of OSU and all its functions well into the future. It was their

belief that an appropriate governance model should be collaborative, with all those with 'faculty' in their title being represented. She noted that the final report was a document of compromise.

The major recommendations which formed the proposed bylaws changes were:

- to include Faculty Research Assistants;
- to include former Management Service personnel;
- to limit the Senate to 132 elected members;
- to base apportionment on a combination of FTE and student credit hours (SCH);
- to do further study to clarify the standing rules of selected committees and councils; and
- implementation strategies

Francis noted that the question of inclusion of administrators in the Faculty Senate was not within the scope of the charge to the task force. However, the philosophy of the task force was one of inclusion and no recommendation to prohibit participation of administrators is being made.

Protection of curricular purview of traditional academic faculty is addressed in two specific recommendations.

Recommendation three proposes that the bylaws be amended so that apportionment will be based on 75% FTE and 25% on SCH. Recommendation four proposes that the Committee on Committees review standing rules, specifically membership, of Senate committees and councils that set policies related to curricular and instructional matters.

The task force believes that Faculty Research Assistants will make the same contributions to the Senate as do those faculty currently included. She stated that the data refute the perception that FRAs are typically employed at OSU for very short periods of time and, therefore, have little institutional commitment. She also noted that many FRAs have direct contact with students and even serve on graduate committees. FRAs do have concerns that are addressed by Senate committees, such as Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement, Grievance, and Promotion and Tenure. Since Sr. Faculty Research Assistants are currently included within existing apportionment units, the task force felt it was philosophically sound to also include FRAs within existing apportionment units rather than treat them as a separate apportionment unit.

Francis noted that the new Professional Faculty category includes the former categories of No Rank and Management Service faculty. Currently there are 283 former No Rank faculty FTE included in Senate apportionment and 237 Professional Faculty FTE currently excluded. The recommendation was to include them in existing apportionment units rather than as a separate unit.

The rationale behind using student credit hours to account for 25% of seats assigned to apportionment units, to some extent, compensates for the inclusion of two new groups of faculty members who may have limited traditional academic responsibilities and to address the concern of some faculty regarding protection of curricular purview by traditional faculty members. She noted that SCH will not reflect noncredit instructional activities, such as Extension programs.

The task force is recommending that an ad hoc transition committee be appointed by President Wilcox to guide the implementation of their recommendations and to plan an informational campaign.

The following capitalized areas (exclusive of the article headings) indicate proposed additions to the bylaws while bracketed sections indicate proposed deletions:

### **ARTICLE III: AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**

Sec. 1. The Faculty is defined as members of the Unclassified Academic Staff who: (1) ARE PROFESSIONAL FACULTY, or (2) hold one of these academic ranks: Instructor, Senior Instructor, FACULTY RESEARCH ASSISTANT, Senior Faculty Research Assistant, Research Associate, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor (as defined in Section 580-20-005 of the OSSHE Administrative Rules) [or (2) faculty in academic support, administrative support, and student support units who are assigned professional position titles without rank].

### **ARTICLE IV: MEMBERS**

Sec. 2. Elected Members. THERE SHALL BE 132 ELECTED MEMBERS AS DETERMINED AND APPORTIONED ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE V, SEC. 1. Faculty as defined in Article III, Sec. 1. shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate providing they are stationed within the State of Oregon at the time Senate apportionment is determined annually.

### **ARTICLE V: MEMBER NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS-**

Sec. 1. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall determine each Fall the full-time-equivalent (FTE) of Faculty as [described] DEFINED in Article III, Sec. 1., above, in each College or unit AND THE TOTAL STUDENT CREDIT HOURS (SCH) GENERATED BY EACH UNIT DURING THE MOST RECENT ACADEMIC YEAR. [and shall establish the number of

representatives and their apportionment on the basis of one representative for each fourteen (14) full-time equivalent Faculty members or major fraction thereof (major fraction thereof is defined as anything above a .50 in figuring, i.e. 74.69 would be 75, 55.49 would be 55). Except, each apportionment group shall have at least one Faculty Senate Member.] THE APPORTIONMENT SHALL BE ALLOCATED 75% ACCORDING TO FTE AND 25% ACCORDING TO SCH, WITH THE NUMBER OF ELECTED MEMBERS OF EACH APPORTIONMENT GROUP DETERMINED BY THE LARGEST WHOLE NUMBER BELOW ITS CALCULATED APPORTIONMENT, AND FRACTIONAL APPORTIONMENT ALLOCATED AS DESCRIBED BELOW. EACH APPORTIONMENT GROUP SHALL HAVE AT LEAST ONE ELECTED MEMBER. ADDITIONAL SEATS NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE A TOTAL ELECTED MEMBERSHIP OF 132 SHALL BE DISTRIBUTED BY ALLOCATING ONE SEAT TO THE APPORTIONMENT GROUP WITH THE GREATEST UNASSIGNED FRACTIONAL APPORTIONMENT AND CONTINUING UNTIL 132 SEATS HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED.

OFFICIAL UNIVERSITY STUDENT CREDIT HOUR REPORTS FOR THE MOST RECENT ACADEMIC YEAR WILL BE THE BASIS FOR DETERMINING THE TOTAL SCH OF EACH APPORTIONMENT GROUP.

If the FTE OR SCH in an apportionment group declines to the extent that the total number of Senators to be allotted to that group in the next apportionment year will be less than the number of Senators scheduled to continue their terms of office into the new apportionment year, the reduction in number of Senators shall be dealt with through an election by members of the apportionment group.

In the determination of representation of each apportionment group, all Faculty members who hold academic rank or FTE in one such group shall be included in that group, whether engaged in instructional, research, or extension work, with the apportionment determined accordingly. Agricultural Research and on campus Extension Faculty shall be included with the College of Agricultural Sciences; Home Economics Research or on-campus Extension [Staff] FACULTY members with the College of Home Economics and Education; Engineering or Forestry Research [staff] FACULTY members with the Colleges of Engineering or Forestry, etc.

Senator DeKock applauded the work of the task force. He felt that limiting the size of the Senate makes good sense and was pleased that these other groups were being added.

Senator Barofsky, Agricultural Sciences, stated he was confused concerning the definition of faculty being used in the document. He felt that a university senate was being described rather than a faculty senate. Francis responded that a university senate might also include classified and graduate students and the recommendation is not to include either of those categories.

Senator Miller, Agricultural Sciences, also commended the task force but was troubled with the SCH issue. He felt that SCH tends to diminish a Senate role that faculty not involved in teaching might otherwise have and was concerned about diminishing Extension's representation. He felt the wrong message was being sent. Francis acknowledged that the proposal does disadvantage some apportionment units, particularly Extension. The task force took that into account when determining the proportional weight to assign to SCH. They also believe that the proposal sends a positive message and reinforces the emphasis the university is placing on teaching and learning, and recruitment and retention of undergraduate students.

Francis stated she met with the Extension caucus and talked about concerns voiced on the floor. She emphasized that this is a work in progress and other motions could come forward regarding apportionment or the name of the body.

Senator Lee, Science, supported this well-crafted document of compromise which deals with a difficult situation.

Question was called for from the floor. Motion 97-532-02 to close debate and vote on the main motion passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. Motion 97-532-01 to approve the proposed bylaws passed by a written vote of 79-22; since 101 votes were cast, 68 was necessary for approval.

## **CATEGORY I PROPOSAL**

Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented for approval a Category I proposal for the delivery of Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Minor in Business Administration (through Business-ONE) in the following community colleges: Chemeketa, Portland (Sylvania), Central, and Southwestern. Burton explained that the State Board allocated \$2.6 million to the College of Business to develop and implement this program. He also noted that the Council felt the curriculum was excellent, but questioned the budget and forwarded the proposal to the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee who agreed that it is expensive, but unanimously recommended approval.

Senator DeKock questioned whether this was a program that is expected to experience growth. Bruce DeYoung, Business, stated that it's difficult to project numbers, but the vision is that the program will grow in student numbers and popularity. He estimated 200 students per year.

In response to Senator Barofsky, Burton stated that external funding was budgeted for four years.

Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, expressed concern about the cost of distance education. He would like a means for the body to determine whether this is a cost effective method of education. Provost Arnold explained that the legislature provided the funds to the Chancellor's Office for the Oregon Joint Professional Schools of Business (OJPSB). The Chancellor was concerned with OJPSB low enrollment and asked the College of Business if they would be willing to design a program as the lead institution for OSSHE. This is a strong and consistent message to access degree completion programs in cooperation with community colleges and OSSHE. The intent is that participants be considered "regular students" with tuition being included in the tuition pool. He noted that faculty will also teach courses on campus, not just for the Business-One program.

Senator Gamble questioned the meaning of offering degrees at a site. Provost Arnold responded that students take lower division courses from the community college and take upper division courses at the community college location via distance education from OSU.

Senator Dodrill, Agricultural Sciences, questioned the lack of reference to evaluation of program content delivery or cost effectiveness. DeYoung responded that there is a peer review committee within the College to address the course content and curriculum; course effectiveness will require the same type of evaluation as is now done by students; and cost effectiveness will require looking at the number of students over time versus the cost of delivery. Provost Arnold reminded Senators that the State Board will require a review of this program in five years, as with all new programs.

Motion 97-532-03 to approve the College of Business Category I proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## *ANNUAL REPORTS*

The following annual reports were included in the agenda:

- Academic Regulations Committee
- Academic Requirements Committee
- Academic Standing Committee
- Administrative Appointments Committee
- Advancement of Teaching Committee
- Baccalaureate Core Committee
- Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee
- Bylaws and Nominations Committee
- Committee on Committees
- Curriculum Council
- Faculty Economic Welfare Committee
- Faculty Grievance Committee
- Faculty Mediation Committee
- Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee
- Faculty Status Committee
- Graduate Admissions Committee
- Graduate Council
- Instructional Development and Technology Committee
- Research Council
- Undergraduate Admissions Committee
- University Honors Council

## *INFORMATION ITEMS*

- Faculty Senate Elections - Ken Krane, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, is accepting recommendations for President-elect, Executive Committee members, and IFS representative. Nominations are due October 9.
- Faculty Senate Committee/Council Chair Meeting - October 16 from 3:00-5:00 in MU 207.

## *REPORTS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT*

President Wilcox reported on the following item:

A recent OSU THIS WEEK article indicated that the Executive Committee (EC) had approved the Information Services budget plan when, in fact, the EC has received the plan and will provide input within the next few weeks after review by the Library, Budgets and Fiscal Planning and Instructional Development and Technology Committees. Curt Pederson, Associate

Provost for Information Services, will report to the Senate in November.

## *NEW BUSINESS*

There was no new business.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

| [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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » June 5, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 531

June 5, 1997

### For All Faculty

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Anthony Wilcox. The April and May minutes were approved as distributed. President Wilcox thanked Thurston Doler for serving as Parliamentarian during the meeting. Wilcox also recognized the recent retirement of Russell Dix, Associate Registrar. He expressed appreciation for Dix's work and devotion over the years, especially in connection with Commencement, and noted that the Senate and University will miss him.

### Meeting Summary

- *Special Report:* Institutional Change - Steve Bosserman
- *Committee Reports:* Faculty Senate Membership Task Force; Task Force on Assessment of Teaching; and Academic Regulations Committee
- *Action Items:* Consideration of Degree Candidates; Category I Proposals - 1) Rename the B.S. in Industrial Engineering to the B.S. in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering with Options in Industrial Engineering and Manufacturing Engineering, and 2) Establishing New Academic Departments in the College of Veterinary Medicine; and Standing Rules Changes [Motion 97-531-01 through 05]
- *New Business:* Insurance Benefits for Domestic Partners and AR 20 [Motion 97-531-06 through 07]

### Roll Call

#### *Members Absent With Representation:*

Akyeampong, U. Mali; Delson, L. Jodice; Kellogg, E. Olsen; Longerbeam, M. Gorski; G. Matzke, M. Matzke; Rielly, C. Rusk; Sanderson, L. Dunnington; Seville, J. Drexler; and Williamson, L. Semprini.

#### *Members Absent Without Representation:*

Burke, Cheeke, Coakley, Cowles, P. Farber, V. Farber, Farnsworth, Fletcher, Foster, Griggs, Hathaway, Hemphill, Henderson, Hu, Huyer, Ingham, Jenkins, Jones, Ladd, Leong, McAlexander, S. Miller, T. Miller, M. Mix, Moon, Olson, Pearson, Perry, Rowe, Schowalter, Tiger, Wander, Williams, L. Woods, and Wrolstad.

#### *Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

A. Wilcox, President; M. Niess, President-Elect; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

#### *Guests of the Senate:*

B. Becker, L. Burns, T. Doler, S. Francis, K. Hardin, C. Kolbe, L. Maughan, A. Morey, J. Mosley, T. Scheuermann, S. Schreiber, G. Stephenson, N. Wendt and R. Wess.

## SPECIAL REPORTS

### Institutional Change

Steve Bosserman, Institutional Change and Organizational Theory Specialist, provided a brief view of his perspective of the university. As President Wilcox noted, several workshops sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation have occurred on campus to facilitate institutional change in conjunction with Bosserman's visits.

Bosserman explained that OSU has been involved in the Interaction Project since 1994 and is one of over 25 land grant institutions participating in 13 Kellogg-funded Food Systems Professions Education (FSPE) projects. The objective is to make significant changes in institutions, and in the connective bodies of stakeholders and students, to help them position for change in the next century. Kellogg's main interest is to see that there is wide-spread involvement from a number of sectors, both internally to the institution and externally. Kellogg's initial concern was that, although there was heavy involvement from faculty, there may not have been sufficient involvement from upper administration in the change process. It was at this point that Bosserman was brought to OSU to assist in integrating participation.



The workshops are focusing on how to have effective conversations, how to bring real issues to the table, how to get those people involved who are necessary to the conversation, and have the conversation lead to something that makes a difference in policies, procedures, programs, structure and funding that are the underpinnings of how the institution behaves. By the Spring of 1998, he anticipates about 700 people to be actively involved in this process of systemic change.

Bosserman explained that the scope of OSU's project is truly of note and is being closely watched nationwide because it encompasses change on a university level, whereas many other projects focus only on individual colleges. OSU has an opportunity to make a difference at a national level. He extended an invitation to all faculty to participate at whatever degree they choose.

### **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 were 3,212 students who were candidates for 3,301 degrees which included: 2,423 Bachelors, 654 Masters, and 224 Doctors. There were also 85 students who were candidates for two degrees and two students who were candidates for three degrees.

The Class of 1997, OSU's 128th graduating class, had 418 seniors who qualify for Academic Distinction and included 201 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50-3.69), 120 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70--3.84), and 97 'summa cum laude' (gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 97-531-01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## *Committee Reports*

### **Task Force on Senate Membership**

Sally Francis, Task Force on Senate Membership Chair, provided rationale behind the recommendations contained in the draft report which pertained to the structure and size of the Faculty Senate.

The Task Force on Senate Membership (TFSM) believes that an appropriate governance model should be collaborative in that all those with 'faculty' in their title should be represented. Francis explained that Senate membership has been broadened in the recent past and the current recommendation would expand representation to two groups already in the Senate: 1) Professional Faculty are already partially represented because No Rank faculty are being recategorized to include former Management Service personnel; and 2) Research Associates and Senior Faculty Research Assistants are already represented, so the issue is whether or not to add Faculty Research Assistants (FRA's). They recommend that these two groups of faculty be included in existing apportionment units.

The Task Force strove to maintain a balance in representation so that no single unit would become comparatively large and to maintain the current size of about 130 senators. Considering that actions of the Senate relate largely to curriculum/academics and that the new categories of faculty are typically not directly engaged in these activities, the TFSM attempted to create an apportionment basis that would somewhat ameliorate the potential dilution of the academic (teaching/curriculum) function. Five apportionment scenarios, ranging from 129-173 senators, were considered by the TFSM: 1) 130 senators based on the current apportionment ratio of 14 FTE per senator (status quo); 2) The combined FTE from scenario one plus the FTE from all FRA's and former Management Service for a total of 173 senators; 3) The combined FTE from scenario two at a ratio of 19 FTE per senator resulting in 129 senators; 4) Apportionment was based on 25% student credit hours and 75% faculty FTE for a total of 132 senators; and 5) All combined FTE was determined on a sliding scale: 16 FTE per senator up to 160 FTE and 27 FTE per senator above 160 FTE.

The Task Force will present one apportionment scenario for approval at the October Senate meeting. The purpose of several scenarios was to gather feedback to aid in formulating the final report.

The TFSM further recommended that an ad hoc transition committee be appointed to guide the implementation of these recommendations and that an educational campaign be mounted to facilitate the transition.

Francis noted that the draft report has been shared with the Faculty Senate Past President's Council, which was supportive of the recommendations, and during a faculty forum. There are also plans to meet with individual senate caucuses to discuss the recommendations.

Senator Morris, Science, questioned what consideration the TFSM gave to the importance of issues discussed by the Senate when concluding that Faculty Research Assistants should be included. He felt that most were academic issues and would not involve FRA's. Francis responded that the judgement of the TFSM was that one-half to three-quarters of Senate action items were curricular in nature. Currently excluded faculty categories serving on the TFSM expressed interest in those issues and felt they would have contributions to make in those areas. Morris was sympathetic to their desire, but asked if there were

other possible ways to include them without giving them Senate representation. Francis stated that there are issues other than curricular, such as salaries, promotion and tenure guidelines, grievance procedures, etc., that the Senate makes recommendations on that would involve FRA's.

IFS Representative Esbensen questioned what guidelines the ad hoc transition committee would operate under. Francis stated there is a statement of purpose in the Faculty Senate Bylaws. She indicated that the action item presented by the TFSM will be the Bylaws change and the report will be an information item. She views the report as the rationale which supports the specific changes.

Senator Rose, Forestry, questioned whether there was anyone on the TFSM who favored removing administrators from the Senate. Francis didn't recall anyone in support of that action.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, asked if the Faculty Senate will vote on the recommendations. Francis reiterated that her understanding is that the report would not be an action item. Daley felt that adding faculty in the Senate who don't have tenure will weaken the position of the Senate with respect to supporting tenure. Francis noted that, alternately, this could strengthen the position.

President Wilcox commended the Task Force for the quality of work and careful thought put into the recommendations.

### **Task Force on Assessment of Teaching**

Maggie Niess, Task Force on Assessment of Teaching Chair, explained that this task force has grown out of a number of avenues and noted that teaching is central to the mission of OSU if we are to provide a compelling learning experience. One of the first things the group dealt with was to differentiate between assessment and evaluation. She defined assessment of teaching as describing what is going on in the teaching act while evaluation of teaching is placing a value on teaching. The group has also discussed at length one aspect that is missing from OSU, which is support for the improvement of teaching, based on both assessment and evaluation.

She noted that the Student Assessment of Teaching Form is the only approved, unsigned document for promotion and tenure that is to be summarized.

Identified challenges and concerns include:

- New Promotion and Tenure Guidelines place a new emphasis on teaching and require a determination of effective teaching.
- Change of instructional modes and techniques isn't reflected on the current Student Assessment of Teaching instrument, making it very ineffective.
- Guidelines for peer assessment and teaching portfolios are not consistent across units.
- The apparent lack of assistance for improvement of teaching.

Since this instrument has received increasing attention over the past year, the Executive Committee charged the Assessment of Teaching Task Force with making recommendations for changes in the assessment and evaluation procedures. The charge is as follows: omake recommendations for changes in assessment and evaluative procedures; oevaluate and critique the efficacy of the university-wide Student Assessment of Teaching instrument and, if appropriate, propose a revision or replacement of this form; oassess the effectiveness of the peer assessment of teaching procedures and, if appropriate, propose assessment procedure(s) that may be utilized to achieve a valid evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness by peers; and orecommend processes for both student assessment of teaching and peer assessment of teaching that consider recommendations for working with faculty to improve their teaching.

Niess explained that, in the selection of task force members, the intent was to keep the group small enough to be workable. People were approached, or volunteered, who had an interest in this issue. Focus groups and several university and Faculty Senate committees will work with the task force. She noted that academic deans are supportive of this task force and are working with their units to identify focus groups. The task force will work over the summer, they will develop a set of recommendations in the fall and final recommendations are due to the Executive Committee in December.

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned where the task force emphasis will be. Niess responded that the emphasis will be on teaching, but they have also discussed the need to recognize the student's role and responsibility in the process. She also noted that the student's would like an ASOSU focus group.

### **Academic Regulations Committee**

Nancy Wendt, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, provided follow-up to questions posed during the April Faculty Senate meeting.

Wendt reminded Senators that the concern expressed was that a student could receive an 'F' in a course due to academic

dishonesty and then intentionally repeat the course and receive a new grade. She explained that there are currently procedures to follow, outlined in Academic Regulation 15, regarding academic dishonesty. Providing that faculty use these procedures, the student will not be allowed to have a second grade replace the 'F' received in connection with academic dishonesty. She indicated that there is a form from the Dean of Students Office, that must be completed by the faculty member in these cases. She described the procedures to follow: 1) the faculty member documents the particular incident on the form; 2) the student is permitted to provide an explanation to the charge; 3) the student is advised of the penalties; and 4) the faculty member indicates the type of penalty.

Wendt discussed this issue with Bill Oye from the Dean of Students Office and he indicated that what is likely currently happening is that a student is being penalized on a single assignment for academic dishonesty and no paperwork is being filed. In these cases, the student could continue to commit acts of academic dishonesty and no one would know that a pattern is emerging since no paperwork is being submitted. Wendt emphasized that, even if the penalty only pertains to one assignment rather than the entire course, the proper paperwork still needs to be submitted. Since repeat courses are processed by hand, a report will be made to the Registrars Office once a term to indicate when there is a situation of a student receiving an 'F' due to academic dishonesty and the student will not be allowed to replace the grade.

In response to a question from Senator Gamble, Wendt indicated that the second grade will appear on the transcript, but will not count in the GPA.

The second concern she researched dealt with why the cumulative GPA does not include work from other institutions. She indicated that this decision was a result of a 1993 Senate action. Concerns voiced at the time centered around grades from other institutions and whether or not there was grade inflation and differing standards at other institutions. The Senate felt that separating the two was a more accurate representation of a students' education.

Senator Gamble stated that graduate students are accepted from all over the world and the Graduate School assesses their transcripts. He feels that the policy is ridiculous.

Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, asked if further discussion had been given to the AR 20 policy which would allow a student to enroll in a class with S/U grading, not attend the class, and upgrade the 'F', thereby changing the GPA (since S/U does not count toward GPA). Wendt responded that this would be possible, but it would show on their transcript that they had failed a class twice.

Senator Thies, Science, felt that the intention was to replace the grade with a letter grade and hoped that, before fall, the AR could be changed to state that intent.

Cheryl Kolbe, Academic Requirements Committee Chair, stated that the opportunity has been opened up to allow students to buy out of suspension. She suggested that AR 20 be changed to state that a letter grade cannot be replaced by an S/U grade. [See New Business]

## *INFORMATION ITEMS*

- Faculty Senate Elections - Ken Krane, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, is accepting recommendations for President-elect, Executive Committee members, and IFS representative. Nominations are due October 9.
- Faculty Senate Committee/Council Chair Meeting - October 16 from 3:00-5:00 in MU 207.

## *REPORTS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT*

President Wilcox reported on the following item:

A recent OSU THIS WEEK article indicated that the Executive Committee (EC) had approved the Information Services budget plan when, in fact, the EC has received the plan and will provide input within the next few weeks after review by the Library, Budgets and Fiscal Planning and Instructional Development and Technology Committees. Curt Pederson, Associate Provost for Information Services, will report to the Senate in November.

## *Action Items*

### **Category I Proposals**

Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented two Category I proposals. The first was an abbreviated proposal to Rename the B.S. in Industrial Engineering to the B.S. in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering with Options in Industrial Engineering and Manufacturing Engineering. Burton reported that the Curriculum Council unanimously approved the proposal, which more accurately describes the degree.

Motion 97-531-02 to approve the above Category I passed by voice vote with no discussion and no dissenting votes.

Burton indicated that the second proposal to Establish New Academic Departments in the College of Veterinary Medicine is an administrative adjustment that will have no budget or curricular impact. This proposal, which also received unanimous approval from the Curriculum Council, would create the departments of Biomedical Sciences and Large Animal Clinical Sciences.

Motion 97-531-03 to establish two departments in the College of Veterinary Medicine passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Standing Rules Changes**

Laurel Maughan, Committee on Committees Chair, presented proposed standing rules changes for the following committees: Academic Requirements Committee, Graduate Council, and Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee. Proposed additions are indicated by shaded areas and proposed deletions are indicated by strike-throughs.

### **Proposed changes to the Academic Requirements Committee dealt with committee members:**

The Committee consists of seven Faculty faculty members, at least two of whom shall be male and two female, and at least two of whom shall be graduate faculty; and three Student student members, at least one of whom shall be a graduate student and one an undergraduate student; and the Registrar (or representative), ex-officio, non-voting.

Maughan explained that the Academic Requirements Committee felt that, due to the nature of the committee, there was a need to designate male and female faculty members.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, questioned why gender was an issue. Cheryl Kolbe, Academic Requirements Committee Chair, explained that the committee frequently deals with issues such as rape, sexual abuse, stalking, etc. which creates the need for an exception to academic regulations. These situations make it extremely difficult for students to talk about the incident with faculty of a particular gender. It is also difficult for the student to write on the appeal what the particular problem is for fear that it may become public, so for the sake of the student, it is in their best interest to have a faculty member of whichever gender they are most comfortable talking with.

Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, questioned the procedure of a student approaching a faculty member. Kolbe explained that the student first contacts the Registrars Office. If they clearly cannot talk with the Registrars staff, they are referred to a committee member. Cornell asked if there would be any value in requiring gender balance in the student members. Kolbe responded negatively and stated that it is not the role of student members to visit with the affected student.

Senator Hansen, Student Affairs, questioned whether it wouldn't be more appropriate to have an advocate for the student. He suggested that there be advocates based on cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds, etc., based on the particular scenario. Kolbe indicated that no one is in the role of an advocate, the student is simply presenting information which the committee is evaluating and determining exceptions to the regulation. Hansen questioned why the recommendation stops at gender. Kolbe responded that the intent is to create a comfortable situation for students. Hansen felt that creating a comfortable situation for the student could be expanded to other distinctions outside of gender.

Senator Lee, Associated, felt that if sensitivity to gender is being considered, then equal sensitivity for ethnic issues and other kinds of similarities and differences must be considered. She didn't feel that gender was more important than race or sexual orientation. Kolbe didn't disagree that these issues occur, but the recommendation was made on the basis of talking with several rape victims. Kolbe also stated that if they tried to represent every possible group, the committee could not be filled.

President Wilcox referred to the preamble to the Faculty Senate committees and councils concerning selection with regard to the operating principles used when making appointments. The objective is to establish broad representation in the areas of faculty status, ethnicity, gender, etc., on each committee or council.

Senator Daley felt that if a student has experienced a trauma and has certification, the case should be approved. Kolbe noted that not all students seek professional help and each case must be judged individually.

Senator Balz, Associated, stated that the Registrars Office will begin taking a different approach to these cases. She stated that staff will be crosstrained at all levels and will be able to work with all students in all areas. All three of the top administrators in her office will see students on a regular basis. The primary liaison with the Academic Requirements Committee will be the Assistant Registrar, who is a hispanic male. The backup person is a white female.

Senator Oye, Student Affairs, spoke in support of reiterating the guiding principle Wilcox referred to or striking the gender designation.

Senator Oriard moved to postpone this recommendation indefinitely and allow the committees to reconsider and determine if there is some way to have a mediator from Student Affairs, or some appropriate unit. Motion was seconded.

Senator Frank, Liberal Arts, questioned whether a report will come back if the motion passes. Parliamentarian Doler advised him to make no assumptions about anything coming back from the committee.

Motion 97-531-03 to indefinitely postpone this recommendation passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

In presenting the following proposed changes to the Graduate Council, Maughan explained that the changes clarify: 1) what the committee actually does; 2) the fact that there are some interdisciplinary graduate programs that account for the deletion of 'departments' and the addition of 'academic units'; and 3) also clarifies committee membership.

## **GRADUATE COUNCIL**

The Graduate Council has jurisdiction over the policies, and procedures, and requirements of graduate work education. The Council establishes and reviews admission standards, basic degree requirements, and general policies; approves all graduate faculty members, new programs, and courses; and periodically reviews all existing graduate programs. The actual formulation creation, design, and specific requirements of departmental graduate programs and the development and direction of the programs of individual students student's programs are the responsibilities of the departments academic units; however, no department academic unit has authority to waive or supersede the general rules policies of the Graduate Council.

The Council consists of one graduate Faculty faculty member representing from each College and School, appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and a graduate student representative selected by the Graduate Student Association. The Chair shall be a faculty member with immediate prior experience on the Council., appointed annually by the Executive Committee. The Dean/Administrator and Associate Dean of the Graduate School and the Chair of the Graduate Admissions Committee shall be a exofficio, non-voting members., the Associate and/or Assistant Dean(s) shall be Ex-Officio, non-voting member(s), and the Chair of the Graduate Admissions Committee shall be a liaison member, non-voting, on the Graduate Council.

There was no discussion on the proposed changes. Motion 97-531-04 to approve the proposed changes to the Graduate Council passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

The next proposal presented by Maughan reflected the formation of a new committee by merging the existing Faculty Economic Welfare Committee and the Retirement Committee.

## **FACULTY ECONOMIC WELFARE AND RETIREMENT COMMITTEE**

The Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee formulates statements of policy and advises on matters of salaries, deferred compensation and Tax Deferred Annuity programs, retirement programs, retirement benefits, insurance, and other programs which affect the economic benefits of both active and retired faculty. It shall make information related to retirement and retirement options available to the faculty. When appropriate, recommendations and findings are made to the Faculty Senate. The Committee shall also formulate recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for possible submission to the Legislature for amendments to the retirement system.

The Committee consists of nine members; two or three shall be retired faculty. In addition, the OSU Staff Benefits Manager shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Motion 97-531-05 to approve the Standing Rules for the Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **OSU Award for Excellence in Service**

A proposal for an OSU Award for Excellence in Service was included in the agenda as an action item. However, since funding for the award was not been identified prior to the meeting, it was not considered at the request of the Faculty Recognition and Awards Chair, Jon Olson.

## *Information Items*

Annual Reports - Annual reports from each Faculty Senate committee/council chair are due July 15 and will be published in the October agenda.

## *Reports from the Provost*



Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

- Commented that the recent Student Awards event is always one of the most inspirational occurrences on campus.
- Project InterAction - In response to many queries, he noted that the project explained earlier by Steve Bosserman is supported by the administration and he encouraged participation by all who wish to do so.
- Searches - Vice Provost for Research candidate, Dr. Kathy Olson, will return in June for an additional visit; the agenda will be totally determined by her to allow her to learn more about OSU and the community.

Candidate names for the Vice President for University Advancement have been received from the search firm. The list will be reviewed and a determination made whether to bring one or more candidates to campus.

The search committee has been appointed for the Dean of Engineering position.

The intent is to conduct a search for the position of Associate Provost for Information Services after July 1. However, arrangements for interim leadership must be made.

- Budget - OSU still has incomplete information concerning the 1997-98 budget. Administration is looking at a university-wide perspective rather than unit by unit which will result in the current year budget with the addition of available roll-ups and possible add-back adjustments. Still on the table for consideration are such issues as: faculty compensation, the engineering initiative, access, and technology.

The second adjustment concerns enrollment. He reminded Senators that OSU experienced a \$2.5 million current year adjustment in the budget since we were below the enrollment targets. The next step in considering the budget will be a meeting with department heads and chairs to review the budget situation, discuss implementation of the budget, and to focus on the university-wide approach in the considerations. A series of approaches will be used to prepare for the adjustment due to smaller enrollments: 1) identify dollars in the budget that can be redirected in 1997--98; 2) continuation of philosophy of investment in probable areas of future revenues (recruitment/retention/marketing); and 3) a philosophy of looking at all opportunities to do things differently.

Two longer-term budget considerations are: 1) The Chancellor's Office intends to change their practice of establishing enrollment targets from a biennial basis to an annual basis. 2) OSU's enrollment corridor may change and it may be an advantage to have a smaller corridor.

Provost Arnold stated that program elimination is not a consideration.

Senator Rose, Forestry, questioned the need for an Associate Provost for Information Services. Arnold responded that the position was created during the Administrative Review process in response to the University Computing Steering Committee's determination that restructuring and focused leadership was needed for Information Services. As a result, University Computing, the Library, Communication Media Center, and Telecommunications were brought together under the leadership of one individual. A team approach has been created to integrate functions and activities within Information Services. It is also necessary to have someone represent OSU on a system, state-wide and national basis regarding internet issues to ensure that OSU is a player.

## *New Business*

Resolution on Insurance Benefits for Domestic Partners

President Wilcox explained that the Executive Committee has sent forward an item of new business in the form of a resolution regarding insurance benefits for domestic partners.

WE, THE FACULTY SENATE OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, HEREBY RESOLVE that Oregon State University seek to provide employment insurance benefits to the domestic partners and children of University employees in domestic partner relationships in the same fashion as is provided for married employees, and we respectfully request that the University president and vice president for finance and administration actively pursue and advocate for the timely extension of such employment insurance benefits with all public entities having jurisdiction in this matter including, but not necessarily limited to, the State Employees Benefits Board (SEBB), the Bargaining Unit Benefits Board (-BUBB), the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE), other public universities and colleges in Oregon, and the Oregon Legislative Assembly.

He explained that this issue is a recent development as a result of a meeting between the Chancellor and OSU and U of O faculty. Chancellor Cox voiced his support for the proposal that insurance benefits be extended to domestic partners and recommended taking it up on a university by university basis and promised to advance the issue to the Executive Committee of the Board of Higher Education. Wilcox also noted that on July 1 the merger between SEBB and BUBB will begin. A ruling by the Attorney General is necessary to extend the eligibility definitions to include domestic partners since neither SEBB nor



BUBB has legal authority to do so. OPEU passed a resolution statewide favoring domestic partner benefits and negotiated that the principle of nondiscrimination be applied in the contract terms. OSSHE OPEU employees are separately negotiating this issue. In the near future, BUBB will submit their plan to the Attorney General to extend benefits to domestic partners. This presents an opportunity to communicate the view of the Faculty Senate on domestic partner benefits. The proposed resolution is a modification of one passed by the U of O University Senate in April. IFS will discuss this issue at their June meeting. Wilcox noted that OSU currently supports domestic partner benefits where it has the authority to do so, i.e., library privileges, use of facilities, reduced admission charges for athletic events, etc. It's estimated that over 500 employers have the policy, as well as numerous municipalities and counties. Benton County has found no cost increase associated with insurance coverage. The City of Portland has had the policy in effect since 1994 and of the approximately 4,500 benefit eligible employees, only 30-40 (less than 1%) have signed up, which is very consistent with both business and municipality settings. The increase in medical claims has been reported to be less than 1%.

In response to Senator Gamble asking who initiated this action, Wilcox stated that faculty went to the Chancellor and asked for his support.

Senator Hale questioned the cost of implementation and expressed concern of not knowing the actual cost and whether it is feasible to do. Wilcox responded that Benton County's experience reflected that the increased expenditure individually was not affected by the increase in extension of benefits, but reflected only the annual rise of insurance costs.

Provost Arnold explained that it would change the allocation of the individual employee's benefits, but would not affect the dollar amount received per employee.

Senator Plant, Engineering, indicated that his colleagues were split 50/50 on the issue. He also was concerned that there was not enough time to properly consider the motion.

Motion 97-531-06 to approve the resolution passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Academic Regulation 20

Senator Thies moved that the following be added to the end of AR 20; motion was seconded: A student receiving an A-F grade can only replace such a grade in the gpa calculation with another A-F grade (not with an S/U grade).

Motion 97-531-07 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:47 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

| [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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » May 1, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 530

May 1, 1997

### For All Faculty

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Anthony Wilcox. The April minutes were not available for approval. President Wilcox read the following resolution of sympathy, which was adopted by unanimous consent and sent to the family of Clarence Calder:

#### *Resolution of Sympathy*

*The Oregon State University Faculty Senate expresses its deepest sympathies to the family of Clarence "Clancy" Calder upon his death on April 15, 1997. Clancy joined the faculty in the department of Mechanical Engineering in 1978. He distinguished himself in his field and held leadership positions in international professional societies. Clancy served his college and university and was a member of the Faculty Senate from 1991-1996. He was also very active in civic organizations, local government, and with his church. This caring and committed citizen of OSU and the community will be truly missed.*

---

### Meeting Summary

- *Special Reports:* Task Force on Greek Life, Larry Roper and Les Risser
- *Committee Reports:* Post-tenure Review Task Force, Ken Krane; Faculty Economic Welfare Committee, James Herzog; and Salary Equity Study Committee, Kathy Heath
- *Action Items:* Standing Rules Changes - Curriculum Council, Graduate Admissions, and housekeeping changes; and nominee for the D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award [Motion 97-530-01 through 04]
- *New Business:* There was no new business.

---

### Roll Call

#### *Members Absent With Representation:*

Balz, R. Dix; Field, P. Thomson; Hansen, P. Ratchfort; Leong, B. Geller; Rathja, C. Bell; and Seville, J. Drexler.

#### *Members Absent Without Representation:*

Calvert, Cheeke, Christie, Coakley, Coblenz, Collier, Cowles, Farnsworth, Foster, Graham, Gregerson, Hu, Ingham, Ladd, Madsen, McAlexander, A. Mix, G. Pearson, Perry, Primak, Putnam, Randhawa, and Tiger.

#### *Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

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

#### *Guests of the Senate:*

B. Becker, L. Burns, S. Francis, A. Hashimoto, K. Heath, A. Lake, L. Maughan, J. McGuire, D. Nicodemus, and T. West.

---

## SPECIAL REPORTS

### Task Force on Greek Life

Larry Roper, Vice Provost for Student Affairs, explained that since he arrived at OSU he has had people talk to him about Greek life, and their comments were at extreme ends of the continuum. He noted that, in recent years, there has been a decline in membership of the Greek system, a reduction in University-provided staffing, and an increase in confusion and ambiguity regarding the relationship between and responsibility of the University to Greek chapters. He reported that more than 2,000 OSU undergraduates are involved in fraternities or sororities. In response to experiencing difficulty in evaluating the Greek system, he organized a task force to conduct a comprehensive review of the Greek system at OSU.

The primary expectations of the task force are:

- 1.To review the nature and structure of the relationship between the University and Greek chapters;
- 2.To assess the current strengths and challenges of Greek chapters and identify the current indicators of good health;
- 3.To assess the "quality of life" for students residing in Greek chapter houses, including: (a) the learning environment, (b) access to educationally purposeful and personal development experiences; (c) attention to personal health and safety issues, (d) availability of role models, (e) availability of healthy relationships, and (f) the influence of membership on academic success;
- 4.To assess the "climate" within Greek chapters, specifically, to evaluate the role of alcohol, to review the relationships among chapters, and to describe the "accepted norms" of behavior;
- 5.To assess the perceptions non-Greeks in the campus and local community have of Greek chapters and to determine the degree to which those perceptions are congruent with the stated missions of Greek chapters.
6. To assess the level of advising available to Greek chapters and make recommendations for appropriate advising expectations;
7. To evaluate the degree to which Greek chapters comply with the stated missions of their national organizations and Oregon State University and the level of compliance with local and University statutes;
8. To review the current member recruitment and selection processes and to make recommendations, where necessary, to improve those processes;
9. To make recommendations for the appropriate relationship of Greek chapters to Oregon State University, including: (a) staffing, (b) expectations, (c) systems of accountability, (d) appropriate reporting direction within the University administration, and (e) educational relationship; and
10. To make recommendations for the future direction of Greek chapters, including recommendations for: (a) enhancing the system's growth, (b) strengthening accountability, (c) managing risks for chapters and the University, and (d) increasing the educational value of the Greek experience.

Roper then introduced Les Risser, task force chair. Risser noted she accepted the challenge of chair for the following reasons:

- 1)believes that all OSU programs need to be successful;
- 2)believes that the Greek system may be suffering from a lack of attention in recent years;
- 3)believes that the University is only as strong as the sum of its parts and that everyone shares in the responsibility of projecting a positive image; and
- 4)believes that a program as rich in history as this one (the first chapters were chartered in 1950) has certain obligations, including:
  - adding value to the University
  - providing compelling learning experiences within confines of a safe environment for members
  - providing opportunities to live a set of values that may not be acquired elsewhere

The task force is comprised of three graduate students, ten undergraduate students (both Greek and non-Greek), ten faculty and staff, and three community members.

Groups and individuals have been identified to speak with the task force regarding their evaluation of the Greek system in terms of strengths, weaknesses, and expectations. The process will include focus groups and written surveys.

Risser applauded those in Student Affairs who recognized the need and initiated the process. For the process to be successful, she indicated that it needs to be open, active, and inclusive. She asked two things of senators: 1) To take time to provide input when the survey is received, and 2) To feel free to contact her with suggestions, comments and questions.

Roper noted that the task force is meeting on a regular basis during the 1996/97 academic year and has been asked to conclude their work during fall term. At that time, a public meeting will be held to share the information gathered, prior to recommendations being made. Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, questioned what the next step would be after the task force makes its recommendations. Roper responded that the recommendations will be shared publicly and he will consult with colleagues to determine what they are capable of doing in response to the recommendations.

Senator Rose, Forestry, questioned whether Roper had the power to physically move all fraternities on campus. Roper indicated OSU has the power to not recognize a fraternity or sorority, but did not have the power to tell them where they can live.

## *Committee Reports*

### **Post-tenure Review Task Force**

Ken Krane, Post-tenure Review Task Force Chair, reported that articles concerning tenure have been appearing at an

increasing rate in higher education publications. He noted that the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate is looking at post-tenure review policies at OSSHE campuses. In addition, the legislature is expressing concern regarding tenure for K-12 teachers and he felt that questions about university faculty are not far behind. He explained that the Faculty Senate felt that it should take the leadership on reviewing tenure and post-tenure review, which resulted in the task force. Krane noted that OAR 580-21-140 requires a system of post-tenure review.

The charge to the task force from the Senate Executive Committee is:

- to compare OSU's Periodic Review of Faculty with review processes in place at other institutions;
- to assess the current status of the relationship between tenure and academic freedom;
- to provide guidance to OSU administrators in conducting faculty reviews, especially the use of the position description and/or other performance expectations as the basis for the review;
- to strengthen our periodic review system by incorporating opportunities for faculty development and enhancement of professional skills in scholarship, instruction, or service.

The task force, which is comprised of members from each college, has been divided into three subgroups with specific responsibilities:

- Subgroup A - to investigate the current relationship between tenure and academic freedom
- Subgroup B - to study post-tenure review systems in place at other institutions
- Subgroup C - to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of OSU's current system of Periodic Review of Faculty

Krane stated there is an existing Periodic Review of Faculty which mandates that tenured faculty be reviewed every three years. He noted there is considerable variation among academic units as to implementation of the review and they are determining those variations on campus. Krane is looking for input consisting of ideas or knowledge of effective post-tenure review systems in place at other institutions and personal experiences with OSU's present system - particularly if a unit has a very effective way of evaluating faculty.

The task force hopes to conclude deliberations in June and will be presenting a report to the Senate during fall term.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, expressed concern about tightening the review process. Krane responded that an outcome would be to strengthen the current review system. OSU already has a more rigorous system than some institutions, however, it lacks a procedure to assist faculty whose reviews are below an acceptable performance.

### **Faculty Economic Welfare Committee**

James Herzog, Faculty Economic Welfare Committee Chair, explained that they analyzed the self-funded 6% mid-year faculty salary adjustments, which consisted of a 2% adjustment for faculty with fully satisfactory service and a 4% pool for merit/equity adjustments. The committee studied the salary adjustments to determine whether they met the intent, as approved by the President's Cabinet, Dean's Council, leadership of the Faculty Senate, and the Chancellor's office.

After reviewing the data, the committee reached the following conclusions:

1. It appeared that most of the units produced salary adjustments which were close to the 6% goal. Overall the adjustments were \$187,445 short of a full 6% adjustment. The major deviation comes from the College of Engineering which was \$101,571 in deficit (see #3). The range of average overages and shortages per individual ranged from +\$645 in Research and International to -\$720 in Engineering.
2. Salary adjustments were analyzed by base salary to determine if the adjustments were skewed toward higher or lower salaried employees. There did not appear to be any unusual variations in the distribution.
3. The committee was deeply concerned about the lack of distribution of salary funds to faculty in the College of Engineering (COE). The COE deviated considerably from the formula specified by the memo of October 4. The average salary adjustment was 4.8%. According to the COE plan, one-third of the available funds (2%) were not distributed to faculty but were instead diverted to a "non-recurring merit increase fund (bonus) administered by COE". The COE would then distribute the funds as bonuses at the end of the academic year. Due to the untimely death of Dean John Owen, it was not possible to get a full explanation of the details of the bonus plan. The committee was concerned about several issues. First, bonuses are non-recurring and do not become a part of the base salary. This deprives the faculty of the potential benefit of compounding due to future percent increases. The committee went on record as being "categorically opposed to the process of diverting salary adjustment funds into non-recurring bonuses." It also questioned the wisdom and legality of doing this.
4. The committee recommends that the Faculty Senate take a firm action to reverse the action

of the College of Engineering and re-appropriate state funds for their intended purpose as salary adjustments.

Herzog explained that a decision has been made to reallocate the COE money to the faculty as a recurring salary adjustment. He noted that the long-term status of the bonus program will be put on hold until a permanent dean is in place.

Senator Budd, Science, questioned whether the COE chairs will determine merit increases. Herzog indicated his understanding is that the department heads and dean will meet and determine reallocation.

### **Salary Equity Study Committee**

Kathy Heath, Salary Equity Study Committee Chair, explained that, in the fall of 1996, OSU conducted a study of salary equity for women faculty and faculty of color. The final report (which will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate when completed) will describe the background, development of guide-lines, implementation, results and recommendations of the study. Heath explained how the committee arrived at the recommendations:

#### **BACKGROUND:**

- Impetus for the study came in 1993, when the President's Commission on the Status of Women (PCOSW) at OSU produced the report, "Achieving Parity for Women at Oregon State University." One of the twelve recommendations was to conduct a study of salary equity based on gender.
- In response to the PCOSW Parity Report, the Provost named a University Salary Equity Planning Committee to propose a model for a salary equity study of faculty women's salaries. This committee recommended that the University conduct a salary equity study: 1) using a comparator analysis; 2) limiting the study to tenured and tenure-track Assistant, Associate and Full Professors; 3) and considering gender-bias but not addressing salary compression or other historical or market-based reasons for salary differences among faculty. They set the time-line for completion as Spring Term, 1996 and suggested a review of all three ranks separately.
- In March, 1996 the University Salary Equity Committee (USEC) was appointed and consisted of the following members: Kathleen Heath (Chair), Alan Acock, Wilbert Gamble, Ilene Kleinsorge, L.J. Koong, Kay Schaffer, Sandra Woods, and Beth Strohmeyer; ex-officio members were Andy Hashimoto and Stephanie Sanford.

**DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES** - In developing the guidelines, the committee supported the idea of using a comparator study and reviewed the following information: a 1993 University of Wisconsin-Madison comparator study of faculty salaries; national data; and AAUP information. Ethnic/racial minorities were added as a second group of faculty for salary review, which had not been done before. The following was also developed: a series of questions; Draft 1996 Plan and Guidelines for a Comparator Study of Salary Equity for Women and Ethnic/Racial Minorities in the Professorial Ranks; distributed questions and the Draft Plan to deans and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and interviewed those groups; the Draft was modified based upon input from these groups. Economic Research Services, Inc. reviewed the overall plan and method and plan proposed by OSU. The 1996 Plan and Guidelines for A Comparator Study of Salary Equity for Women and Ethnic/Racial Minorities in the Professorial Ranks was submitted to the Provost who approved it and submitted it with the October 4, 1996 salary adjustment memo.

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STUDY** - Analysis conducted at the college/unit level; there were 14 major units. Twelve units appointed a Salary Equity Study Committee (SESC) composed of five to seven tenured or tenure-track faculty with professorial rank. The Comparator Study consisted of identifying three caucasian male comparators, finding the closest match between discipline (and specialty area where possible), rank, years in rank, and years at OSU. Based on the final report submitted by the SESC, the executive administrator or dean determined what equity allocation, if any, was appropriate for each faculty member reviewed. The SESC and administrator/dean reports for each unit were submitted to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

**RESULTS** - The committee reviewed the reports from each unit to ensure that the procedures used met the basic requirements of the comparator analysis. Of the 337 faculty whose salaries were reviewed, 97 or 29% received a gender and/or race/ethnicity equity adjustment which ranged from \$315 to \$12,876; the percentages ranged from 1% to 17.8%; the median adjustment was \$1,830. Of the 255 women reviewed, 85 or 33% received equity adjustments; 82 people of color were reviewed and 12 or 15% received equity adjustments.

Heath noted that, overall, the members of the USEC were pleased with the implementation and outcome of the salary equity study and were especially impressed by the careful involvement of the SESC's at the unit level.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS -**

1. Consideration must be given to the time that is needed for this type of study. At least three



months should be allowed, once the SESC's are formed. This would allow more time to educate the SESC members about the comparator analysis, to compile all the data on merit and other performance measures and allow time to revisit cases that may be difficult.

2.As was done in this study, there should be a variety of opportunities for administrators and faculty to discuss the purpose of the review and the methods chosen for the review. Committee members meeting with deans and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to receive input was considered to be invaluable.

3.In order for the analysis to be valid, it must be focused on determining equity, not equality. The comparator method is not aimed at giving equal salaries to faculty comparators; rather it is intended to identify equitable salaries across comparators, given the value of various job-related criteria.

4.Funding of equity adjustments raises the philosophical issue regarding who should pay for the adjustments? Should there be a pool of central money or should it come from the units? When targeted funds are not available centrally, the study may be viewed as creating inequities that is a smaller total pool of funds for units with good representation of women and/or people of color. The other side of this issue is that units that have done a good job with equity are penalized when salaries moneys are withheld centrally. The committee suggests that this issue needs to be revisited any time there is to be an equity study.

5.Another salary equity review for women and minority faculty be conducted within the next 3-5 years to continue to monitor possible inequities based on gender and/or race/ethnicity. Any future study should include a study of equity overall, for all employees regardless of gender/race/ethnicity.

6.The University should give serious consideration to a similar study for fixed term faculty.

In response to a question by Sally Francis, Home Economics and Education, Heath responded that Faculty Research Assistants (FRA's) were not included in recommendation #6. Andy Hashimoto, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, clarified the issue by stating that most FRA's were fixed term and would be included.

Senator Rose, Forestry, suggested that the next study should consider salary compression as an issue.

Heath thanked the committee members and all faculty who participated in the process.

## Action Items

### Standing Rules Changes

Laurel Maughan, Committee on Committees Chair, presented Standing Rules changes to the Curriculum Council and Graduate Admissions Committee, as well housekeeping changes to affected Standing Rules, and a recommendation regarding a prelude to the Standing Rules. Highlighted sections indicate additions and strike-throughs indicate deletions.

**CURRICULUM COUNCIL** The Curriculum Council reviews the University curricula in an effort to implement the long-range educational mission of the University. After careful study, it recommends the introduction of new programs or changes in existing ones. It makes recommendations regarding major curricular changes proposed by the Colleges academic units of the University. It attempts by coordination to bring about a suitable and rational balance of academic programs. It delegates to the Committee's Executive Secretary Council's Chair responsibility for administering approving minor curricular changes. and It formulates curricular policy for guidance and publishes, in cooperation with the Office of Academic Affairs, a Curricular Procedures Handbook. The Council consists of seven nine Faculty and two Student members. In addition, the following are to be members: a A member of the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee, appointed by its Chair chair, shall serves as a Liaison liaison member, non-voting. , on the Curriculum Council, and the The Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs, shall be a ex-officio, non-voting, ex-officio member serves as the Council's Executive Secretary. An ex-officio Three Information Services faculty members, non-voting, are appointed annually by the Information Services Associate Provost for Information Services; , shall serve as a Liaison member on the Curriculum Council. one represents the library, one represents distance education, and one represents instructional technology. The Catalog Coordinator shall also serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Maughan noted that the changes more accurately reflect what the Curriculum Council actually does; the membership increase was proposed due to the increasing workload of this Council; and it increases opportunity for Information Services input. In response to Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, questioning the need for additional members, Joe McGuire from the Curriculum Council indicated that, per year, about ten undergraduate programs will be reviewed, in addition to the current



workload.

The Curriculum Council requested a friendly amendment to insert "University" before "Catalog Coordinator" in the last sentence of the last paragraph. Motion 97-530-01 to approve the Curriculum Council Standing Rules changes, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## GRADUATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Admission to the Graduate School is determined by the Committee on Graduate Admissions. The Graduate Admissions Committee acts on appealed applications for admission to the Graduate School. Candidates are considered on the basis of the undergraduate record and the preparation for graduate work, with special reference to the particular field desired. The Committee consists of eight Graduate Faculty members, with the Director of Admissions and Orientation, Ex-Officio. The Chair of the Graduate Admissions Committee shall be a Liaison member, non-voting, on the Graduate Council.

Maughan explained that the proposed changes more adequately reflect what the Graduate Admissions Committee does and provides consistency between the committee names in the head and body of the Standing Rules, as well as correctly reflecting the correct title of the ex-officio.

After a discussion on what constitutes appealed applications to the Graduate School, Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, proposed an amendment to the first sentence to insert "referred and" between "acts on" and "appealed"; motion was seconded. Motion 97-530-03 to amend the Standing Rules was defeated by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Motion 97-530-02 to approve the Graduate Admissions Committee Standing Rules, as proposed, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

The following proposed housekeeping changes would provide consistency between all committee/council Standing Rules:

- The committee/council names be consistent in the heading and body of the Standing Rules, e.g., Graduate Admissions Committee vs. Committee on Graduate Admissions;
- change references to liaison from upper case to lower case;
- change references to ex-officio members from upper case to lower case; and
- add "non-voting" after ex-officio in all cases where an ex-officio member is listed.

Motion 97-530-04 to approve the proposed housekeeping changes passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

The Committee on Committees also recommended that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee send the following prelude to the published Standing Rules to all committee chairs each year in addition to their copy of the Standing Rules. Currently, the prelude is typically not included with Standing Rules for individual committees. The Bylaws of the Faculty Senate provide that "The Committee on Committees shall propose Standing Rules, subject to the approval of the Faculty Senate, for each of the Senate's standing committees and councils, and cause those Rules, thus approved, to be published annually in the Faculty Senate Handbook, and in each issue of the Faculty Handbook" (see Article VIII, Sec. 4 of the Bylaws). These Standing Rules are listed below; for each, the most recent date of Senate approval for original wording and/or revision is noted in parentheses. Unless noted otherwise, Ex-Officio members are non-voting.

To fulfill its responsibility to the Faculty Senate, each Committee and Council is expected to report at least once each year to the Senate; recommendations for the Senate's consideration may be presented at any time deemed appropriate by the Executive Committee. To conduct its business, each committee and council may develop operating procedures or Guidelines which are consistent with its Standing Rules. Such procedures or guidelines should be reviewed periodically and, where appropriate, reported to the Faculty Senate.

The memberships of Faculty Senate Committees and Councils are published in the Faculty Senate Handbook. For additional information, contact the Faculty Senate Office, 541/737-4344.

## Information Items

- Interinstitutional Faculty Senate - A recap of the April IFS meeting was sent to Senators via e-mail.
- Joint IFS/AOF/AAUP Meeting - The annual joint meeting will take place May 17.
- Summer Field Tour - Reservations for the College of Agricultural Sciences Summer Field Tour must be made by May 30.
- University Guidelines on the Policy of Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Religion - Recently approved guide-lines, included in the agenda, indicate that nondiscrimination on the basis of religion requires a balance of refraining from promoting religion and refraining from inhibiting religion.
- University Procedures for an Accelerated Search - Recently approved procedures were attached.

## Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

- Post-tenure Review - He met with IFS representatives in April who discussed this issue. Arnold noted that the Northwest Academic Forum met the previous month and the issue of post-tenure review was also an item of discussion. Several OSU faculty were invited to Ohio State, as part of a larger group, to discuss OSU's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and post-tenure review also came up in that gathering. The Texas legislature passed rules requiring changes in post-tenure review, however, Texas Tech is not making changes because they have determined that their current process is consistent with the expectations. Arnold suggested that their process be reviewed. He also learned that Iowa State is completing a review of this issue.
- Accelerated Search Process - Arnold noted that this process, which received input from the Executive Committee and was included in the May Faculty Senate agenda, would be used in the search for an engineering dean.
- Legislative Update - All of the hearings for the OSSHE higher education base budget have been completed by the Education Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee which has agreed to move the budget forward. The committee chair invited Chancellor Cox to submit a prioritized list of items to be considered as possible addbacks.
- Searches - Three individuals for the position of Vice Provost for Research have visited campus and a fourth will be on campus May 8 and 9. Dan Hess and Kathy Olson continue under consideration and are regarded as active and interested candidates. Vice President for University Advancement - The University is using the services of a search firm who has received about 50 formal applications. They have selected 10-12 whom they consider to be appropriate for further consideration. The screening committee, President and Provost will review all candidates selected by the search firm and determine whether candidates will meet with the President or Provost at a neutral site. These meetings will determine whether to invite specific candidates to OSU for interviews.

Vice Provost for Information Services - Joy Hughes has accepted an offer from George Mason University to become their Vice President for Information Services effective July 1. Provost Arnold has met with the senior management team of Information Services (IS). He noted there has been some discussion to rethink how to connect IS to aspects of distance education or extended education. Arnold is meeting with various groups on campus and with President Risser to determine how to move forward with this search.

Senator Krane, Science, questioned whether there were plans to expand the marketing efforts statewide. Arnold responded affirmatively and that there were plans to launch marketing efforts on a larger scale. He also noted that a screening process is underway to select a new advertising agency for OSU.

Senator Matzke, Science, questioned whether the self-funded salary increase was built into the legislature's base budget. Arnold responded that it is in the OSSHE base budget recommended by the governor and subcommittee. Still to be determined is what portion of the OSSHE budget will be allocated to OSU.

## Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Wilcox included the following items in his report:

- Reminded Senators of the joint IFS/AAUP/AOF meeting on May 17.
- Referred to the OSU This Week article on institutional change. Paul Axtell will conduct a two-day workshop on June 5 and 6 and an additional two-day workshop prior to the start of fall term. Steve Bosserman will speak to the Senate on this topic in June.
- Referred to the Guidelines on the Policy of Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Religion which is in the process of a minor revision to clarify the distinction between responsibilities as employees and as private citizens. A statement will also be added indicating that it is permissible for faculty to serve as advisors for recognized student organizations with religious affiliations. Wilcox noted that these changes were pursued by the Executive Committee.
- The Task Force on Assessment of Teaching, chaired by Maggie Niess, has just begun meeting. The charge is: to evaluate the effectiveness of the university-wide student assessment of teaching instrument and proposed revision, if deemed necessary; assess the effectiveness of the peer assessment of teaching procedures; and to recommend processes for both student assessment of teaching and peer assessment of teaching that consider recommendations for working with faculty to improve their teaching or faculty development. The task force will conclude at the end of the calendar year.

## *New Business*

There was no new business.

## *Executive Session*

Jon Olson, Faculty Recognition and Awards Chair, presented information on the nominee for the D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award, which will be awarded at University Day on September 16. There was no discussion. The nominee was approved via written ballot.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:03 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

| [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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » April 3, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 529

April 3, 1997

### For All Faculty

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by President Anthony Wilcox. The March minutes were corrected to reflect the correct spelling of Senator Esbensen's name; deleted "...but felt that it was necessary to do so..." in the last sentence of the next to the last paragraph under "Enrollment Projection Process"; and the word "abstentions" was added to the last sentence of the last paragraph of the "Alumni College Recommendation" to read "...and abstentions are, therefore, irrelevant." The minutes were approved as corrected.

---

### Meeting Summary

- *Special Reports:* Legislative Update, Mark Nelson
- *Committee Reports:* University Honors College Council and Committee on Bylaws and Nominations
- *Action Items:* AR 20, Repeated Courses [Motion 97-529-01 through 02]
- *New Business:* There was no new business.

---

### Roll Call

#### *Members Absent With Representation:*

Fast, G. Hightower; Isensee, P. Brown; Jenkins, P. Thomson; G. Pearson, I. Wong; Pereira, J. Krueger; Savonen, T. Gentle; Seville, J. Drexler; Thies, M. Matzke; Wander, S. Francis; Williamson, L. Semprini; and L. Woods, U. Mali.

#### *Members Absent Without Representation:*

Bentley, Burke, Cappaert, Cheeke, Christie, Cowles, Cromack, P. Farber, V. Farber, Farnsworth, Frank, Hemphill, Hu, Huyer, B. Johnson, Jones, P. Lee, Leong, Levine, Lomax, Lundin, Matzke, McAlexander, T. Miller, A. Mix, Putnam, Rielly, Rowe, Tiger, and Verts.

#### *Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

A. Wilcox, President; M. Niess, President-Elect; K. Krane, Immediate Past President; G. Tiedeman, Parliamentarian protem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

#### *Guests of the Senate:*

L. Burns, A. Hashimoto, and N. Wendt.

---

## SPECIAL REPORTS

### Legislative Update

Mark Nelson, Association of Oregon Faculties Lobbyist, provided an update on higher education issues in the legislature.

Nelson noted that we are facing a Republican dominated session: 31-29 in the House and 20-10 in the Senate. Dominating issues before the legislature include:

- 1)The "Kicker" - A 1979 requirement that returns personal and corporate taxes if the revenue projections exceed 2%. At present, the kicker amounts to \$444 million. It has not yet been determined if the money will be returned.
- 2)Ballot Measure (BM) 47 - The approved measure cuts and caps property taxes. The impact to both schools and local governments totalled \$1 billion at the beginning of the session, but has dropped some since. The legislature is committed to replacing most of the lost revenue to K-12, that would come from the general fund.
- 3)Term Limits - The exodus of quality legislators has had a dramatic effect on institutional memory, leaving many freshmen legislators heading committees.

The State Board adopted a budget in July which addressed access, tuition freezes, the statewide engineering school,

technology, and compensation. The pre-BM 47 budget allowed an average of 6% faculty salary compensation for six years to reach the mid-point of comparator lists. Upon passage of BM 47, the Governor reduced the faculty compensation from \$45 million to \$28.5 million, to be allocated by the Board. Nelson felt that the best Ways and Means Subcommittee in the last 10 years was in place, the majority of whom are all strong higher education supporters. On the downside, there seems to be even more control exercised by the Ways and Means leadership on the subcommittee in an effort to reduce budgets.

The major difference between the Governor's budget and the Republican budget is that the Governor included the "kicker" and the Republican's didn't. Due to the last minute intervention of Senator Hannon, \$7.5 million for recruitment and retention was restored to the budget.

The Republican budget now stands at a 2+2 faculty salary package. An additional \$10 million is to be given as merit; higher education's cut amounts to about \$2.5 million. Nelson believes that an add-back may occur to restore the 3+3 package.

There is a push to be more aggressive to place additional dollars back on the table. It's important to replace the \$16.5 million lost from the pre-BM 47 State Board budget. Nelson briefly outlined several areas where replacement revenue could be reallocated. He noted that there has been a continuous reinvestment to K-12 since the passage of BM 5.

Nelson mentioned several other areas being considered:

- He felt there is a good chance that the bill sponsored by IFS and AAUP to add two faculty members to the State Board will be approved.
- There are still some anti-PERS bills, but not as many since the departure of Representative Tiernan.
- Senate Bill 580 would eliminate fair share.
- BM 9 campaign finance has been struck down by the Supreme Court.

President Wilcox noted that OSU Professor Gary Tiedeman gave a powerful statement to the State Board to encourage them to be aggressive to pursue funding and asked for Nelson's assessment of the State Board in that pursuit. Nelson responded that the State Board and the Chancellor have been too timid.

When questioned whether there was a plan to unify a stronger voice for higher education, Nelson stated that OSU is the only alumni organization that has been effective. He also noted that the Oregon Student Lobby has been absolutely wonderful - their testimony yesterday before Ways and Means has been among the best presented.

## *Committee Reports*

### **University Honors College Council**

Jim Krueger, University Honors College Council Chair, explained that the Council has general jurisdiction of policies and procedures of the University Honors College (UHC) and advises the UHC Director. The UHC was established in the fall of 1994 and opened in fall 1995.

Administration of the UHC rests with UHC Director Joe Hendricks, but the Council is responsible for the following:

- admission criteria
- degree requirements
- criteria for selection of UHC faculty
- assessment of program quality
- curricular structure and content of UHC

The objectives of the Council are to:

- review the director's annual report and assess progress of the College
- recommend new or modified policies
- review information distributed in November calling for new courses
- assist in recruiting new courses and faculty
- review new student applicant files for admissions
- review prospective schedule of classes
- evaluate the applicant review process
- review demographics of entering group

Krueger outlined the two types of admissions to the UHC: entering freshman are "Honors Scholars" and those entering the UHC with two years left at OSU are "Honors Associates." A student graduating from the UHC receives a joint degree from the UHC and the college responsible for their major. There are currently 265 students with a target of 400. There have been 375 UHC applications received for 1997-98, with 197 already accepted.

Krueger mentioned that there is an effort to have student representation from all colleges that have undergraduate students. There is a fairly broad representation of courses among most disciplines, but additional courses are always encouraged. However, there is a special need for Engineering courses. Krueger welcomed Engineering faculty to suggest courses that could be offered, in particular, Baccalaureate Core Courses. He noted that not many courses are repeated from one year to the next, allowing opportunities for new courses.

Senator Mix, Science, questioned whether there was a process to follow-up on students from their department of interest if not accepted to the UHC. Krueger responded that he didn't think that anything was yet organized, but that Director Hendricks plans to send a list of prospective students not accepted to the UHC to respective OSU departments.

Senator DeKock, Science, felt that the UHC was a good way to raise the number of quality students and questioned why enrollment was limited. Krueger responded that the number of courses limits enrollment.

Krueger urged faculty to assist in making the UHC competitive across the U.S. and noted that the UHC would welcome any questions or inquiries.

### **Committee on Bylaws and Nominations**

Sally Francis, Committee on Bylaws and Nominations Chair, and Senate Membership Task Force Chair, discussed the function of the task force.

When asked to consider the issue of Senate membership, the Committee recommended that a task force be appointed, which was approved by the Executive Committee, to allow for broader input and discussion. The considerations put before the committee were 1) the reclassification of former Management Services employees who, with the former No Rank Faculty constitute the newly created Professional Faculty rank; and 2) the motion in December 1996 to create an academic senate whose members would be comprised of professorial ranked faculty and Faculty Research Assistants who do not have formal administrative assignments.

The charge to the task force is:

- to revise the existing Bylaws to reflect the discontinuation of the No Rank classification of faculty appointments and the creation of the Professional Faculty classification;
- to formulate recommendations on the issue of Faculty Senate representation for the former Management Service employees and for Faculty Research Assistants;
- to consider whether former Management Service employees should have designated representation on the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee, the Faculty Grievance Committee, and the Faculty Mediation Committee;
- to consider the recommendations made at the December 1996 meeting to create an Academic Senate; and
- to consider if a higher apportionment ratio is needed to reduce the size of the current Senate.

Francis listed the task force members: Dan Edge, Karin Hardin, Ken Krane, Jo-Ann Leong, Laurel Maughan, Jan Mosley, Al Mukatis, Teresa Sawyer, Tom Scheuermann, Sara Schreiber, Garry Stephenson, Ray Tricker, Lita Verts, Robert Wess, and Bill Wilkins.

At the first meeting the following list of concerns were generated:

- What is the purpose of the Senate?
- How inclusive should the Senate be?
- Should Faculty Research Assistant's (FRA) be included?
- How would the inclusion of FRA's affect the size of the Senate?
- How would the inclusion of FRA's affect the proportionality of specific apportionment units?
- Should there be an exclusion period for Senate eligibility?
- Is there an inherent difference in viewpoint among the different classifications of faculty?
- How can the curricular purview of traditional academic faculty members be protected if the composition of the Senate changes?

The task force will meet each Monday from 9:30-11:00 and expects to have its work completed by June 15. Francis encouraged faculty to provide input to any task force member.

## **Action Items**

### **Academic Regulation 20 - Repeated Courses**

Nancy Wendt, Academic Regulations Chair, presented the following proposal to change Academic Regulation 20 concerning



## "Repeated Courses." AR 20. Repeated Courses

If a course is repeated, all grades received in that course (except for I, W, S, U, N, P, Aud, and WAU) shall be used to compute the cumulative grade point average. Although more than one grade will appear on the transcript for a repeated course, the credits will only be counted once toward graduation requirements. Courses may be repeated once for grade replacement. Both grades will appear on the academic record, but only the second grade will be counted in the cumulative grade point average and toward graduation requirements. Additional retakes of the course will appear on the academic record but not count in the cumulative grade point average. Regardless of the number of times a course is repeated, credits earned will be counted only once for graduation requirements. Recognized repeatable courses, such as activity courses, research, seminars, and selected topics, do not come under this restriction.

Wendt explained that a number of individuals, as well as the Academic Advising Council, requested a review of AR 20. Concern has been expressed that this method is punitive and adversely affects retention.

She noted that this regulation has been handled in many different ways on this campus and provided the following chronology:

- 1972 - Students could repeat courses with the previous grade lined off their record.
- 1982 - Students needed to petition for "legal repeats" which would be lined off their record. "Illegal repeats" were averaged.
- 1984 - Students could repeat courses with the previous grade lined off their record.
- 1985 - Students may repeat courses, but grades are averaged.

PSU, EOU, OIT, SOU, and WOU currently allow repeated courses to be replaced with the second or latest grade. OSU and U of O currently average the grades. UC Davis, UCLA, and ASU allow repeated grades to replace the original. Some institutions limit the number of repeats allowed.

The Committee originally spoke with the Executive Committee about only allowing repeats for the lower grades. Concern was expressed that a student hovering near the C- point would purposely earn a lower grade in order to be eligible to repeat the course. The current wording was then proposed.

Wendt noted that, currently, certain colleges can and do limit the number of repeats allowed and would continue to be allowed to do so under the proposal.

An additional concern regarded receipt of a low grade due to academic dishonesty. The committee didn't feel it was appropriate to address that issue in the regulation since it rarely occurs. She also mentioned that it appears that this issue is taken care of in the Dean of Students Office.

There are currently about 2,000 cases per year where a student repeats a course. Under the proposal, multiple retakes will be allowed, but only the first retake will be figured into the cumulative gpa.

Wendt agreed when questioned by Senator Gamble, Science, whether the rationale behind the proposal is to allow students to improve their grade.

Senator Prucha, Associated, spoke against the proposal since she felt that it has an under-graduate thrust which has a potential to inflate gpa's.

Senator Coakley, Science, was supportive of the proposal and felt it would assist in retention.

Senator protem Drexler, Business, found it difficult to understand the rationale and questioned why, if the purpose is to be less punitive, was the highest grade earned not recorded. Wendt responded that it would unduly inflate the gpa and would not be representative of what the student was capable of.

Senator Rose, Forestry, raised the point of how this proposal would impact graduate student funding if students retake a class and expect to be funded for an additional quarter.

Wendt did not know the answer to Senator van der Mars, Health & Human Performance, questioning whether she was aware of the percentage of retake grades which are lower than the first time.

Senator Morris, Science, didn't understand what difference it would make if a student takes a class five or six times.

Senator Plant, Engineering, felt that the current system is effective. He also felt it was not productive to have a student

continually repeat courses.

Senator Ladd, Extension, felt that the current averaging system was punitive and supported the proposal.

Senator Coblentz, Agricultural Sciences, felt that a student should have an opportunity to correct a problem with a course, although he didn't feel that a student should have endless opportunities to take up space in a course.

Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, questioned which grade would stand if the initial grade received was as a result of academic dishonesty and a student repeated the course. Wendt responded that the committee is attempting to ascertain how this will be handled without an additional academic regulations change. Senator Oye, Student Affairs, explained that the appeal process for academic dishonesty does not rest with the Dean of Students Office. As with other grade disputes, it goes through the department chair and college. He noted that, although extremely rare, a second offense of academic dishonesty would likely result in suspension.

Senator Krane, Science, was opposed to the proposal based on the vagueness of the academic dishonesty issue. However, he also felt that the current regulation is punitive since the credits are counted once toward graduation requirements and again for gpa. He would prefer that the regulation state that the credits be counted only once toward both graduation and gpa.

Senator Rathja, Engineering, felt that Senator Krane's reference to the regulation being punitive was true for a student taking a small number of credits, but didn't feel it was an impact on a student earning 192 credits. He spoke in opposition to the proposal and felt the issue is currently being handled well.

ASOSU President Libby Mitchell expressed concern that OSU students would be competing for admission to graduate school with students from other institutions who have this policy in place. OSU students will be at a disadvantage if grades continue to be averaged.

Senator protem Matzke, Science, noted that she and Senator Thies felt this proposal would be useful when a student is coming off probation or suspension since it would give them a chance to improve their grade.

Senator Randhawa, Engineering, was concerned that this proposal would promote mediocrity. However, he was in favor of encouraging students to repeat courses when appropriate.

Senator DeKock, Science, called for the question. Motion 97-521-02 to end debate and vote on the main motion passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 97-521-01 to approve the changes to AR 20 passed by voice vote with many dissenting votes.

When questioned about the implementation date, Barbara Balz, Registrar, stated she will recommend to the Provost's Office that the changes take effect fall term 1997.

Senator Krane requested a definitive ruling concerning academic dishonesty; Wendt will continue to talk with Oye.

Senator Gamble asked Wendt to determine why the gpa from transfer institutions has been separated from the OSU cumulative gpa; Wendt will research AR 2.

## *Information Items*

**Committee Interest Forms** - Please consider volunteering to serve on University or Faculty Senate committees; forms are to be returned to the Faculty Senate Office.

## *Reports from the Provost*

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

As a result of a news report concerning denial of tenure to an OSU faculty member, Dr. Arnold focused on the Promotion and Tenure Process. He noted that he could not publicly discuss specific cases, but outlined the steps involved in the process:

-The guidelines place a distinctive emphasis on the review of the dossier submitted in relation to expectations defined for the faculty position. -Decisions will be based on quality and productivity in three areas:

- a) focus on all aspects of performance and responsibilities as defined for a particular faculty position
- b) scholarship
- c) service (professional and university)

-Input from clients, students, and peers

A typical process consists of the following:

- Dossier preparation and sign-off by the faculty member indicating it is a complete statement of what was done
- Initial review at departmental level consisting of a departmental committee and independent judgement by the department chair. Recommendations originate at this level.
- Provisions allow for additional faculty input on issues raised by the department to the next level of consideration.
- It is next reviewed at the college level by a college committee and independently by the dean. At this point, a level of comparable treatment for all dossiers across units within the college is reviewed. Additional questions or issues will be reviewed and addressed, which may require additional information prior to a recommendation.
- The University Promotion and Tenure Committee then reviews each dossier. The Committee will meet with respective deans regarding questions resulting from recommendations. If there is a difference between the recommendations at the departmental and college level, both the chair and dean will be involved. An observer from the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee will be present when dossiers are being considered and are allowed to review individual dossiers.
- Recommendations are forwarded to the Provost for review and a final decision. The Provost is allowed to seek additional information.
- Appeals are sent to the President who ensures that the guidelines and procedures have been followed appropriately.
- When all decisions have been made, two reports are developed: 1) An annual report by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs which summarizes the outcomes of decisions for that year, and 2) a report from the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee which incorporates the previous report, offers observations, raises issues, and makes recommendations for consideration.

Arnold noted that, in previous years, these reports have noted the thoroughness and careful attention in the process to assure that faculty are fully represented and considered in the process.

Senator DeKock questioned whether there is any way to redress a dossier during the process. Arnold stated that it is not uncommon for deans to return a dossier which is not complete or which requires a letter to be reworded. The Associate Vice Provost may also return dossiers for additional information.

## *Reports from the Faculty Senate President*

President Wilcox included the following items in his report:

- Reminded Senators to complete and return the Committee Interest Forms.
- Thanked Gary Tiedeman for serving as Parliamentarian.
- Reported that a Task Force on Post-tenure Review is being chaired by Ken Krane. The charge is as follows:
  - to compare OSU's Periodic Review of Faculty with review processes in place at other institutions;
  - to assess the current status of the relationship between tenure and academic freedom;
  - to provide guidance to OSU administrators in conducting faculty reviews, especially the use of the position description and/or other performance expectations as the basis for the review;
  - to strengthen our Periodic Review system by incorporating opportunities for faculty development and enhancement of professional skills in scholarship, instruction, or service.
- The joint IFS/AAUP/AOF meeting has been post-poned from April 26. The meeting date will be announced when determined.
- Several meetings ago the Senate was dealing with Article III. Sec. 2 of the Bylaws requiring apportionment units to comply with OAR 580-15-005 banning discrimination. At the April meeting it was stated that, due to difficulty in implementing that Section, a recommendation would be brought before the Senate to rescind that Bylaw. It is still the intention of the Executive Committee to ask the Senate to reconsider that Bylaw, but probably not until the early fall.

## *New Business*

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:03 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker*

*Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

| [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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » March 6, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 528

March 6, 1997

### For All Faculty

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

#### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

*The following resolution of sympathy to the Owen family was presented by President Wilcox and unanimously passed by voice vote (motion 97-528-01):*

*The Oregon State University Faculty Senate expresses its deepest sympathies to the family of John Owen upon his death on February 15, 1997. During his twenty years at Oregon State University, John provided visionary leadership for the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, the College of Engineering, and the Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education. An internationally recognized scholar, John was a champion for excellence in engineering research and education in the State of Oregon.*

*John enthusiastically embraced both the challenges and pleasures in life. He enriched Oregon and Oregon State University, and he truly will be missed.*

---

### Meeting Summary

- *Special Reports:* Intercollegiate Athletics; Enrollment Projection Process; Undergraduate Education Council Retention Work Group; and Alumni College
- *Action Items:* Alumni College and Academic Regulation 27 [Motion 97-528-01 through 04]
- *New Business:* There was no new business.

---

### Roll Call

*Members Absent With Representation:*

Georgiou, K. Hooker; Kellogg, A. Skaugset; and Morris, C. Bayne.

*Members Absent Without Representation:*

Bentley, Burke, Calvert, Cheeke, Christie, Daley, DeKock, Edge, Farnsworth, Fletcher, Gregerson, Hale, Heidel, Henderson, Hu, Ingham, Jenkins, Jones, Ladd, Leong, Levine, Lunch, Lundy, McAlexander, T. Miller, A. Mix, M. Mix, Neumann, Pearson, Prucha, Putnam, Savage, Tiger, and Verts.

*Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

A. Wilcox, President; M. Niess, President-Elect; T. Doler, Parliamentarian protem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

*Guests of the Senate:*

B. Avery, L. Burns, J. Caspers, V. Cooley, J. Root, J. Schuster, B. Strohmeyer, and N. Wendt.

---

## SPECIAL REPORTS

### Intercollegiate Athletics

President Wilcox reported on two issues which were raised last year. There is currently a draft proposal, which the Executive

Committee is reviewing, of an accelerated search process for hiring coaches that may shorten the time frame, or narrow the participation of the search committee, or focus on identifying one finalist to be interviewed. Concerning the issue of religion and athletics, Wilcox has been promoting the adoption of a clear, concise, and consistent university-wide statement. President Risser has voiced support for a university-wide policy on religious activities. Meanwhile, Intercollegiate Athletics has drafted a policy which, when finalized, they intend to distribute to all student athletes and employees.

Bob Frank, NCAA Faculty Representative, reported on legislation approved at the recent NCAA meeting and OSU graduation rates.

Frank reported that recently passed legislation specifies that a student athlete who is drafted by a professional team no longer has remaining eligibility in that sport. Athletes will now be allowed a partial qualifier to earn a fourth season of competition provided the student athlete receives a baccalaureate prior to the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student's initial full-time enrollment. Additionally, Division I student athletes are now permitted to earn legitimate on and off campus income during quarter time provided such income, in combination with other financial aid included in the student's individual limit, does not exceed the student's positive attendance.

At 95%, OSU has the highest student athlete graduation rate in the nation. Frank noted that the important thing to remember is that the determination of satisfactory progress is made by advisors in departments and colleges, not by athletic staff. He commended the help by advisors and faculty to help student athletes attain this rate. In determining rates, only students on financial aid are included in the report and those who have graduated six years from the time of initial full-time enrollment in any institution of higher education. The average time for graduation for those initially enrolled in 1983-84 through 1989-90 is five years for all students and 5.1 years for student athletes.

Dutch Baughman, Director of Athletics, expressed appreciation for the opportunity to speak to the Senate and for the opportunity to work with President Wilcox. He noted that an additional piece of legislation, effective August 1997, will be to prove that an NCAA institution has a viable program in sportsmanlike conduct and ethical behavior.

Baughman noted that OSU recently participated in the NCAA National Convention for Life Skills Coordinators. He explained that the athletic life skills program is designed to assist and support student athletes to develop skills in areas outside of their competitive opportunities. The BALANCE program (Beaver Athletes for Life Skills Awareness and the Necessary Choices for Excellence) was created at OSU five years ago. The OSU program was featured at the recent convention.

Baughman publicly and sincerely thanked the faculty for their support and direction to assist in the retention of student athletes.

The Athletic Department is in the process of developing a Diversity Education Program. Several models from across the nation have been studied but have not found to be satisfactory. Recently a workable program was formed through the invitation from the Student Advisory Board to a panel from the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Alliance to create a dialog. In addition to the panel, coaches were also invited which provided them an opportunity to ask questions and receive candid responses which will assist them in dealing with particular situations. The panel will continue to meet with coaches and athletic staff until every sports program has been covered.

The department recently partnered with the Women's Center and Recreational Sports to sponsor the National Girls and Women's Sports Day. The collaboration was such a success that there has been talk of creating another event so the groups will have an opportunity to continue working together.

Baughman stated that the Valley Football Center, that will be functional rather than lavish, will be completed within 30 days. The project is within budget and the funding was raised entirely through private means.

He briefly addressed the hiring process and noted that it is standard procedure for a candidate being considered for a head coach position to meet with the Athletic Advisory Committee, which has Faculty Senate representation, prior to hiring.

In introducing Mike Riley, Head Football Coach, Baughman explained that the profile created for this position included finding an individual who would maintain the values and leadership appreciated and expected in the football program, such as academic prowess and citizenship. It was also necessary to find a coach with experience at the highest level of competition and to have that individual provide a profile of the proposed staff.

Coach Riley expressed appreciation at the opportunity to be invited to appear before the Senate and introduce his staff. He indicated there would be an open door policy within the department and invited faculty to drop in and get to know them. Riley proceeded to introduce his coaching staff who, with the exception of one individual, have all either played for or coached for him: Ron Simonson (Recruiting Coordinator and Running Back Coach), Jim Gilstrap (Assistant Head Coach and Offensive Line Coach), Mike Johnson, Mark Banker (Defensive Backs and Kickers Coach), Paul Christ (Offensive Coordinator), Dan Langsdorf (Graduate Assistant), Bruce Read (Special Teams and Tight Ends Coach), Greg Newhouse (Defensive Coordinator), James West (Recruiting and Line Backers Coach), and Michael Gray (Defensive Line Coach and working with Coach Newhouse). In closing, Riley expressed the desire to achieve a partnership with the faculty and community and asked



for help in recruiting the best student athletes possible.

When asked what strategy will be used in his first year recruiting, Riley responded that finding the best players with the best academic standing is crucial. He also indicated that it's important to sell the atmosphere of the institution and community.

### **Enrollment Projection Process**

Bob Bontrager, Director of Admission and Orientation, indicated he was optimistic about enrollment goals. An initiative of his office has been to get campus-wide involvement in the effort of recruitment and retention.

Bontrager was surprised to learn that no real enrollment goals have been set other than those which appeared in the 1995 University AIMS document and targeted 16,000 students by 1999. Last fall he began the process of goal setting and reviewed figures with several campus groups. Fall 1996 total enrollment was 13,784 compared with the goal of 16,000; the breakdown was 11,096 undergraduates (12,800 goal) and 2,688 graduate students (3,200 goal). The goals represented a split of 80% for undergraduates and 20% for graduate students to maintain an adequate number of graduate students; the fall 1996 split was actually 80.5% and 19.5%.

The following numbers represent undergraduate enrollment for fall 1996 with the goal in parenthesis: Freshmen, 1,824 (2,300); 75th percentile or above on the SAT, 489 (845); Average combined SAT, 1,073 (1,150); and Average h.s. gpa, 3.42 (3.5). Transfers accounted for 1,200 (1,400). Ethnicity: African American, 145 (200); Asian/Pacific Islander, 833 (960); Hispanic, 360 (700); and Native American, 176 (200). Bontrager explained that the ethnicity goals are pegged at the percentages of those groups in the Oregon population. Residence (new freshmen): Oregon, 1,480 (1,725); Other States, 327 (530); and International, 17 (45). He noted that these are very ambitious goals and almost impossible to achieve all at once since each requires a specific recruitment strategy. He also mentioned that recruitment is only part of the enrollment picture and that retention is extremely important. These goals represent the type of planning needed to make program decisions based on resources.

IFS Representative Esbenson stated that graduate enrollment in some colleges is closely tied to a dollar figure to support students. He questioned how much of the proposed enrollment increase is tied to actual dollars available to recruit students. Bontrager responded that, as initially proposed, the goals have not been tied to dollars, but felt that it was necessary to do so because there are direct funding implications.

Senator Randhawa, Engineering, questioned the type of coordination needed to put the strategies in place to achieve the goals. Bontrager stated that coordination is a key factor and is occurring primarily with the head advisors, but also with Deans. He welcomed coordination with any college and is willing to talk specifically about unit recruitment strategies as they relate to the university-wide recruitment.

### **Undergraduate Education Council Retention Work Group**

Leslie Davis Burns, Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs, discussed plans for changes in New Student Orientation and the First Year Experience Course.

A transitions group has been working to develop a focus program for New Student Orientation, to be held September 24-28, which will include educational programs, advising sessions, and campus activities. Student orientation groups, which will meet one hour per day, will be led by faculty and peer leaders and will allow students an opportunity to connect with members of both groups.

The Retention Work Group of the Undergraduate Education Council has been working on the First Year Experience Course, which was formerly called Retention Services. The objective of the course is to assist students in making the transition into the academic and social culture of OSU by helping them develop the skills and knowledge necessary for a successful OSU experience.

Bill Keith, Retention Work Group member, invited all faculty at OSU to participate in the First Year Experience Course. He felt this was a fairly radical departure from other courses since it will introduce students to the culture of the community of OSU. He noted that a major reason why students don't return to a university is that they lack a sense of connection to the university community. This course is aimed at giving them that connection.

Both Keith and Burns are willing to talk to any group about this program and invited faculty to collaborate with them and provide input.

Burns explained that training, resources, and materials will be available to faculty, as well as support staff, for both programs. A signup sheet for faculty who wish to participate in the First-Year Experience Course, which is a one-credit course, is available from Burns and is due back to her by May 1. In response to President Wilcox, Burns stated that the course is an elective Academic Learning Services Course, as yet unnamed. Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, questioned whether the course

would be graded. Burns responded that the grading mode had not yet been decided.

Senator Matzke, Science, questioned whether it has been determined that this type of course will make a difference. Burns responded that there is evidence, over a five-year period, that retention rates for students who participated in a similar course were significantly higher than for those who didn't.

In response to a question concerning eligibility of transfer students to participate in the course, Burns stated that freshmen are initially being targeted, but they are looking at ways to also serve transfer students.

## **Alumni College**

Sandra Woods, Faculty Associate to the Provost: Extended Education, presented a proposal for an Alumni College and President Risser's "OSU STATEWIDE" initiative. The Alumni College concept surfaced after talking with business communities which indicated that people were lacking in higher education.

Woods explained that the Alumni College is not a real college, but is purely a concept with a group of policies and no staff or resources. She initially met with the Curriculum Council, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the Academic Advising Council to explore the concept. She later involved the Academic Regulations Committee, the Deans Council, and most of the deans individually. This concept also occupied the time of many staff in the Registrar's, Admissions, and Financial Aid Offices.

She mentioned that a "Launch Lunch" took place in Portland on March 5 to announce OSU STATEWIDE where Dr. Risser outlined some of the programs involved: Extension, Agricultural Experiment Stations, Forest Research Lab, Hatfield Marine Science Center, SMILE, Saturday Academy, as well as Liberal Studies programs which are offered in five areas in the state. Business One will begin next year in four locations in cooperation with various community colleges. This lunch also gave Dr. Risser the opportunity to inform the Alumni Association about the Alumni College, which was well received by them. The gathering also provided an opportunity to invite partnerships that would enable OSU to deliver degrees throughout the State of Oregon. Dr. Risser's goal is to develop programs with every community college in the state. Woods paraphrased Dr. Risser by saying, OSU STATE-WIDE expands Oregon State University throughout the state, through space; the Alumni College will expand us with time by serving students throughout their entire lives.

The Alumni College consists of three aspects: 1) allows automatic readmission of OSU graduates (would eliminate the current \$50 fee and required essay indicating why one should be able to attend OSU); 2) provides a "living transcript" which allows graduates to add new credentials to their transcript; 3) recognizes that not all OSU graduates are in Corvallis, so it will allow them access to degree programs statewide. Students will initially be readmitted to their former academic home and require a request to change their major, which allows programs some input over admissions. Majors and options will only be open to OSU graduates.

The living transcript allows for post baccalaureate minors for OSU graduates as well as any graduate from any accredited institution. Graduates may receive a minor and a transcript, but not a degree. Post-baccalaureate minors allow for curricular control, require 15 upper division credits, and create the ability to develop exciting new minors based on need.

Since it's obvious that not every degree program offered at OSU can also be offered off-campus, it is intended that the statewide degree programs be determined after a careful thought process. Strategies for coursework development would fulfill multiple requirements, e.g. a course which would serve as both a synthesis and a minor in a program.

Off-campus courses will be offered in partnership with either community colleges or OSSHE institutions to allow OSU to deliver high quality, upper division courses and allow students adequate instructor contact.

Sally Francis, Home Economics & Education, noted that some colleges and departments have enrollment limitations and expressed concern about automatic enrollment. Woods indicated that students are granted automatic enrollment in the sense that they don't have to apply or pay a fee. After applying to their major department, they can request a change of major, but ultimately the program they are requesting has admission approval to allow for enrollment limitations.

Senator Matzke, Science, questioned how course priority for these students would be determined. Woods responded that they would be granted whatever priority that current post-baccalaureate students receive; limits on courses would still apply. One individual expressed concern about applying limitations. Woods stated that, if approved, information would be quickly disseminated. She concurred that enrollment limitations are a problem, but noted that even though courses may not be available on campus, they may be open in other areas throughout the state.

As a result of some confusion being expressed by senators, Immediate Past President Krane explained that the only reason the Senate was being asked to consider this proposal is that a decision was made to use the term "college" in the title of the program. He noted that there is an approval procedure to be followed to use the name "college" which requires a Category I and Senate approval. It was deemed appropriate to come before the Senate to grant approval to use the word "college" in this program.

Senator Cowles, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, expressed a sense of smoke and mirrors since statewide programs do exist. He was concerned that there was too much hype and not enough substance. Woods noted that OSU STATEWIDE and the Alumni College are different programs. She stated that every statewide program will come before the Faculty Senate for approval. Woods sees the Alumni College as being truly unique to OSU - there is no other university in the country which has a commitment to their students for life-long learning. Cowles felt that the Alumni College is premature, based on resources available.

Senator Lundin, Extension, felt it was important to remember that OSU already has faculty statewide and applauded the effort to continue to move OSU into the state and bring alumni back to the university since he witnesses this need on a daily basis.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, was troubled by particular aspects of the Alumni College. Woods responded that only OSU alumni would be allowed to waive the application fee and receive automatic admission.

## Action Items

### Alumni College Recommendation

The Curriculum Council forwarded the following recommendation:

The term "Alumni College" is to be the name of the OSU initiative to encourage life-long learning among alumni. Further, the use of the term "college" in this instance is distinct from the meaning of "college" for which a Category I proposal is required (has faculty, departments and/or programs, confers degrees, etc.).

Senator Gamble, Science, questioned whether the term "college" would be distinguished in print from the usual use of the word. Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, stated that in this context it will always follow the word "Alumni" and be distinguished in that manner.

Senator Frank, Liberal Arts, spoke in favor of the Alumni College. He acknowledged that concerns were raised during the meeting and hoped that senators would act on this issue with the understanding that some concerns will be addressed at a later time. Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, echoed Senator Frank's endorsement of the proposal. Oriard felt that it would help in enrollment goals, although it may be misnamed with the use of the word "college" he didn't feel it was troubling, or that any concerns raised during the meeting would be a particular problem, and it may also create a sense of community around the state.

Senator Gamble indicated he was not opposed to any program which will enhance enrollment. He was concerned that this body was being asked to approve a program where the name is not considered to be important.

When questioned by President Wilcox if there would be a review process, Burton responded that the Curriculum Council would perform the review if necessary.

The question was called for. Motion 97-528-03 to determine whether or not to vote on the motion was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 97-582-02 to approve the motion presented by the Curriculum Council pertaining to the use of the term Alumni College passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

When questioned by Senator Frank whether abstentions are ever called for. Parliamentarian Doler ruled that motions are passed by a majority of those present and voting and are, therefore, irrelevant.

### Academic Regulation 27 Proposal

Nancy Wendt, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, explained that the committee was asked to create regulations which would allow students to return to OSU after earning a degree and obtain something other than a baccalaureate or graduate degree. She presented the following proposal to add a new regulation relating to the Alumni College:

#### AR 27 SUBSEQUENT CREDENTIALS: MINORS, CERTIFICATES, OPTIONS AND MAJORS

a. Subsequent Minors and Certificates: A student who has received a previous baccalaureate degree from either OSU or another accredited university or college may be granted a subsequent minor or certificate. The student must:

- 1) Complete requirements for minor or certificate and receive Dean's approval;
- 2) Achieve a minimum of 2.0 on OSU cumulative grade point average on work taken for subsequent credential;
- 3) Academic residence: minimum 15 credits.

b. Subsequent Options and Majors: A student who has received a previous baccalaureate degree from OSU may be granted a subsequent option or major credential.

- 1) Complete requirements for option or major and receive Dean's approval;
- 2) Achieve a minimum of 2.0 on OSU cumulative grade point average on work taken for subsequent credential;
- 3) Academic residence: minimum 15 credits.

c. Additional credits necessary for subsequent credentials may be taken at any time prior to or subsequent to the granting of a previous baccalaureate degree.

This proposal will require that the current AR 27 and AR 28 be renumbered.

Wendt suggested deleting the proposed wording for both a.3) and b.3) and inserting the following, "Complete a minimum of 15 credits in residence." No objection received.

She explained that the intent of the regulation is to allow individuals to come back and earn a minor. The subsequent minor and certificate applies to graduates from OSU or another accredited university or college. AR 27 b. applies only to OSU graduates who wish to earn an additional option or major. AR 27 c. applies to individuals who have earned credits at OSU and allow them to apply the credits toward a subsequent minor, certificate, option, or major.

Senator Tiedeman suggested a friendly amendment, which was accepted, to delete the word "on" prior to "OSU cumulative..." in AR 27 a.2) and b.2).

Senator Frank questioned time limits associated with c. Wendt indicated a dean's signature would be needed to determine whether the courses were still appropriate at the time the student is returning.

Senator Oriard suggested a friendly amendment, which was accepted, to make b. parallel to a. by inserting "The student must:" at the end of the paragraph.

Senator Plant, Engineering, expressed concern about the meaning of completing 15 credits in residence and how that affects extended programs off campus. Wendt responded that if a course is offered through OSU with an OSU designator, it is considered to be in residence.

Senator Manogue, Science, was concerned that requirements change and questioned if a.1) and b.1) referred to current requirements or whether the student would be allowed to complete the requirements in effect when they were initially enrolled. Wendt responded that the intent is whatever is current. A friendly amendment was offered and accepted to insert "current" between "Complete" and "requirements" in both a.1) and b.1).

After some discussion of the intent of c., a friendly amendment was proposed and accepted to strike "at any time" from c.

Motion 97-528-04 to approve AR 27, as amended, which sets forth regulations for earning subsequent credentials other than a baccalaureate degree passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

## *Information Items*

- Senators were reminded that it is their responsibility to arrange for a representative from their apportionment group if they are unable to attend Senate meetings. If Senators are unsure of those eligible to represent them, contact the Faculty Senate Office.
- An e-mail version of the February Interinstitutional Faculty Senate recap was sent to all Senators.
- Committee Interest Forms will be distributed after spring break; please consider volunteering for committees.

## *New Business*

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:32.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

| [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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » February 6, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 527

February 6, 1997

### For All Faculty

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

---

### Meeting Summary

- *Special Reports:* University Marketing
- *Committee Reports:* Graduate Council & Academic Regulations Committee
- *Action Items:* Academic Regulations Proposals (AR 25 & 26) and ROTC Reinstatement [Motion 97-527-01 through 06]
- *New Business:* There was no new business.

---

### Roll Call

#### *Members Absent With Representation:*

Akyeampong, D. Johnson; P. Farber, K. King; Hathaway, J. Thompson; McAlexander, J. Drexler; Rielly, E. Brazee; Wander, J. Chambers; and Williamson, P. Nelson.

#### *Members Absent Without Representation:*

Budd, Christie, Collins, Farnsworth, Field, Fletcher, Grunder, Hu, Huyer, Locke, McEwan, A. Mix, Oye, Perry, Randhawa, Rathja, Rowe, -Tiedeman, Tiger, Warner, and Williams.

#### *Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

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

#### *Guests of the Senate:*

B. Bruce, L. Burns, B. DeGraaf, T. Doler, D. Fast, A. Hashimoto, R. Landis, K. McCreight, C. Michel, D. Nicodemus, M. Rice, J. Ringle, T. Scheuermann, J. Schuster, and N. Wendt.

---

## SPECIAL REPORTS

### University Marketing

Jill Schuster, University Marketing Director, spoke about repositioning the University in terms of image development. She views OSU as a set of products and services that are provided to customers. She noted that she had initially been told that OSU had no image, but has determined that is not the case.

She mentioned several positive events which have occurred in the last seven years:

- Established the University Honors College and International Degree Program
- Improved customer service campuswide
- Recovered from Measure 5 budget cuts
- Restructured internal recruiting operations
- Realigned recruiting publications strategies

Rebuilding OSU's image is an area that needs further improvement. Schuster expressed the need to communicate clearly and as one voice rather than each unit separately embarking on marketing techniques. She shared the following thoughts about image: Image is the communication of what is true, either positive or negative - image is sometimes based on perceived truth and sometimes based on inaccuracies.

After interviewing high school students from several areas, it was apparent that OSU's image was not clear to them. Schuster



listed the following responses from the students:

- people at OSU are conservative
- Corvallis is not a cosmopolitan community
- OSU has strong academic programs
- athletic programs are not well supported
- good Greek system

After meeting with people on campus, Schuster felt that the following accurately describes what OSU really is:

- strong academic programs
- hope for men's athletics
- active Greek system
- OSU is a safe place, with a diverse group of people
- Corvallis, as a community, has a lot to offer
- pretty conservative, but welcoming, with progressive ideas

In summary, Schuster felt that OSU is probably the best school in Oregon, and possibly in the Northwest, if you want a good start on your career and to make friends for life.

Currently the slogan, "Real Education for the Real World," is being tested in the Salem market to gauge effectiveness. Twelve billboards with this slogan and pictures of students will be visible in the Salem area for two months. Other marketing efforts taking place in Salem to recruit students include: OSU Night, high school visits, as well as advertising in newspapers at Chemeketa Community College and high schools.

Schuster explained that the next step will be to identify an ad agency that will develop creative TV spots to be marketed fall '97 through spring '98.

Senator M. Mix, Science, felt that since OSU has an extraordinary number of promising young investigators who are on the leading edge of research, it would benefit the marketing campaign to give them a higher profile and showcase their efforts. Schuster welcomed the opportunity to know more about the quality of work by faculty.

Senator Ladd, Extension, felt that a unique component of OSU is the land grant university designation that provides education to entire families and fosters life-long learning.

President Wilcox questioned how marketing is going to relate to public relations efforts. Schuster responded that News and Communication Services is an excellent vehicle to provide news releases to the media, but they are not in business to create publicity. University Marketing has the opportunity to create event marketing and intellectual academic events that highlight the faculty and work in progress.

## *Committee Reports*

### **Graduate Council**

Jack Drexler, Graduate Council Chair, reported on the committee focus and issues they are considering.

Drexler explained that the Council has jurisdiction over the policies and procedures of graduate work; formulates basic policy procedures and requirements for all graduate work at OSU; establishes admission standards, basic degree requirements and general rules; approves all graduate faculty members, programs and courses; and periodically reviews existing graduate programs on a 10-year cycle.

The Council is currently dealing with the following issues: oDistance Education - two distance education programs were recently approved by the Senate; the Council is receiving an increased number of proposals for advanced degree programs being delivered through a variety of media and being delivered outside of Corvallis.

- Category I Proposals - All proposals for advanced degree programs are currently reviewed by four independent groups (Budgets & Fiscal Planning, Graduate Council, Curriculum Council, and Faculty Senate Executive Committee). He feels that this approval process is not always well coordinated, and needs to be improved.
- Graduate Program Development - Drexler noted there is a set of rules relating to graduate program development that are not available in any single source. The Council hopes to consolidate these rules into one coherent document.

### **Academic Regulations Committee**

Nancy Wendt, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, outlined the committee's responsibilities:

- To study the effect of current and proposed policies and regulations and recommends changes. She noted that the Academic Regulations are listed each term in the Schedule of Classes.
- To review: transfer credit from other institutions; add/ drop procedures and dates; withdrawal dates; finals procedures; repeat course policy; and basic requirements for the baccalaureate degree.

Wendt felt that future issues include distance education as well as CIM and CAM integration.

## Action Items

### Academic Regulations Proposals

Nancy Wendt, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, presented proposed changes to AR 25 and AR 26.

The Committee recommended that the footnote be deleted to bring it into compliance with the State Board, which has determined that an undergraduate student who has earned 135 term credit hours shall be classified as a senior; there is no mention of a 2.0 GPA requirement.

AR 25.h. appears below; the strike-through sections indicate proposed areas to be deleted:

#### AR 25. Institutional Requirements For Baccalaureate Degrees

AR 25.h.

Application for degree: To become a candidate for a degree, a student must have achieved senior standing and must make formal application for the degree. The student must file an application with the Registrar during the first week of the term preceding the term in which he or she expects to complete requirements for a degree. Before senior standing may be achieved, a student must complete 135 credits with a grade point average of 2.00.

Motion 97-527-01 to delete the above footnote to AR 25.h. passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

The Committee also recommended changes to AR 25 and 26 that will allow an individual to obtain a baccalaureate degree with more than one major. Currently a student's education is not accurately represented since only one major appears on a transcript even though requirements for more than one major have been completed.

Affected portions of AR 25 and 26 appear below; proposed changes are indicated by highlighting to add sections and strike throughs to delete sections:

#### AR 25 - Institutional Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees

- a. An undergraduate student may be granted a baccalaureate degree with two or more majors.
- b. Credits: Minimum 1804, which must include:

- 1) Credits in upper division courses: minimum 60 (exclusive of upper division physical education activity courses).
- 2) Credits in each major: minimum, 36, including at least 24 in upper division courses.

c. Baccalaureate Degrees: All students receiving a B.A. degree shall have proficiency in a foreign language equivalent to that attained at the end of the second year sequence with a grade of C- or better, certified by the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. Colleges offering both the B.A. and the B.S. will have specific requirements distinguishing the two degrees. The college requirements for the two degrees will place comparable demands upon the time and effort of students, and that assessment of comparability will include the foreign language requirement for the B.A. Departments offering both the B.A. and B.S. may have specific requirements distinguishing the two degrees.

d. Grade Point Average: minimum of 2.00 on OSU cumulative grade point average.

e. Academic Residence:

- 1) Academic residence is defined as OSU courses taken as a regularly enrolled student of OSU or through an approved off-campus degree program. A minimum of the last 45 credits, or 45 of the last 60 credits as approved by the student's dean, must be completed at OSU.

- 2) a minimum of 15 upper division credits used to meet the preceding residency requirements (1) must be taken in each of the student's majors.
- 3) A student must be enrolled at OSU, in regular standing, before undertaking academic work to satisfy this requirement.
- 4) Credits earned by special examination for credit (AR 23) are not considered in academic residence.

f. Deans' certification of fulfillment of all requirements of major colleges. (For details see college advisors and deans.)

g. Restrictions: maximum credits applicable toward degree.

- 1) Correspondence study: maximum, 60 credits.
- 2) Law or medicine: maximum, 48 term credits.
- 3) Music (applied music): maximum, 12 credits. (Restrictions not applicable to majors in music.)
- 4) Physical activity course: maximum, 11 credits.
- 5) A maximum of 36 credits of those presented in satisfaction of the baccalaureate degree may have been graded on an S-U basis at Oregon State University. The maximum for students transferring to Oregon State University from another institution is equal to the number of terms enrolled as a full-time student at Oregon State University multiplied by three.
- 6) Academic Learning Service courses: maximum 15 credits.

h. i. Application for degree: To become a candidate for a degree, a student must have achieved senior standing<sup>2</sup> and must make formal application for the degree. The student must file an application with the Registrar during the first week of the term preceding the term in which he or she expects to complete requirements for a degree.

## **AR 26 - Concurrent and Subsequent Baccalaureate Degrees**

a. Concurrent Baccalaureate Degrees: An undergraduate student may be granted two or more baccalaureate degrees (for example the B.A. or B.S.) at the same graduation exercise. The student must:

- 1) Complete institutional, college, and departmental requirements for the degree;
- 2) Complete, for each additional degree, a minimum of 32 credits more than the requirements of the curriculum requiring the least number of credits, and;
- 3) Complete each additional 32 credits in residence.

b. Subsequent Baccalaureate Degree: A student who has received a previous baccalaureate degree from either OSU or another accredited university may be granted a subsequent baccalaureate degree. The student must:

- 1) Complete, for a B.A. degree, the requirements for foreign language proficiency (AR25cd);
- 2) Achieve a minimum of 2.00 on OSU cumulative grade point average;
- 3) Complete requirements of the major college and receive the Dean's certification; and
- 4) Meet the requirements for a concurrent degree as specified in AR 26a, if a previous baccalaureate degree has been received from OSU. The additional credits may be taken at any time prior to or subsequent to the granting of a previous OSU baccalaureate degree. Students with a baccalaureate degree from another institution must meet the Academic Residence requirement in AR25ef.

c. A student seeking a baccalaureate degree under the provisions of either AR26a or AR26b also must satisfy the appropriate residence requirements as defined in AR25ef.

Wendt explained that the current regulations don't specifically prohibit multiple majors with one baccalaureate degree, but it has been interpreted in that manner since the regulation reads "credits in the major..."

In response to Senator Thies, Science, questioning how this would appear on the diploma and transcript, Wendt stated that both majors would be listed on both documents.

Senator T. Miller, Agricultural Sciences, pointed out that AR 25.b. should read "...may be granted a baccalaureate degree with one or more majors." This correction was considered to be a friendly amendment.

When questioned if a double major would require only 180 credits, Wendt responded that if it could be accomplished with only 180 credits, no additional credits would be required.

Immediate Past President Krane questioned which academic unit would receive credit when a student earns more than one major. Wendt's understanding is that both departments will receive credit, but only one degree will be counted for the college total if both majors fall within one college; two colleges will receive credit for the degree if the majors are in different colleges. Senator Balz, Associated, agreed that more majors may be awarded than are degrees. She indicated that there may be a need to amend crediting to the department or college to accurately reflect degrees awarded.

Senator Prucha, Associated, noted that the Graduate School has experienced the same difficulty in awarding dual major degrees. To alleviate the problem they footnote their statistics to indicate dual majors, but do not add the numbers which does create problems and complaints from programmatic units.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, was pleased with the proposal and noted that several times a year he has to inform students that they can't have a double major at OSU. He also commented that these particular students are the most committed and energetic.

Motion 97-527-02 to approve the proposed changes to AR 25 (as amended) and AR 26 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **ROTC Reinstatement**

President Wilcox provided a brief background of motions and actions pertaining to ROTC representation since November 1995. As a result of a request by Senator Hale to reconsider ROTC exclusion, and arguing that the ROTC policy should be interpreted as reasonable differentiation, Wilcox presented a recommendation from the Executive Committee to reinstate ROTC in Senate apportionment. Wilcox noted that a Bylaws change in December 1995 required the Executive Committee to determine compliance with OAR 580-15-005. The Executive Committee feels they are not capable of ascertaining if all apportionment units are in compliance with this OAR since it does not prohibit a unit from practicing discrimination, instead it prohibits a unit from "recogniz[ing], register[ing], or otherwise provid[ing] assistance to any organization that discriminates."

In considering Hale's request, the Executive Committee was unanimous in its condemnation of the ROTC policy of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. However, they found that ROTC does not discriminate unreasonably since federal regulations have legal supremacy over state regulations, thus it is not unreasonable for the OSU ROTC to follow the Department of Defense policy.

The Executive Committee forwarded the following motion to the Faculty Senate:

The ROTC apportionment unit is to be represented by one (1) senator in the Faculty Senate in 1997, effective immediately.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, proposed an amendment in the hope of finding common ground. He believed that the Faculty Senate did act responsibly in 1995 when a faculty member lost his job on the basis of sexual orientation. However, he felt that the Senate erred by not keeping the focus on the issue of non-discrimination governing faculty; instead the Senate attempted to affect DOD policy that created the situation. He also hoped that this motion would bring the Senate back together and end the divisiveness that has been continuing since 1995. He proposed the amendment since the motion forwarded by the Executive Committee leaves unaddressed the original concern which is the principle of non-discrimination at the university. He urged those who voted in favor to exclude ROTC in 1995 to recognize that ROTC does not have the power by itself to comply with the University's policy of non-discrimination based on sexual orientation and vote in favor of the amended motion, which was seconded. While reaffirming the Faculty Senate commitment to non-discrimination based on sexual orientation in the employment practices at the University, the Senate agrees that the ROTC unit should be readmitted to the Senate and the ROTC apportionment unit is to be represented by one (1) senator in the Faculty Senate in 1997, effective immediately.

In response to a question asking whether this was a vote to change the Bylaws, Wilcox stated that this action was a vote to interpret the Bylaws. He noted that the Senate each year approves the Executive Committee's recommendation for representation in each unit in the form of the apportionment table and Senators were being asked to vote on an additional apportionment unit.

Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, questioned what kinds of activities could be undertaken to effect a change in government policy. Provost Arnold stated that a series of letters were sent in 1990 from President Byrne to the Secretary of the U.S. Department

of Defense citing the inconsistency of the sexual orientation policy between the DOD and the institution (copies went to the NASULGC President and the governor). The letter also asked that DOD leadership take action to see that the policy be changed. A response was received indicating the basis and rationale of the policy and citing that every court ruling on the issue has held that the homosexual exclusion is constitutional and the policy would not be reassessed. A letter was written by then Faculty Senate President Martin to the person responding to Byrne's letter, a letter from Dr. Byrne then went to the American Council of Education, and another letter was sent in November 1995 from Dr. Byrne to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation. President Risser recently made a commitment to visit with members of the Oregon congressional delegation and again reiterate OSU's stand on this issue.

Senator Krane moved the previous question. Motion 97-527-05 to vote on the amendment passed by voice vote.

Motion 97-527-04 to approve the amendment passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, read a letter from Mina Carson, CLA faculty member, appealing to the Senate to not rescind the vote taken to exclude ROTC representation. Foster stated that this issue is about reaffirming a policy of non-discrimination and expressed concern that this was being viewed in conjunction with OSU's public image; he didn't feel it was about public relations, or development or alumni relations. He felt that alumni, by withdrawing their support from OSU, are directing their ire at the wrong target; it should be directed at the Department of Defense.

Senator Gamble, Science, felt that everyone at one time had experienced some type of discrimination and could not understand why the Senate would want to single out ROTC without reviewing other units to determine whether they comply with the non-discrimination policy.

Senator Ladd, Extension, expressed concern that the bias shown toward ROTC in denying them representation has not been discussed and felt that an apology should be made to ROTC.

Senator Ede, Liberal Arts, recalled from the 1995 discussion that ROTC members were the only courtesy faculty with Senate representation.

Senator Rose, Forestry, repeated his comments from 1995 that if this action were actually aimed at the federal government then, perhaps, OSU should stop taking money from federal agencies. He noted that many people have been hurt over this issue.

Senator Griggs, Associated, expressed concern for ROTC students which the ROTC apportionment group represents and urged passage of the motion. By excluding ROTC, representation is being denied to ROTC students, which includes homosexual students.

Krane stated that this motion is not a reaction to the loss of donations to the institution, regardless of what has been reported by the local media. He noted that the Senate's action has placed the Executive Committee in the very difficult position of determining compliance by each apportionment unit each year and added that the Executive Committee should not be put in the position of policing the behavior of units at OSU. Krane reminded Senator's that they are the ones who approve the apportionment table each year.

Foster felt that it is the responsibility of the Executive Committee to make those decisions and the Faculty Senate should stand against the type of discrimination represented by the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy.

Rose expressed the belief that the Faculty Senate discriminated itself against ROTC.

Senator Matzke, Science, reminded Senators that military officers are not only found at OSU in ROTC; there are a number of officers across campus in various departments. Senator Pearson, Veterinary Medicine, moved the previous question and all pending business. Motion 97-527-06 to end debate passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 97-527-03 to approve the main motion, as amended, passed by a written vote of 63-36.

## Information Items

- Faculty Awards Deadline - OSU Distinguished Service Award nominations are due February 7. The remaining awards selected by the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee are due February 14.
- "Faculty" Electronic Mail List - This mailing list is originated for Faculty Senate use only and is an attempt to rely less on departmental forwarding of electronic mail to faculty.
- If you wish to subscribe yourself to the faculty major-domo mailing 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



- AOF, AAUP, IFS Joint Meeting - The joint meeting will be held April 26 in the MU East Forum. Details will be announced as they are finalized.

## Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold provided information regarding enrollment trends upon which budget decisions were made. The information contained in the overheads he showed can be found in the OSU Fact Book.

He reported that enrollment at OSU reached a high of 17,600 students in 1980-81, while current enrollment stands just below 14,000. He also showed changes in majors by college and changes in student credit hour generation (which directly relates to revenue).

## Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Wilcox reported on the following items:

- IFS will be lending their support to a bill which has the backing of AAUP and AOF to add two faculty as voting members on the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.
- The OSU Women's Center is holding a meeting on February 11 to begin preparing a comprehensive plan to install more emergency phones across campus in an effort to increase personal safety.
- The Faculty Economic Welfare Committee (FEWC) has forwarded to Associate Provost Hashimoto inequities in the optional retirement plan. They are concerned about faculty who elected to switch from PERS prior to being vested in the system (less than five years) and whose state contributions accumulated during the time prior to the switch would not accompany that individual to the retirement plan they elected to be included in. Wilcox noted it may require legislation to make that change, but that the committee is pursuing this issue. They calculated that there were approximately 900 OSU faculty who fell into the five year or less period of service and about 140 who elected to switch from PERS are being affected.

The FEWC also sent a letter to the Staff Benefits Director identifying inequities in the state retirement contribution for new faculty in their first year. The committee doesn't feel that these faculty are properly informed of the consequences of electing to be paid over a 9-month vs. 12-month period. Since no contribution is made toward retirement during the first six months of employment, they will only receive contributions for three months if they elect to be paid over a 9-month period in the first year. They are recommending that faculty be properly informed of this economic consequence.

## New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:35.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

[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

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1997 Minutes](#) » January 9, 1997

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1997 No. 526

January 9, 1997

### For All Faculty

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

---

### Meeting Summary

- *Committee Reports:* Graduate Council and Baccalaureate Core Committee
- *Action Items:* Install Elected Officials; Approve Parliamentarian; and approve Category I Proposal - Providing an Existing Program (Master of Science in Nutrition & Food Management with a Concentration in Dietetics Management) at new locations [Motion 97-526-01 through 02]
- *New Business:* There was no new business.

---

### Roll Call

*Members Absent With Representation:*

Bentley, D. Belair; Rielly, C. Rusk; Sanderson, M. Brouwers; and Tate, D. Griffiths.

*Members Absent Without Representation:*

Balz, Cheeke, Christie, Coakley, Collins, Cowles, Cromack, Fletcher, Hathaway, Henderson, Hu, Ingham, Jones, Ladd, P. Lee, Locke, Longerbeam, McAlexander, S. Miller, A. Mix, M. Mix, Ratchford, Tiger, Torres, and S. Woods.

*Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:*

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

*Guests of the Senate:*

L. Burns, J. Chambers, A. Hashimoto, D. Johnson, and A. Messersmith.

---

## Action Items

### Installation of Elected Officials

President Ken Krane noted that the past year has been a very exciting time for him, the Senate, and for OSU. In some respects it has also been a difficult year dealing with a number of issues. Distance learning and distance education will probably be viewed as the most important Senate accomplishments of 1996. Krane mentioned the following as unfinished business: post-tenure review; intellectual property in the electronic age; increasing faculty input in administrative reviews; faculty representation on the State Board of Higher Education; and representation in the Senate.

Krane thanked all those who have worked on behalf of the Faculty Senate in the past year. In particular, to Sally Francis who has been a constant source of advice and help; to Provost Roy Arnold for his support, encouragement, and availability; to Vickie Nunnemaker for her assistance; and to President Risser for inviting him to attend all of the President's Cabinet meetings and allowing him to gain a unique insight into the operation of the University and the knowledge of the incredibly strong academic instincts of the Cabinet as well as their constant regard and concern for the interest of faculty and students.

In installing Anthony Wilcox as President, Krane encouraged him to continue the strong tradition of shared governance at OSU and hoped that he would receive the same amount of support from the University community as Krane received during his year as President.

While thanking Krane for his service, President Wilcox stated that Krane has set a high standard in his leadership role for the Faculty Senate. Wilcox expressed his appreciation for the dedication and insight Krane brought the presidency. He then presented Krane with a Myrtlewood plaque with the following inscription:

Kenneth Krane  
Oregon State University Faculty Senate President  
1996

Given in appreciation for his leadership,  
judgement, compassion, and dedicated  
service to the faculty of Oregon State University.

The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is a source of all true art and science.

- *Albert Einstein*

President Wilcox then asked President-elect Maggie Niess, the newly elected Executive Committee members (Bruce Coblentz, Irma Delson, Larry Griggs), and IFS Representative Carroll DeKock to stand and declared them installed. Wilcox thanked the retiring Executive Committee members: Sally Francis, John Lee, and Russ Dix. After asking the newly elected Senators to stand, he also declared them installed.

### **Approval of Parliamentarian**

Motion 97-526-01 to approve Trischa Knapp as Parliamentarian for 1997 was passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Category I Proposal**

Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented a Category I proposal to Provide an Existing Program (Master of Science in Nutrition and Food Management with a Concentration in Dietetics Management) at New Locations. Burton noted that the proposal is to provide this program nationally via distance learning and would be self-funded through grants.

Senator Lee, Science, questioned what would happen in the event of a lack of grants. Ann Messersmith, Nutrition and Food Management Chair, responded that funding is anticipated to be adequate between grants and increased enrollment. She also noted that if they can't afford the program, it will be discontinued and only those who are enrolled at the time will be allowed to finish.

Senator Matzke, Science, questioned how this program interacts with University enrollment. Andy Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, responded that since this program is self-supporting and is offered through the Office of Continuing Higher Education, enrollment would not count toward the University total.

Motion 97-526-02 to approve the above Category I proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **Committee Reports**

### **Graduate Council**

The Graduate Council report was rescheduled to February.

### **Baccalaureate Core Committee**

Kerry Ahearn, Chair, noted that because many faculty have come to OSU since the Baccalaureate Core was instituted and don't know what it is, he would welcome suggestions of ways to inform faculty.

The function of the committee is to assess completed proposals, solicit courses in the core, and assist with proposal writing. The 1997 goals are to reinforce the idea that perspective courses be lower division; to create a notification system each term notifying appropriate faculty that they are teaching a baccalaureate core course and to supply them with the criteria that course must satisfy; and to encourage more proposals in the social processes and institutions. Ahearn would also like to encourage pre-proposal sessions which would allow faculty to learn what is expected from the proposal and result in fewer being turned down. The Committee is currently working toward a way to evaluate the Core as well as seeking a way to make critical thinking an across-the-board criterion.

Ahearn encouraged faculty to contact him with questions.

## Information Items

Faculty Senate Handbook Update - Continuing Senators who would like an update for their handbook should contact the Faculty Senate Office.

## Reports from the Provost

### **Provost Arnold's report focused on budget issues.**

Dr. Arnold reminded Senators that since the State System budget is distributed on a Basic Allocation System (BAS) model that relates to enrollment and student credit hour generation, OSU needs to be concerned about enrollment if we expect to receive a similar share of the resources as received by other institutions.

During the past month OSU was notified of an adjustment to the current budget. Since enrollment targets were not met, the total shortfall in our budget is \$2,581,-000. Mid-year receipt of this information necessitates reducing the rate of expenditure for the current fiscal year and devising a way to implement the reduction. Central administration (Provost's Office and Finance and Administration) will absorb \$1 million of the cuts; \$581,000 will come from university reserves; and the remaining \$1 million will come from the academic colleges.

The academic college distribution of the \$1 million reduction was determined through across-the-board reductions (two-thirds) and enrollment related indicators derived from student credit hours (one-third). Deans and other administrators were being consulted to determine how to develop plans to manage the adjustment. So far, four units have submitted plans which range from using carryover or reserve funds to vacancy salary savings.

Arnold emphasized that the situation is clearly OSU's responsibility and is a result of low enrollment. He noted that, although there has been a decrease in overall enrollment since 1991, the number of new students has increased. Enrollment targets, when determined, seemed to be reasonable based on available data such as: high school graduation rates, retention rates, and current enrollment.

For the coming year, Arnold stated that the Governor's budget is a continuation budget which assumes the same level of services as currently provided. There is also an investment budget which requires excess revenues to be invested in the future of the State rather than returned if they exceed the revenue estimates by more than 2%. There is a sense that higher education is well positioned going into the legislative session. The final determinants for next year's allocation hinge on the resources provided by the State and where OSU fits in the enrollment corridor. The enrollment target will likely be adjusted downward next year and Arnold emphasized that our fate with regard to tuition revenue is largely in our own hands. He stated that OSU is moving to enhance its success in student recruiting and retention, and noted that the Faculty Senate has been involved in some of those successes, such as: the Honors College, new or modified academic programs designed to be responsive to the interests of students, student ambassador programs which have been developed in colleges and units, and a now fully staffed Admission and Orientation Office. Arnold stressed that student recruiting is the responsibility of the entire University, not just one unit. He added that the investment in marketing is an important enrollment tool.

Arnold challenged academic and support service units to determine what they can do to increase enrollment and what kinds of partnerships can be developed across campus. We need to find ways to make students feel welcome and assist them in finding support services when needed. He also challenged the Faculty Senate to identify ways that faculty can help OSU increase enrollment and the quality of students.

Senator Morris, Science, questioned whether there has been a decrease in the number of credit hours per student. Arnold responded that student credit hours have declined over the past five years. Andy Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, stated that both headcount as well as student credit hour generation have been decreasing, but was not sure if the ratio was the same over the same period of time.

Senator DeKock, Science, questioned the loss of approximately \$2.5 million. Arnold stated that the amount was a revenue estimate and that the money never actually existed. Since OSU didn't generate the revenue, it's not available to be spent.

Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, observed that he knows of many children of OSU faculty who have been avidly recruited by the University of Oregon and never contacted by OSU. He also mentioned that there was no advertising from OSU in the Oregon Scientist, although the U of O, PSU, and others were represented. Arnold acknowledged he has made the same observations in the past, but believes that this trend is changing through efforts in admissions and marketing. He also mentioned that it is not feasible to market OSU

everywhere. Since there are limited resources, the marketing dollars must be spent where it's been determined they will be most successful. Hashimoto indicated that the University will be asking faculty to recommend students who should receive recruiting information about OSU. Arnold also mentioned the initiative to make some OSU classes available in local high schools.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, questioned why the College of Liberal Arts received the biggest cut in relation to the \$1 million reduction from academic colleges. Arnold reported that since two-thirds of the reduction was across the board, the largest cuts will occur in those units with the largest budgets. The remaining one-third is based on enrollment trend which considers the magnitude of decline in student numbers and what the BAS model indicates for average cost of instruction in programs.

Senator T. Miller, Agricultural Sciences, questioned why OSU doesn't receive student credit hours from courses offered through the Office of Continuing Higher Education (OCHE) and should OCHE courses be discouraged. Arnold stated that this is currently a topic of discussion in the State System. Tuition for Continuing Education courses is distributed to the academic unit which offers the course and to OCHE rather than to OSSHE for distribution among state institutions. If this practice is changed, a system would need to evolve for revenue to return to the academic units. Arnold noted that for non-degree or certificate workshops it is appropriate for them to continue to be offered in a revenue generating mode to the units.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, asked if we know where students are now who would normally be attending OSSHE institutions. Arnold stated that several years ago when OSSHE institutions experienced a significant decline, community colleges saw a corresponding increase in enrollment. Although the expectation was that OSSHE institutions would later experience an enrollment increase due to transfer students, this did not occur. As a result, increased recruitment attention will be focused toward community colleges.

Immediate Past President Krane pointed out that faculty morale does have an effect on student recruitment and retention and noted the need to change the mindset of some faculty to encourage them to generate enthusiasm and participate in student interactions.

Suggestions mentioned during the recruitment/retention discussion included:

- A contract with entering freshmen which guarantees a set tuition rate over four years; monthly payments; and guarantees that the necessary courses will be available to allow them to graduate in four years.
- An internal listserve where faculty can post exciting ideas which they are currently working on or which have been successful.
- Allow tuition breaks to children of faculty and staff.

In responding to a question asking if we know why students leave, Leslie Burns, Director of Undergraduate Education, stated that there is currently a study underway to determine why they left. Arnold noted that it was disturbing to learn that many of those who were doing well academically are among those not returning.

In response to Senator Manogue, Science, asking if drop-out statistics were available, Arnold provided the following retention figures: Freshman - 75.6%; Sophomore - 81.8%; Junior - 75.4%; and Senior - 91.5%.

When questioned as to the amount of money OSU derives from ROTC, Arnold responded that a significant amount of scholarship support is received. Senator Rose, Forestry, requested OSU retention rates among ROTC students. Although Arnold, did not have those figures, he felt that they were high.

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, felt that we are still seeing some impacts from Measure 5 and noted that when programs were cut, such as Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism Management, there was a hope that the programs would be reinstated. After admitting that it's difficult to reinstate programs without funding, he questioned if programs not currently offered elsewhere would be reinstated. Arnold responded that it's difficult to bring back programs if there is a similar program at another institution - SOSC has a modest HRTM program. He noted that there are OSU faculty developing a media communications program proposal which would be an updated journalism offering.

## *Reports from the Faculty Senate President*

President Wilcox included the following items in his report:

- Encouraged faculty participation in the teach-in during the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day Celebration. Dick Thies suggested that faculty use in-class time to focus on ideas, teachings, and beliefs of Martin Luther King, Jr. as a way to enrich their classes. There are resources available in a teach-in packet which faculty could use as a starting point to assist them in planning their class.
- There is a need for additional courses in the Honors College; Wilcox encouraged faculty to participate in

this program.

- Nomination deadlines for many University awards are in February; contact the Faculty Senate Office for specific information.
- An academic employee forum to discuss implementation of the Human Resources Information System will be held from 9-11 AM on January 16.
- Thanked President Risser for hosting a reception for Faculty Senate members immediately following the meeting.

## *New Business*

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:35.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

| [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](#).