

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 1998 Minutes

This document is over 80 pages. Use caution when printing.

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 or 541-737-4344 for more information.

- [December 3, 1998](#)
- [November 5, 1998](#)
- [October 1, 1998](#)
- [June 15, 1998](#)
- [June 4, 1998](#)
- [May 7, 1998](#)
- [April 2, 1998](#)
- [March 5, 1998](#)
- [February 5, 1998](#)
- [January 8, 1998](#)

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

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

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

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

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

Valid [xhtml](#).

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » December 3, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 543

December 3, 1998

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Maggie Niess on December 3, 1998, at 3:05 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center. The October and November minutes were declared approved.

Meeting Summary

- Committee Report: Senate Election Results
- Action Items: Baha'i Institute of Higher Education Resolution; Category I Proposals: Off-Campus Delivery of a Baccalaureate Degree in General Agriculture, Extending the Liberal Studies degree program to Chemeketa Community College, and Masters in Business Information Systems (M.B.I.S.); Executive Committee Election; Post-Tenure Review Guidelines; and OSBHE Faculty Member Resolution [Motion 98-543-01 through 15]
- Discussion Item: Student Affairs Task Force on Greek Life (Larry Roper)
- Old Business: None
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Denning, J. Coakley; Hardin, J. Ridlington; Hoogesteger, M. Gorski; Pereira, A. Faridani; Sandstrom, I. Kleinsorge; Sanford, D. Plaza; and Seville, D. Hermann.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Biwan, Bontrager, Brodie, Carson, Chambers, Champeau, Cheeke, Cowles, Elwood, P. Farber, J. Field, Folts, Foster, Frank, Gross, Grunder, Hale, Huyer, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Kiem, Lajtha, Levine, Maas-Hebner, Neumann, Primak, Righetti, Rosenberger, Savage, and Stephenson.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; K. Williamson, President-Elect; A. Wilcox, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; Ex-officios: R. Arnold, P. Lee, and J.A. Torres; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

L. Burns, L. Cole, W. Fanno, A. Hashimoto, D. Johnson, K. Krane, R. Landau, L. Maughan, D. Nicodemus, J. Rutledge and J. Schuster.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Faculty Senate Election Results

Tony Wilcox, Ballot Counting Committee Chair, thanked those who agreed to candidacy

and reported that Gordon Matzke (Professor -- Geosciences) was elected President-Elect and Gary Tiedeman (Professor -- Sociology) was elected as the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative.

ACTION ITEMS

Baha'i Institute of Higher Education Resolution

Senator Manogue, Science, presented the following resolution:

The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University wishes to express its strong concern over the recent shutdown of the Baha'i Institute of Higher Education by the Iranian Government, accompanied by the arrest of some faculty members and the confiscation of academic books, exam records and education equipment in private homes.

This action amounts to denying students who are already excluded from public universities any right to learn, even if it is done in private. It violates both the International Declaration of Human Rights, as well as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, to which Iran is a party.

It is the highest aspiration of Oregon State University to free people's minds from ignorance, prejudice, and provincialism and to stimulate a lasting attitude of inquiry. We strongly urge the Iranian Government to implement Article 13 of the above mentioned covenant, which states that "higher education shall be made equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity."

Manogue explained that the Institute is not an underground university; that Baha'i's have been jailed for their affiliation with the Institute; that there is an attempt to eliminate the Baha'i culture in Iran; and that Baha'i's are not being allowed to pursue higher education in private homes.

Motion 98-543-01 to accept the resolution passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Category I Proposals

Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented three Category I proposals:

a) Off-Campus Delivery of a Baccalaureate Degree in General Agriculture – Burton reported that courses would be offered by OSU at Treasure Valley Community College, Blue Mountain Community College and extended to other sites as partnerships are developed. Students could register and attend class at any of the institutions and the tuition would stay at the institution where the student registered. An extensive review is scheduled for three years after implementation.

There was no discussion. Motion 98-543-02 to approve the Off-Campus Delivery of a Baccalaureate Degree in General Agriculture passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

b) Extending the Liberal Studies degree program to Chemeketa Community College – This program has been delivered off-campus since 1984 to five other sites. This proposal also indicated that it could be extended to other community colleges in the state as partnerships are developed. There was no discussion. Motion 98-543-03 to approve Extending the Liberal Studies degree program to Chemeketa Community College passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

c) Masters in Business Information Systems (M.B.I.S.) Program – The M.B.I.S. is OSU's response to Senate Bill 487 passed by the 1997 Oregon legislature increasing the education requirements for Certified Public Accountant candidates sitting for the Uniform CPA Exam. The program expects to first enroll students Fall Term 2000. There was no discussion. Motion 98-543-04 to approve the Masters in Business

Information Systems (M.B.I.S.) Program passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Executive Committee Election

Executive Committee candidates were: Gary Beach, Robert Burton, Stella Coakley, Jack Drexler, Sandie Franklin, Pam Henderson, Debbie Jimmerson, William Lunch, Mark McCambridge, Tom Plant, Bruce Sorte, and Dick Thies.

Ballots were distributed and counted during the meeting. Those elected to two-years terms were: Robert Burton (Professor and Associate Chair -- Mathematics), William Lunch (Professor -- Political Science), and Bruce Sorte (Professional Faculty -- Business & Personnel Officer, College of Agricultural Sciences). Those elected to one-year terms were: Stella Coakley (Professor and Chair -- Botany & Plant Pathology) and Dick Thies (Professor and Associate Dean, College of Science).

President Niess thanked the following Executive Committee members for their service: Bruce Coblentz, Irma Delson, James Foster, Larry Griggs and Gordon Matzke.

Post-Tenure Review Guidelines

Ken Krane, Task Force on Post-Tenure Review Chair, reported that he had met with the OSU AAUP Executive Board and received comments from them regarding the guidelines that were postponed from the November meeting. He noted that the first section of the guidelines will be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook and the second portion will be distributed to departments by the Provost's Office. Krane then reviewed the rationale for changes in the guidelines.

AAUP prepared alternate wording to the guidelines (below) that were available at the meeting. Rubin Landau, representing AAUP, felt that the process doesn't need to exist since faculty should not have to prove competency and considered this an attack against tenure.

1. In the event of repeated unsatisfactory reviews and failure to achieve the goals of an agreed-upon development plan, the peer committee (in consultation with the unit head) may explore other mutually agreeable possibilities, such as redistribution of effort within the unit or separation to another unit. If these are not practicable, or if no other solution acceptable to the parties can be found, then a different faculty committee elected for that purpose at the level of the college or corresponding academic unit above that which originated the recommendation, should review the findings of the unit-level committee. The administration should not consider sanctions until after this second review.

The standard for dismissal or severe sanction remains that of adequate cause. The mere fact of successive negative reviews does not diminish in any way the obligation of the institution to show such cause for dismissal in a separate forum before an appropriately constituted hearing body convened for that purpose. The administration is still required to bear the burden of proof and demonstrate not only that the negative evaluations rest on fact, but that the facts rise to the level of adequate cause for dismissal. [This section was proposed to replace the last two paragraphs of 'Consequences of the Five-Year Review' on pages 3 and 4 of the Guidelines.]

2. In order for the faculty member to have a fair chance to successfully meet the requirements of their position description, the description should be mutually agreeable to faculty and unit head, and should be in effect for a time period appropriate for the discipline. [This section was proposed to replace the last sentence of the first paragraph of 'Annual Review' section on page 2 of the Guidelines.]

3. The Faculty Senate will periodically review the effectiveness of the post-tenure review process. [This section was proposed to replace the language in 'Review of the Post-Tenure Review Process' on page 4 of the Guidelines.]

In response to the AAUP recommendation #3 regarding evaluation of the process, Krane felt this section was inappropriate to place in the Faculty Handbook and noted this issue was addressed in the report adopted by the Senate in June. Duane Johnson, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, reported that commonly asked promotion and tenure questions will be placed in the Handbook.

Senator Shore, Engineering, had concerns about references to position descriptions in the document since she wasn't aware of position descriptions in Engineering. After further discussion focusing on position descriptions, it was determined by a show of hands that about one-third were not aware of position descriptions existing for their job.

Senator Burton, Science, proposed an amendment to revise the last paragraph under 'Five-year Reviews:' that was seconded. The amendment read as follows:

If a faculty member so requests, at any time during the five-year interval between regularly scheduled peer committee reviews, ~~a faculty member may request a peer committee review~~ **will take place** if it is considered to be beneficial to the professional development of the faculty member.

The question was called for to close debate; motion 98-543-07 passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote. After discussion, motion 98-543-06 consisting of the above amendment was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, moved substitution of the text as provided by AAUP and requested it be divided into three sections.

{Several amendments were made to the proposed AAUP language, with discussion both in favor and opposition, but were not recorded in full in the Recording Secretary's minutes and the tape recording failed to copy. None of the AAUP language was approved to be placed in the document.}

A motion was made and seconded to amend the Guideline document by deleting the last paragraph on page three and the first paragraph on page four in the 'Consequences of the Five-year Review' section and inserting the AAUP language in #1 above; motion seconded. Motion 98-543-08 to amend the guidelines by inserting AAUP's first recommendation was defeated by voice vote with no votes in favor.

Motion 98-543-09 to amend the Guidelines to delete the last sentence of the first paragraph under 'Annual Reviews:' and insert AAUP's second recommendation was defeated by voice vote with several votes in favor.

Motion 98-543-10 to amend the Guidelines to insert AAUP's third recommendation by replacing the section under 'Review of the Post-Tenure Review Process' was defeated by voice vote with several votes in favor.

In response to a question from the floor asking if the Guidelines apply to administrators, Krane indicated that all faculty would be reviewed.

Senator Sayre moved to add the word "standing" in the second sentence of the third paragraph under 'Consequences of the Five-Year Review' and delete the last part of the sentence. The amended sentence read:

Any recommendation for sanctions made by the academic unit must be reviewed by a **standing** faculty committee elected for that purpose at the level of the college or ~~corresponding academic unit above that which originated the recommendation;~~ if the originating academic unit is a college, the Provost shall arrange for the election

~~of a suitable faculty review committee.~~

Senator Brooks, Business, felt the proposed amendment was appropriate. Senator Morris, Science, was opposed to the amendment and felt that the level of detail is best spelled out by the unit. Senator Matzke, Science, felt units should identify faculty committees before they were needed.

Motion 98-543-11 to amend the document as described above passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.

Senator Manogue moved to amend the same paragraph by moving the amended sentence to the beginning of the paragraph prior to the portion describing sanctions; motion seconded.

Senators Sayre and Shor spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment.

The question was called for to end debate; motion 98-543-13 passed by voice vote with dissenting votes.

Motion 98-543-12 to approve the proposed amendment was defeated by voice vote with some votes in favor.

Senator Tiedeman questioned who performs the peer review of the peer review members during annual reviews. Krane responded that, in Physics, the review member steps aside during their own review.

A proxy from Science expressed concern over a number of issues:

- * Felt that the section relating to tenure on page 1 is too weak.
- * Felt that the system gives too much power to the department chair.
- * It should be spelled out who will vote when electing faculty to the standing committee.
- * Position descriptions should be spelled out before voting.
- * Yearly reviews may prove to be an overload to department heads.

In response to the above concerns, Krane explained that this document is not meant to be a defense of tenure and it gives less power to department heads than the current process. Each unit should determine who will be eligible to vote in the election of the standing faculty committee. He emphasized that all faculty are required to have a position description.

Senator Jones, Extension, indicated that her faculty are concerned about the annual peer review given the various geographic districts for Extension. She felt this would add to the workload since Extension already has annual reviews and they don't want duplication of tenure. In response, Senator Morris pointed out that the document says peer reviews are encouraged.

Senator Matzke called for the question. Motion 98-543- 14 to close debate on the proposed Guidelines passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 98-543-05 to approve the Guidelines, as amended, passed by voice vote.

Senator Gardner, Science, called for a Sense of the Senate vote: *That the mechanism for reaching consensus between the faculty member and the unit head be clarified and that the grievance procedures be clarified in case a consensus is not reached.* Motion 98-543-15 passed by voice vote. President Niess will prepare a letter to be sent to the Promotion and Tenure Committee to this effect.

OSBHE Faculty Member Resolution

Tony Wilcox, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, explained that the Governor is considering a faculty position on the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE) in June of 1999. This position would be a two-year term rather than four years for other Board members.

Wilcox noted that the OSU Faculty Senate received a request from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) to endorse the nominating process developed by IFS and the Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF) for nominating faculty members to the Governor for appointment to the OSBHE. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (EC), in turn, charged the Bylaws and Nominations Committee to review the process and forward a recommendation to the EC. After careful consideration of the suggested process, the Committee is recommending the following amended nomination process:

1. *Engage institution Faculty Senates in identifying qualified and willing candidates for the position. Have each institution forward its nominations to a Nominating Committee through their IFS Senator by January 15, 1999.*
2. *A Nominating Committee consisting of faculty from the IFS will select no more than 3 names to submit to the Governor.*
3. *These names will be shared with each Faculty Senate for endorsement prior to submission to the Governor.*
4. *The finalists' applications will be sent to the Governor.*

In addition to the nomination process, IFS also requested that a call for nominations on each campus be initiated for faculty qualified and willing to serve on the Board.

Laurel Maughan, AAUP State President, expressed frustration that AAUP has been left out of the process and that this position would not be possible if it weren't for the efforts of AAUP. Senator DeKock, Science, agreed that, without the work of AAUP and AOF, this issue would not be before the Senate. He also noted that it is difficult to get all three groups to work together, given their respective agendas, and called for all to be engaged. DeKock felt that IFS needs to revisit this issue and clarify who should be involved. He also stated that the letter from IFS President Kemble Yates did not accurately reflect action taken by the IFS.

DeKock moved to postpone approval of the nomination process until January so IFS can clarify their recommendation (IFS meets in December); motion seconded. Motion 98-543-16 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Student Affairs Task Force on Greek Life

Larry Roper, Vice Provost for Student Affairs, recapped the Task Force's final report and recommendations.

In response to Senator Delson, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, questioning the level of support received from national organizations, Roper reported that very little support has been received and there have been no campus- based conversations.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- New Senator Orientation: New Senator Orientation will be held January 7, 1999.
- University Awards: A summary of the following awards was included in the Senate agenda. Nomination materials must be submitted to the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee c/o Faculty Senate Office. The deadline for the OSU Distinguished Service Award is February 5, 1999; the deadline for all other awards

is March 5.

OSU Distinguished Service
OSU Alumni Association Distinguished Professor
Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor
Dar Reese Excellence in Advising
Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching
OSU Outstanding Faculty Research Assistant
OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence
Extended Education Faculty Achievement
D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service

– Student Appointments to Faculty Senate Committees: Faculty are asked to help identify students interested in serving on the following Senate committees:

Academic Regulations Committee
Academic Requirements Committee
Academic Standing Committee
Advancement of Teaching Committee
Baccalaureate Core Committee
Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee
Committee on Committees
Instructional Development & Technology Committee
Library Committee
Student Recognition & Awards Committee
Undergraduate Admissions Committee

– Faculty Senate Handbook Return: Retiring Senators are asked to return their Faculty Senate Handbooks to be updated and redistributed to new Senators.

– 1999 Distinguished Professor Nominations: The deadline for nominating outstanding faculty members for the "Distinguished Professor" honor is January 29. Nominations are to be submitted to Paul Farber in History. A copy of the criteria may be obtained from Nancy Hoffman at 737-0733.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

While introducing Provost Arnold, President Niess noted that the Executive Committee recently participated in a review for the Provost and she wanted Senators to hear a portion of their response:

"...Provost Arnold continues to serve in this position with distinction. He is able to bridge the gap between the President and the faculty. From our perspective, he has been helping the campus understand the issues and concerns affecting higher education and Oregon State University in particular. We feel that Provost Arnold is under-appreciated. He has held OSU together through very tough times."

Niess then publicly expressed her appreciation to Provost Arnold for his help and support throughout the past year and for his careful, exceptionally well-prepared, responses at Senate meetings. Her comments were followed by a round of applause. Provost Arnold congratulated the newly elected officers, Senators and Executive Committee members and thanked those retiring.

He reported that the intent is for the funding request to be presented to and considered by the Emergency Board at their January meeting.

The Governor's budget recommendations have been made and forwarded to the State Board. The recommendations for \$73 million include the following: \$44.7 million to implement the new budget model; \$15.3 million to fund the tuition freeze for resident undergraduates; \$8 million for enrollment growth targeted to high demand areas such as engineering and teacher training; and \$5 million for faculty recruitment and retention. The Senate leadership also developed recommendations prior to the last election with a larger figure for higher education, including \$80 million for budget implementation. Arnold noted that the assumptions used for available revenue differed between the two recommendations and that the Governor's assumptions are based on more recent revenue projections. He reminded Senators that the final figures depend on what happens in the legislative session and with enrollment.

The OSU Budget Work Group is continuing to meet and Budget Allocation Guidelines were available at the Senate meeting.

Past President Wilcox noted that Caroline Kerl, Legal Officer, stated that access to the Student Assessment of Teaching is confidential information and questioned whether this was subject to internal actions. Arnold stated that the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR's) define this information as being treated confidentially to the faculty member, unit administrator and others who may need to know for purposes of Promotion and Tenure decisions. To change the policy would require a change in the OAR's. He noted there is the option of students initiating their own secondary process where they provide input that can be published.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Niess explained that, since the December meeting marked the end of the 1998 Senate session, the two Category I proposals tabled in January will disappear. She noted that units have worked very hard to develop program specifics requested by the Senate and progress on the proposals has been made. The proposals will reappear before the Senate in 1999.

Since December was her last meeting, Niess thanked Senators for their patience while she was trying to learn Robert's Rules of Order.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

President Niess declared the session adjourned at 5:53 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](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » November 5, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 542

November 5, 1998

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on November 5, 1998, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Maggie Niess.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Apportionment Table; Category I Proposals: Master of Science in Applied Physics and renaming a degree program, B.S. in Interior Merchandising to B.S. in Interior Design; Post-Tenure Review Guideline Recommendations; Senate Nominations/ Elections; and Ballot Counting Committee [Motions 98-542-01 through 08]
- Discussion Item: Public Employees Bargaining Board (PEBB)
- Old Business: None
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Anemaet, L. Maughan; Caspers, C. Rusk; Caughey, S. Francis; Coakley, K. Krane; Drexler, D. Herrmann; Henderson, D. Keszler; Leong, P. Bottomly; Marks, R. Rodriguez; Neumann, R. Tricker; Schowalter, D. Myrold; Sorte, K. Carpenter; Tate, D. McIntyre; Thies, P. Seimens; and Wander, M. Traber.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bird, Biwan, Chambers, Cheeke, Cowles, DeKock, Elwood, Farnsworth, J. Field, K. Field, Foster, Gomez, Gross, Grunder, Hale, Hoogesteger, Hooker, Huyer, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Kesler, Kiem, Lajtha, Levine, Lomax, Longerbeam, Lowrie, Mallory-Smith, McCambridge, Mix, Pereira, Reed, Righetti, Sanford, Savage, and Yamada.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; K. Williamson, President-Elect; A. Wilcox, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; Ex-officios; R. Arnold and P. Lee; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

L. Burns, V. Douglas, S. Esbensen, A. Hashimoto, R. Landau, A. Messersmith, D.B. Nicodemus, J. Schuster, M.C. Wray, and D. Yunker

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of 1999 Apportionment Table

OSU Faculty FTE in the ranks of Instructor or above, including Professional Faculty, Research Associates, and all Faculty Research Assistants as of October 16, 1998, together with student credit hours apportioned to individual units, resulted in 23.71 FTE/Senator and 16,943.18 SCH/Senator. (Apportionment is based on 75% FTE and 25% SCH with a cap of 132 Senators.)

Motion 98–542–01 to approve the apportionment table passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Category I Proposals

Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented two Category I proposals for approval:

- 1) Master of Science in Applied Physics – This proposal contains no budgetary implications and is a redirection of the present program. There was no discussion. Motion 98–542–02 to approve this proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.
- 2) Renaming of a degree program: B.S. in Interior Merchandising to B.S. in Interior Design – The proposed name better reflects the program. There was no discussion. Motion 98–542–03 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Task Force on Post–Tenure Review—Guideline Recommendations

Ken Krane, Task Force on Post–Tenure Review Chair, presented recommended guidelines to be included in the Faculty Handbook. A revised page 3 was distributed at the meeting. The guidelines were published in the June 1998 Senate agenda and not presented for approval until November to allow ample time for discussion by the OSU community and review by AAUP. Krane briefly outlined each proposed change to the document.

Krane noted that the local AAUP chapter reviewed and was supportive of the report, but suggested a number of changes to the guidelines. Some changes in the proposed guidelines reflect concerns expressed by both faculty and AAUP.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, felt that the system could be used to reward oneself and punish others for a zero sum gain.

Rubin Landau, representing AAUP views, stated that AAUP had not had an opportunity to review the revised guidelines and prepare detailed responses.

Senator Matzke, Science, questioned the time period concerning repeated negative reviews on page three. Krane responded that the task force deliberately left the time frame vague to give the unit latitude.

Senator Morris, Science, questioned peer reviews. Krane explained that, if approved, the guidelines would require a peer committee for the five–year review. However, it would be at the unit's discretion to determine the meaning of peer involvement at the annual review.

Senator Shor, Engineering, questioned whether a five–year review will be required for every tenured faculty member when the guidelines go into effect. Krane responded that this would be left to the individual units. Since tenured faculty are being reviewed annually in the first five years after being tenured and then evaluated every three years thereafter under the present system, the five–year cycle could try to be incorporated as closely as possible to the current system.

Senator Burton, Science, moved to postpone action on the guidelines until December to allow time for AAUP to review the revised recommendations; motion seconded.

Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, noted that the task force has been working on this for a very long time, he felt the document was excellent and was opposed to postponement since a review occurs every year.

Senator Daley did not like the document but felt that taking another month for additional review would not be harmful.

Landau noted that the national AAUP had been contacted for their input on the first draft and they would like an opportunity to do the same with the revisions. Krane responded that the AAUP recommendations were very detailed and the task force chose to adopt some of their recommendations and not others. The reason it was delayed until November was to give AAUP an opportunity to review the draft.

Senator Sayre, Liberal Arts, pointed out that, since the document states: The Faculty Senate will periodically review the effectiveness of the post-tenure review process, the Senate could approve the guidelines and revise them at any time.

Senator Manogue, Science, has a serious concern about rewording in the document regarding the mediation and grievance procedure and favored an additional review and postponement until December. Krane responded that he had conferred with the Legal Officer and the same mediation and grievance process would be in effect for reviews. Krane added that the present review of faculty outlined in the Faculty Handbook does not address the mediation and grievance process.

Several Senators spoke in support of delaying action until December; others spoke in support of not delaying with the understanding that review and changes could be made at any time.

Senator Fisk, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, thought that the document contained awkward wording in that some cases the dean is the unit head and felt this should be addressed. Krane noted that, for that reason, the document indicates the dean or some appropriate supervisor to allow a second level of faculty review. In the case of Fisk's unit, the Provost would be the second level of review.

Motion 98-542-05 to postpone action definitely until December on the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Faculty Senate Nominations/Elections

Tony Wilcox, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented the slate of nominees for elected positions:

- * President-Elect – Robert Frank (Professor, English) and Gordon Matzke (Professor, Geosciences).
- * Interinstitutional Faculty Senate – Steven Dodrill (Associate Professor, Extension & Experiment Station Communications) and Gary Tiedeman (Professor, Sociology).
- * Executive Committee – Gary Beach (Professional Faculty, Academic Affairs); Robert Burton (Professor, Mathematics); Stella Coakley (Professor, Botany & Plant Pathology); Jack Drexler (Associate Professor, Management, Marketing and International Business); Sandie Franklin (Professional Faculty, Printing and Mailing Services); Pam Henderson (Professional Faculty, College of Forestry); Debbie Jimmerson (Professional Faculty, Mechanical Engineering); William Lunch (Professor, Political Science); Mark McCambridge (Professional Faculty, Business Services); Tom Plant (Associate Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering); Bruce Sorte (Professional Faculty, Agricultural Sciences); and Dick Thies (Professor, Science).

There were no nominations from the floor for any position; the nominations for each position were closed by voice vote with one dissenting vote for President-Elect, motions 98-542-06 through 08.

Senator Daley was disturbed with the process of selecting the President-Elect and felt there should be more opportunity for input. Wilcox reminded Senators that the process explained last month included a call for nominations that resulted in a robust response from campus.

Election materials for President-Elect and IFS representative will be sent the week of November 9 to all eligible voters and the Executive Committee election will be determined by Senators during the December 3 Senate meeting.

Wilcox expressed appreciation from the committee to those who participated in the nomination process and to the candidates for their willingness to serve.

Ballot Counting Committee

Niess called for volunteers to count President-Elect and IFS ballots on December 2 at 11:00 AM. Those volunteering were: Barb McEwan, Molly Shor and Hans van der Mars;

Tom Daniels is the alternate.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Public Employees Bargaining Board (PEBB)

Three individuals addressed the issue of changes in health benefits:

Lois Courtney, OSU Benefits Manager, explained that Blue Cross Plan 3 (affecting 300 OSU faculty), Qual Med and Regent HMO Oregon plans were eliminated beginning in 1999. In comparing Blue Cross Plans 2, 3 and the Co-pay, she noted the primary difference is that the co-pay has no deductible while Plan 3 has a \$150 deductible. She mentioned a common misconception that the Corvallis Clinic is not a preferred provider, and was not under Plan 3.

In response to Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, Courtney stated there are no pre-existing conditions during open enrollment.

Denise Yunker, OUS Benefits Manager, explained the composition of the PEBB Board and stated that she is representing OUS interests to the PEBB Board.

She noted that last fall PEBB advisory groups and discussion groups were established to gain input from each OUS campus concerning benefits. Chancellor Cox wrote a letter to PEBB in March indicating that higher education valued cash-back and opt-out options. In August Chancellor Cox and UO President Frohnmayer testified before the PEBB Board that the health plan is used for total compensation in faculty recruitment and retention.

Yunker indicated that many employees felt confused by the number of choices and that PEBB considered elimination options very carefully. PEBB determined that the benefit structure of Plan 3 was closely mimicked by two other plans. She also mentioned that cost had been increasing dramatically in Plan 3 while enrollment was decreasing.

Ken Krane, Physics, noted that the most popular plan was eliminated. He also pointed out that Plan 3 provided the most generous set of benefits for non-preferred provider coverage, which is needed when traveling outside the state. Yunker acknowledged recognition of that concern but, because of the cost, a large number of employees couldn't afford the plan. She mentioned that the elimination of Plan 3 was probably a bigger issue in higher education than any other group. With respect to the travel concern, Yunker indicated that consultant's who work with the PEBB Board didn't feel this was a problem since they can negotiate out-of-area coverage with all of the offered plans.

President-Elect Williamson, Engineering, questioned why Plan 3 subscribers weren't notified until the open enrollment period and asked if this method of notification would be repeated when other plans are canceled. Yunker stated that they found out in August that the plan changes were being made and most faculty were gone at that time. The logic was to send out notification close to the open enrollment period so subscriber's wouldn't put it aside and possibly lose it. Courtney indicated she had sent out a letter in September to those being affected at OSU.

Steve Davis, Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee Chair, explained that the benefit plan design process is moving quickly and he read a letter the committee is sending to the PEBB Board expressing their concerns about the changes.

Niess thanked the committee for their efforts and reported that she has been in contact with Kemble Yates, IFS President, who indicated that IFS is also considering providing input to the PEBB Board.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- PEBB Materials – The agenda contained materials to help explain the changes in PEBB health plans.
- Interinstitutional Faculty Senate – October IFS minutes were sent via e-mail.
- AAUP Response to Post-Tenure Review Guidelines – The OSU AAUP Chapter provided recommendations regarding the proposed guidelines on post-tenure review.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

1) Assessment of Teaching Task Force – Arnold has met with Niess to discuss the recommendations in the report. The first action step will be a discussion of the complete report with the Academic Deans. His responses to recommendations include:

- a) The Provost will reiterate the policy of student assessment of teaching in each class every term;
- b) Colleges and departments will be charged with the development of a set of survey questions, as described in the report;
- c) Peer review guidelines will be designed for evaluative purposes by colleges and departments;
- d) Colleges will develop a process used for evaluation of teaching that utilizes both student and peer assessment, to be submitted to the Provost for approval and consultation with the Promotion and Tenure and Advancement of Teaching Committees.
- e) In response to establishing a .5 FTE coordinator position, given OSU's budget circumstance, the university is not in a position this fiscal year to do so. The Advancement of Teaching Committee will be asked to develop a position description, with a target of filling the position in the summer of 1999.
- f) The Advancement of Teaching Committee is working on developing plans for a series of forums to create wider conversation about teaching excellence with the OSU community.

2) Budget Allocation Principles – A document was available outlining the new funding model, activities of the Budget Work Group and budget allocation principles developed by the group.

In response to Senator Seville, Business, questioning whether the OUS matrix was final, Arnold stated that it would never be final since it needs to be reviewed systematically.

3) Emergency Board Request Status – Materials were submitted for the November 19 and 20 Emergency Board meeting requesting funds to reflect substantial enrollment increases for OSU and OIT since both institutions exceeded their enrollment corridors. OIT's request is for \$294,415 and OSU is requesting \$3,271,845 for the current year. Arnold acknowledged the efforts of Associate Provost Hashimoto and Vice President Specter in compiling the information for the E-Board.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Niess' report included the following items:

- She has convened an Allocation Advisory Group to assist her in representing faculty perspectives on the University Internal Allocation Work Group.
- In response to a request from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate to endorse a specific process for nominating a faculty member to the OSBHE, Niess has asked the Bylaws and Nominations Committee to review the proposed process and provide a recommendation to the Senate. It is expected that nominations will be forwarded to IFS, via the OSU IFS representatives, by January 15, 1999. The proposed process will be presented in the form of a motion at the December meeting.
- Niess is working with Kevin McCann to develop a resolution of support for the OUS budget as it is being presented to the legislature. The resolution will be

provided to IFS for their consideration.

- In response to many concerns with respect to the purchase of Microsoft products, Niess has appointed a Microsoft Task Force to prepare and present a position paper no later than the end of Winter term. Norm Lederman is chairing the task force.
- As a result of the recommendations in the Information Services (IS) Task Force report, an Ad Hoc Information Services Committee has been established. The charges are to: review and provide input to IS policies and procedures, to consider the implementation of the recommendations, and to collaborate with IS, the Library and Instructional Development and Technology Committees and the Dean's Strategic Team on Computing to identify and articulate a vision for computing at OSU and to propose a comprehensive organizational and operational plan to assure a breadth of input from the OSU campus to IS long-range planning. Henry Sayre is chairing the committee.
- She challenged all Senators to become active in moving higher education forward by becoming involved with budget discussions, sharing the PEBB information, and engaging faculty in their apportionment unit in these discussions.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 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](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » October 1, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 541

October 1, 1998

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on October 1, 1998, at 2:30 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Maggie Niess. There were no corrections to the minutes of May 7, June 4 or June 15, 1998; they were declared approved.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports: President Paul Risser
- Committee Reports: Nominations and Bylaws
- Action Items: Installation of President-Elect and Assessment of Teaching Task Force Report [Motion 98-541-01]
- Discussion Item: Information Services Task Force Recommendations – Old Business: Vote of No Confidence Motion [Motion 98-541-02 through 03]
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Coakley, R. Robson; Cromack, B. Bond; Hart, B. McCullough; Jimmerson, K. Murphy; Neumann, S. Prows; and Shor, J. Van Vechton

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bontrager, Chambers, Cheeke, Cowles, deGeus, Elwood, Farnsworth, Franklin, Gomez, Gregerson, Heidel, Henthorne, Hooker, Huyer, Jepson, Jones, Kerkvliet, Mix, Randhawa, Righetti, Savage, and Savonen

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; K. Williamson, President-Elect; A. Wilcox, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; Ex-officios: R. Arnold, P. Lee, and J.A. Torres; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

J. Corbett, S. Francis, Z. Holmes, D. Johnson, R. Landau, L. Pribyl, and K. Steele

INSTALLATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT

Ken Williamson was installed as President-Elect by President Niess who publicly thanked him for volunteering over the summer to take on some of the President-Elect duties prior to his election.

SPECIAL REPORT

President Paul Risser

President Risser felt that all areas of the university were running well and noted several OSU accomplishments:

- Contributions to the foundation, primarily endowed funds, in the last year totalled \$40 million compared to \$29 million the previous year.
- Enrollment has been spectacular with the largest freshman class in 10 years and the largest one- year increase in 29 years.
- There are 65 sections of Odyssey courses being taught by outstanding researchers and volunteers.
- The exceptional SOAP and Connect '98 programs.
- Extension programs across the state are run largely by about 30,000 volunteers.

Risser then spoke about areas where accomplishments are in progress:

1) Gifts & Donations – In an effort to more effectively align all development, gift and fundraising activities, all these operations are being moved to the Foundation. Currently a CEO search is underway. The search committee consists of four members from the university and four from the Foundation.

2) Library Funding – Due to the Library's organizational structure within Information Services, they were being required to repay more of the debt than they actually incurred. Dr. Risser announced that, after a review by a Senate task force, the Library will not be required to repay any more debt than they incurred; their debt will be repaid over a six-year period. The Library budget will be increased at least 2% over the next two biennias.

He asked the Senate to work with the Provost, and perhaps the University Librarian and Dean's, to identify a group to think about the future of the Library since reinvesting in the established pattern may not be in OSU's best interest.

Risser noted that about \$240,000 was held back to add class sections and laboratories to accommodate the increased enrollment. He acknowledged that "faculty are simply having to work harder."

The short-term budgetary solution is to request additional funds from the Legislative Emergency Board in November. He noted that the groundwork is being laid and felt optimistic that the request will be granted to receive additional funds based on tuition.

The long-term solution concerns the funding formula from the state. The State Board has been working on revising the funding formula to focus on enrollment in the current year (rather than focusing on previous years under the BAS model) and funding is based on enrollment at each institution. The formula consists of two parts: 1) student driven -- numbers of students, kinds of subjects, class standing per student and cost within discipline; and 2) program parts -- funds programs such as Extension, Forest Research Laboratory and research. Under the research component, the state will provide an additional 4% to the university for research that faculty attract to OSU. An additional category is performance funding based on a set of criteria for each university. There are also special initiatives for areas such as Engineering and technology.

The document "The New Oregon University System Funding Model: Opportunities for Oregon State University" was available at the meeting. Dr. Risser asked all faculty to read and think about the document that describes the essence of the new funding model and describes the implications of the new formula.

An additional document, "Performance Goals and Objectives for Oregon State University and the President of Oregon State University" was also available. Risser noted that this is not a mission statement for the University but a statement about how OSU relates to the state system. He suggested that the Senate may want to appoint a body to study this document and, perhaps, make recommendations.

Risser felt that the opportunities for OSU are absolutely enormous and that OSU has built

an enviable record in the last two years. He noted that, although he wants things to proceed at a fast pace, it is acceptable to tell him that a slower pace needs to be observed.

Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, questioned the change in the funding process. Risser responded that initially the discussion focused on all students being funded the same, but classes are actually differentiated by level and cost of education. He stressed that the new formula is based, in part, on what peer institutions in other states are spending, which is frequently higher than our spending.

In response to Senator Giovannoni, Science, Risser indicated that student tuition waivers will have to be paid by each institution.

Responding to Senator DeKock, Science, Risser stated that the internal allocation has not yet been determined. He noted that an internal group consisting of Maggie Niess, Paul Farber, Brent Dalrymple, Fred Horne, Mark McCambridge and Andy Hashimoto have been meeting to discuss this issue.

Following Liberal Arts Senator Lunch's comments about the possibility of not fully funding the model, Senator Tate, Science, questioned whether fully funding the new model will be adequate. Risser responded that fully funding the model (\$115 million) puts the state very close to the average in Western states.

Senator Matzke, Science, questioned whether a potential source of funding would be to reduce the Chancellor's Office. Risser noted that there is a reduction in the funds handled by that office since the money will go directly to institutions. An additional question under consideration is whether each institution should have its own board which could mean that some responsibilities handled by the Chancellor's Office or State Board may then be handled by individual institutions. He felt that the new formula puts each institution on a more independent basis, thereby possibly reducing the need for Chancellor's Office staff.

ACTION ITEMS

Assessment of Teaching Task Force Report

President Niess reminded Senators that the report and recommendations were discussed at the June meeting and were on the agenda for approval. If approved, the report and recommendations will be forwarded to the Provost for implementation of the recommendations. Niess noted that Recommendation #6 has already been charged to the Advancement of Teaching Committee for implementation.

ZoeAnn Holmes, Task Force member, briefly described the process used by the task force to arrive at the final report. She reviewed the three criteria the Task Force was asked to address:

- 1) Evaluate and critique the efficacy of the university-wide Student Assessment of Teaching instrument and, if appropriate, propose a revision or replacement of this form.
- 2) Assess 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.
- 3) Recommend processes for both student assessment of teaching and peer assessment of teaching that consider recommendations for working with faculty to enhance their teaching.

Following are the recommendations proposed for approval:

- 1) Student assessment of teaching should be conducted in each class every term.
- 2) For evaluative processes (P&T and other personnel matters requiring evaluation),

each college should design a minimum set of survey questions for student assessment of teaching that will be used by all teaching faculty in the college; each department should add questions to the college set to assist in evaluations at the department level.

3) Each college should design a minimum set of peer review guidelines to be used for evaluative purposes. Each department should extend these guidelines to meet departmental specifics. Individual faculty members should further clarify with their peers the criteria to be used in the specific peer review.

4) Each college should develop a process for the assessment and evaluation of teaching that utilizes and integrates both student assessment and peer assessment. This process should be clearly described to the faculty and submitted to the Provost who, in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Advancement of Teaching Committee, approves the process as supporting both P&T and the enhancement of teaching.

5) The Provost should establish a minimum of a .5 FTE faculty position (with support personnel) as Coordinator of Teaching and Learning. The coordinator should be a faculty member with the widest possible successful teaching experience in a breadth of courses offered at OSU: services courses (such as Baccalaureate Core Courses), undergraduate and graduate teaching, etc. The coordinator should assist the various colleges and committees in focusing on questions surrounding the appropriate organizational support for faculty in on-going professional development for the enhancement of teaching and learning.

After two years, the Coordinator should work with the Advancement of Teaching Committee to conduct an evaluation of the teaching/learning processes at OSU and make recommendations for the advancement of OSU's commitment to the support of enhancing teaching and learning.

6) The Advancement of Teaching Committee of the Faculty Senate will develop a series of forums that should actively engage all OSU faculty in a discussion of the question: "What is effective teaching?"

Senator Manogue, Science, felt that Recommendation #3 is unclear about who actually decides what criteria will be used. Holmes responded that individual faculty members need to provide their course syllabuses and outlines to indicate how the guidelines relate to the course of their teaching. This was included as a result of the concern that faculty had no input. Niess added that, since the faculty member knows the course specifics and what they most need help with from their peers, this allows the faculty member to have some say in what is reviewed.

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, questioned the rights of faculty versus the peer review. Holmes responded that the faculty member has the right to refuse, at their own risk, to submit their syllabus, if requested. It's hoped that the department sets minimal requirements and leaves room for flexibility to allow the faculty member to provide information needed to evaluate the faculty member.

In response to Senator Morris, Science, Holmes stated that the task force does have procedures on file from other universities and is available on the web at <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/fs/tat/index.html>.

Senator Wood, Health & Human Performance, stated this his college instituted recommendations 3 and 4 over four years ago and noted that it is a completely open process and works well. He supported the recommendations presented.

Senator Landau, Science, was concerned that student evaluations sometimes distort what actually occurs in the classroom and questioned if this issue had been addressed. Niess responded that there was a great deal of discussion on this issue. She noted his concern is why recommendation #4 allows flexibility and leaves the process up to the

college. Landau encouraged student input, but felt that the input should be directed toward the instructor.

Senator Thies, Science, questioned why evaluations are not made public. Holmes stated that it is the understanding of the task force that the legislature prohibits the evaluation from being released to the public.

Motion 98-541-01 to accept the report and recommendations and send forward to the Provost for consideration and implementation passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Information Services Task Force Recommendations

President Niess explained that the task force was charged to analyze the causes of the Information Services (IS) budget deficit and make recommendations for preventing future budget deficits. She emphasized that their work has provided a tremendous service to OSU through their inquiries which provided them with a thorough understanding of the events. In addition to recognizing the task force members, she expressed appreciation to the administration for working with and responding to the task force. Niess noted that the report will be accepted following discussion, although motions or resolutions may be in order.

Tony Wilcox, Information Services Task Force Chair, briefly summarized the report and expressed a debt of gratitude to the task force members: Gary Beach, John Block and Bruce Sorte.

The task force received the following charge:

- Analyze the causes of the Information Services budget deficit.
- Analyze where the budget deficits had occurred, i.e., in which accounts.
- Relate the budget deficit reduction plan to the Information Services units responsible for the overspending.
- Offer recommendations for preventing future budget deficits in Information Services, in particular, and other units on campus, in general.

Several key factors that led to the deficit were discovered and are outlined in detail in the report:

- Conversion to FIS
- IS units simultaneously undergoing restructuring
- Lack of budgetary oversight
- University-wide budgeting challenges
- Institutional demands on IS

Their analysis was that an untimely convergence of multiple factors created circumstances that overwhelmed their ability to manage their budgets.

The deficit was \$2.1 million at the end of 1996, but was treated as a \$1 million deficit due to an advanced purchase. At the end of FY 1997, the deficit had risen to \$5.4 million according to task force findings.

The task force assigned responsibility for the deficit to:

* IS for its failure to integrate its financial management with its revised organizational structure and for failing to recognize that help was needed in the business office.

* The University for deficiencies in budgetary oversight and a failure to assume a greater responsibility for financial management when the deficit was first known.

The IS Task Force recommended that the following be implemented during the 1998-99 fiscal year:

1. Improve the fiscal practices of academic and administrative units of OSU by implementing the policies and procedures listed in the previous section.
2. Ensure that quarterly budget meetings of the President's Cabinet and the Deans continue. When problems are identified at these meetings, all participants should work collaboratively to review the specific issues, and the administrative or academic unit with budget difficulties should make commitments that will improve their budget situation.
3. Reinstate and continue the monthly Budget Status-At-A-Glance reports produced by the Office of Budgets & Planning for review by the President's Cabinet.
4. Develop and distribute monthly and quarterly budget reports in two forms:
 - a. Budget summary that indicates: what has been spent; what is committed; and what is left.
 - b. The percentage of what has been spent at particular times of the year compared to patterns in previous fiscal years.
5. Formalize the budgeting practices at OSU to assure that business managers know how to: build budgets, correct budget problems, make an OPE correction, analyze a budget, and so forth.
6. Update and distribute the OSU Budget Handbook on a regular basis.
7. Develop training workshop opportunities for individuals across campus with budgetary and fiscal responsibilities. The Office of Budgets and Planning and the Office of Business Affairs should jointly offer this training program.
8. Implement a process that progressively removes budget authority from units that are unable to balance their budgets.
9. Conduct regular budget and financial audits of administrative and academic units.
10. Build unit budgets based upon current needs and resources, independent of historical budgeting.
11. Create reporting responsibilities for the University Librarian to both the Associate Provost for IS and to the Provost and Executive Vice President. The University Librarian should report to the Associate Provost for Information Services in areas that relate to integrating information services, and to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in areas relating to the role of the Valley Library in the academic mission of the University.
12. Secure from Central Administration a commitment that the IS deficit reduction must not involve the serials and monograph acquisition budgets.
13. Limit the Valley Library deficit-reduction payback to the level of its overspending in creating the deficit, which was \$751,417.
14. Require that the funds used to restore the monograph budget (University reserve funds and Library endowment funds) also reduce the deficit payback expected of the Library.
15. Rename the Faculty Senate Instructional Development and Technology Committee and revise its standing rules.
16. Review the rate structure of Telecommunications.
17. Request that Information Services articulate a vision for computing at OSU that includes network operating systems, personal computer operating systems, and supported software. There was no discussion on the report or recommendations.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Nominations & Bylaws Committee

Tony Wilcox, Bylaws & Nominations Committee Chair, outlined the nomination process for Senate elections and duties for upcoming vacancies.

The committee has already sent out a notice calling for nominations for President-Elect, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Representative and Executive Committee members. Candidates will be presented at the November meeting. He emphasized that, if nominations are made from the floor at the November meeting,

the nominator must have previously received consent from the nominee to have their name placed on the ballot.

Wilcox noted that President-Elect candidates must be a current or previous Senator.

The IFS parallels the Faculty Senate and represents the institution at the state level; candidates need not have prior Senate service.

Ballots for President-Elect and IFS Representative will be distributed in November to all eligible faculty.

Executive Committee candidates must be current Senators and will be voted on by Senators at the December Senate meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- As a result of the summer elections, Ken Williamson was elected Faculty Senate President-Elect.
- Faculty Senate Calendar – All meetings are scheduled in the LaSells Stewart Center Construction & Engineering Hall:

January 7, 1999
February 4, 1999
March 4, 1999
April 1, 1999
May 6, 1999
June 3, 1999

- President Niess encouraged assistance from faculty in appointing students to Senate committees and councils.
- A membership roster for all Faculty Senate Committees and Councils was included in the agenda.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Niess' report included the following items:

- She particularly thanked Dick Weinman for his assistance as moderator on University Day, as well as thanks to Ken Krane and Ken Williamson who both volunteered to assist with preparations in the absence of a President-Elect.
- 9 Month vs. 12 Month Salary Issue – Due to implementation of new software, a program was developed which meant that 9-month faculty would take a pay cut on a monthly basis following a 60% taxable draw in September. After Niess prepared a spread sheet for administration showing the pay cut, a solution was worked out for a no-interest draw of 60%. The draw was implemented because the legislature won't allow the type of pay redistribution necessary. If the legislature does not change the law, OSU administration has pledged to continue this process to avoid hurting faculty if they elect a 12-month salary distribution. Niess noted that this problem was solved in a two-week period once it was identified. This is another example of the administration working with faculty on faculty issues.
- Budget – OSU must determine an internal budget allocation for the money that

will come from OUS. The budget work group has been charged to guide the dialog to develop an internal budget allocation process to be presented to President Risser in January. Niess has met with the Executive Committee and committee/council chairs and has charged each committee/council to meet to suggest what principles should be used to develop the model. Senators will be involved via the Senate listserv. Input from faculty is highly encouraged and Senators were challenged to involve faculty they represent.

- Health Benefits – Niess reported that SEBB and BUBB has merged to create PEBB, which agreed there would be no increase in costs. After reviewing the various benefit packages, Blue Cross/Blue Shield Option 3 (which affects numerous OSU faculty) was eliminated since there was a higher than expected premium cost for this plan. PEBB maintains that Blue Cross Co-pay Plan offers a less expensive alternative with comparable or better benefits, Blue Cross Plan II offers somewhat decreased benefits with considerable savings in the form of cash back.
- As a result of this decision, without faculty input, faculty have since made known to the PEBB Board that HMO's do not adequately serve those who travel outside the U.S. Since there is some question as to what benefits will be available beyond 1999, Niess encouraged faculty to inform the PEBB Board members of important components in a health benefits package.
- OSBHE Faculty Member – Niess noted an ongoing concern that faculty don't seem to be well represented externally. The Governor intends to appoint a faculty member to the State Board of Higher Education and Niess plans to work with IFS and AAUP to gain faculty representation.
- Committees – The Baccalaureate Core Committee has been asked to review the Baccalaureate Core and Difference, Power and Discrimination courses. The Curriculum Council and Graduate Council have been challenged to look at the length of time it takes to accomplish tasks. An Ad Hoc Information Services Committee has been established in response to the Information Services Task Force report. The Committee, chaired by Henry Sayre, will work with the Instructional Development and Technology Committee and Information Services to obtain input. The Library Committee will be charged with determining requirements to obtain Association for Research Libraries (ARL) status. The Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee will provide input on merit increases. The Bylaws and Nominations Committee has been asked to review the election procedures.

OLD BUSINESS

Vote of No Confidence Motion

Niess explained that, in June, Senators voted to postpone definitely until October a motion of no confidence in President-Elect Robin Rose. Since the motion is no longer pertinent due to the resignation of Rose, Niess asked Senators how they wished to handle the motion.

The motion read: *The Faculty Senate give its President-Elect, Dr. Robin Rose, a vote of no confidence.*

Senator Gardner, Science, moved to postpone the motion indefinitely; motion seconded.

Senator Morris, Science, expressed his opinion that the Senate should have voted down the motion in June in view of an individual's freedom of speech. He spoke against the postponement motion and felt the issue itself should be voted on.

Senator Gardner's opinion of the meaning of the motion was different from Senator Morris'. Gardner did not feel that the motion dealt with Rose's freedom of speech.

In response to Senator Robson, Science, questioning why the motion could not be withdrawn, Parliamentarian Iltis explained that only the maker of the motion could request to withdraw it, and Mike Caudle was not present. If the motion is postponed indefinitely, it does not express the will of the body, but will effectively kill the motion; although it could be activated at some later time.

Senator Frank, Liberal Arts, didn't understand the meaning of voting either against or for a motion pertaining to an individual who no longer holds office.

Senator Plant called for the question. Motion 98-541-03 to end debate passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Motion 98-541- 02 to postpone indefinitely the motion of no confidence passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:14 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](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » June 15, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 540

June 15, 1998

For All Faculty

A special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on June 15, 1998, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Maggie Niess.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Resolution to declare the President-Elect position vacant; Special election procedures; and Slate of Nominees [Motion 98–540–01 through 06]
- New Business: Motion to condemn harassing actions and encourage free and open debate [Motion 98–540–05 through 07]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Campbell, H. Sayre; Candolfi, R. William; Hoogesteger, E. Hansen; Isensee, P. Brown; Lundy, C. Bell; Moon, C. Sproul; Oriard, D. Hart; Peters, E. Gonzales-Berry; Sandstrom, D. Denning; Tate, K. Krane; and Tiedeman, D. Plaza

Members Absent Without Representation:

Biwan, Bontrager, Breen, Brodie, Budd, Carson, Caspers, Chambers, Champeau, Cheeke, Cornell, Cowles, Crateau, deGeus, DeKock, Elwood, P. Farber, V. Farber, Farnsworth, K. Field, Fisk, Gamroth, Green, Gregerson, Hale, Hathaway, Heidel, Hemphill, Henderson, Hooker, Huber, Huyer, Jepson, Jones, Kerkvliet, Lajtha, Levine, Locke, Lowrie, McDaniel, McEwan, Nelson, Neumann, Plant, Randhawa, Reed, Righetti, Rossignol, Schowalter, Shor, Sorte, Thies, Williams, Winograd, Yamada, and Yim

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant

Guests of the Senate:

B. Brose, S. Butler, J. Estimada, T. Finch, S. Francis, A. Helle, J. Hendricks, B. Wilkins, and L. Wood

ACTION ITEMS

Resolution to Declare the President-Elect Position Vacant

President Niess reported that she had received a letter from Robin Rose resigning his position as President-Elect, effective June 9, 1998. She stated that the Bylaws are clear that a vacancy in the position must be filled by an election of the entire faculty; there are no provisions for succession. The Senate must approve the following items prior to an election:

- 1) The position must be declared vacant.
- 2) Special election procedures must be identified.
- 3) A slate of nominees must be presented at a Senate meeting, with the opportunity for additional nominations from the floor.

Niess noted that the duties of the President-Elect are extensive during the summer with the planning of University Day and the absence of a person in this position would clearly jeopardize the work of the Senate. In addition, there is no allowance in the Bylaws with respect to succession to the position of President-Elect. For these reasons, the Executive Committee (EC) voted to call this special meeting. and the absence of a person in this position would clearly jeopardize the work of the Senate. In addition, there is no allowance in the Bylaws with respect to succession to the position of President-Elect. For these reasons, the Executive Committee (EC) voted to call this special meeting.

Resolution

Whereas Article VI, Section 4 requires the Faculty Senate to declare a resigned position vacant, therefore,

Be it resolved that the OSU Faculty Senate declares the position of President-Elect vacant.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, felt this was a terrible thing to happen. Rather than vote on the outlined procedure, he suggested that the Senate vote on whether or not to accept Robin Rose's resignation. Niess explained that, under the Bylaws, it is not up to the body to accept or reject the resignation. Daley insisted the Senate had to vote to accept or reject the resignation since it goes against freedom of speech, it will hurt equal opportunity and look bad in the press. Niess conferred with the Parliamentarian and reported that it was her understanding that we cannot suspend the Bylaws since they do not allow us to reject the resignation. Daley argued that freedom of speech is paramount and a solution must be found.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, urged Senators to separate two issues: 1) The circumstances under which Rose resigned, which Foster found unfortunate at least and despicable at worst. He acknowledged that the circumstances probably impinge on Rose's constitutional freedom of speech.
2) The issue before the body today is to deal with the situation where there currently is not a Senate President- Elect.

Parliamentarian Ittis stated that the Bylaws are clear in that when someone resigns, the President accepts the resignation and the Senate declares a vacancy. He also indicated that the Senate could choose to not declare a vacancy, but would need to determine an alternate course of action.

Senator Mallory-Smith, Agricultural Sciences, supported Senator Daley's position.

Niess assured the Senate it was clear to her that the only option she had was to accept his resignation. She welcomed any Senator to go to the Senate Office to read Rose's letter of resignation.

Upon the request of Senator Daley, Parliamentarian Ittis indicated the following options for voting: postpone, lay on the table, or defeat the motion to declare the position vacant.

Senator Daley called for the question, which was seconded. Motion 98-540-02 to close debate was approved by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

The main motion (motion 98-540-01), consisting of the resolution, was approved by voice vote with dissenting votes. The position was declared vacant.

President Niess read the proposed election procedures, which constituted a motion for approval: Pursuant to Article VI, Section 4, the OSU Faculty Senate adopts the following

- procedures for a special election: a) The election will commence immediately after approval of a special election; ballots will be due in the Faculty Senate Office no later than 5:00 PM July 17; results will be announced July 20.
- b) Official current University personnel statistics will be the basis for determining voting eligibility.
- c) The Bylaws and Nominations Committee will present nominees for the position of President-Elect.
- d) Nominations will be accepted from the floor.

A suggestion was made from the floor that, perhaps someone could be appointed to assume the duties until September when an election could be held. Niess stated that the motion could be amended, but cautioned that a volunteer would be assuming the duties of the President-Elect. Parliamentarian Iltis read Article V, Section 2 which states "All faculty...shall be eligible to vote in the nomination and election of Senate Officers." He noted it is the right of every faculty member to choose the President-Elect and it is clearly not the right of anyone to impose their will and have a stand-in for this office.

Motion 98-540-03 to approve the proposed election procedures passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Niess explained that, in preparation for this meeting, the EC asked the Bylaws and Nominations Committee to prepare a slate of nominees for the vacated position. Niess noted that nominations would be accepted from the floor after the slate was read, but nominees must have given prior consent to be nominated. Senator Daley objected to the requirement of receiving prior consent. President Niess stated that this requirement was clearly stated in the agenda sent to Senators on June 11. Parliamentarian Iltis interjected that the Bylaws had been followed in the preparation of a special meeting, which only requires a 24-hour notice. He noted that the reason for the expediency stemmed from the fact that, according to the Bylaws, after June 15 the EC had the power to act on behalf of the entire Senate. The EC felt it was better to have this democratic body take up its right to engage the nomination process rather than have the EC determine the process. Senator Daley viewed this process as indecent haste and felt that the EC took a stronger role than is appropriate, regardless of the Bylaws; he felt this was completely wrong. Niess indicated that these very issues are on the agenda for the next EC meeting and she has requested the Bylaws and Nominations Committee review the Bylaws.

Ken Krane, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented a slate of two candidates: Henry Sayre, Professor of Art and Kenneth Williamson, Professor of Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering. President Niess stated that both nominees have agreed to stand for election and called for nominations from the floor.

In response to Senator Daley nominating Robin Rose, President Niess called that nomination out of order. She explained that the Bylaws specify that any officer who has served more than four months is ineligible to serve during a two-year period.

Senator Matzke, Science, nominated Larry Daley from the floor; Daley accepted the nomination which was second ed.

Senator Lunch moved to close the nominations, which was seconded. Motion 98-540-04 to close nominations for the position of President-Elect passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

President Niess will appoint a ballot counting committee consisting of four faculty. Ken Krane and Tony Wilcox have been appointed, but she invited two others to volunteer.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Seville, Business, moved that the Faculty Senate condemn the harassing actions

directed at Robin Rose in response to his expression of his opinion and that the Faculty Senate go on record as encouraging free and open debate of issues on campus; motion was seconded.

Senator Warner, Liberal Arts, felt that those were two very separate issues and suggested that they be dealt with separately.

Senator Rosenberger, Liberal Arts, noted she saw the public part of the debate and felt that should be occurring on a college campus. She acknowledged there may have been other things impugning character, but there would need to be clear evidence prior to action on this motion.

In response to Senator Burton's comment that unlawful harassment should be investigated, Niess assured the Senate that Rose was encouraged to notify authorities.

Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, was bothered by everything about this situation. He noted there was a lot of impugning of various people, both by Rose and by those unfairly impugning him. He felt that the situation was being extended by now wanting to condemn those who condemned him.

Senator Coakley, Science, felt that the second part of the motion has real merit and that the Senate has supported this position in the past. Niess indicated it is possible to divide a motion. Senator Gardner moved to divide the motion to read: I move that the Faculty Senate go on record as encouraging free and open debate of issues on campus; motion was seconded. Motion 98-540-05 to divide the question passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

The first motion, as printed below, was then opened for discussion.

The Faculty Senate condemn the harassing actions directed at Robin Rose in response to his expression of his opinion.

Senator Matzke felt this motion should be defeated until evidence is presented.

Senator Lee, Science, moved to table this motion; motion was seconded. Senator Graham, Business, questioned what this motion meant. Niess explained that it would need to be removed from the table by a Senator no later than the December meeting. Motion 98-540-06 to table the first part of the divided motion condemning harassing actions passed by a show of hands with 43 in favor and 31 opposed.

Motion 98-540-07 to pass the second part of the motion regarding free and open debate of issues passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

President Niess expressed appreciation to all Senators for taking the time to deal with this situation.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant

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

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » June 4, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 539

June 4, 1998

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on June 4, 1998, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Maggie Niess.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Consideration of Degree Candidates; Category I Proposals: consolidating programs to create a Bachelor of Science in Fisheries & Wildlife Science and a name change to the Department of Environmental and Molecular Toxicology; revisions to AR 2 & 14; Difference, Power and Discrimination Resolution [Motion 98–539–01 through 10]
- Discussion Item: Assessment of Teaching Task Force Report
- New Business: [Motion 98–539–12 through 13]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Campbell, L. Roberts; Cornell, R. Rodriguez; Graham, Denning; Kerkvliet, I. Tinsley; Nelson, Williamson; Pereira, R. Robson; Peters, D. Plaza; and Primak, S. Crust

Members Absent Without Representation:

Cheeke, Cowles, Daniels, Elwood, Farnsworth, Foster, Frank, Gregerson, Hale, Huyer, Jepson, Leong, Levine, Lomax, Longerbeam, Mallory-Smith, Powelson, Reed, Righetti, Riven, Rose, Schowalter, and van der Mars

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant

Guests of the Senate:

B. Balz, M. Fraundorf, E. Fritzell, A. Hashimoto, G. Hobart, N. Hoffman, Z. Holmes, H. Hoogesteger, D. Johnson, R. Landau, P. Lee, F. Miller, L. Pinto, S. Prock, M. Prucha, J. Ringle, J. Schuster, R. Schwartz, M. Spraggins, B. Stroh meyer, and C. VanAlstine

ACTION ITEMS

Consideration of Degree Candidates

Barbara Balz, Registrar, recommended for approval the proposed lists of degree candidates and honors subject to final confirmation of all degree requirements. There were 3,318 students who were candidates for 3,393 degrees which included: 2,480 Bachelors, 681 Masters, 187 Doctors and 45 Professional Doctor degrees. There were also 71 students who were candidates for two degrees and two students who were candidates for three degrees.

The Class of 1998, OSU's 129th graduating class, had 481 seniors who qualify for

Academic Distinction and included 237 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50–3.69), 132 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70–3.84), and 112 'summa cum laude' (gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 98-539-01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Category I Proposals

Bob Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented two Category I proposals for approval: 1) Consolidation of Two Existing Baccalaureate Degree Programs Into a New Program Leading to the Bachelor of Science in Fisheries & Wildlife Science and 2) a name change from the Department of Agricultural Chemistry to the Department of Environmental and Molecular Toxicology.

Burton indicated that the Fisheries & Wildlife Science proposal is revenue neutral and was unanimously approved by the Curriculum Council. Consolidation of the Fisheries Science and Wildlife Science degrees will allow the department to have one degree with many options.

Senator Fisk, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, questioned the omission of oceanic courses in the proposal. Erik Fritzell, Fisheries & Wildlife Department Head, responded that the degree program has marine fisheries courses taught at the Hatfield Marine Science Center (HMSC). He also noted that students who take the specialty option with the title "marine" in it, would be required to attend the courses at HMSC. However, they are not required courses for all students. Senator Fisk commented that no oceanic courses at the 100400 level are offered in the program. Fritzell felt that there will be more students choosing to take oceanic courses, as well as other disciplines. This program will be a much more student centered curriculum which will require more advising.

Senator Fisk moved that a 300 level oceanographic course, specifically OC 331, be added to the Fishery Science Option in the grouping of classes containing Z 361, ENT 433 and FW 494; motion was seconded. In response to Senator Coakley questioning what the class was, Fisk indicated Introduction to Oceanography was a junior level course in all aspects of marine science.

Senator Thies, Science, felt that OC 331 was too general and not appropriate for this purpose.

Senator Mix, Science, felt that fine tuning the proposal should be up to the department or committee rather than the Faculty Senate.

Motion 98-539-03 to amend the Fishery Science Option to add OC 331 was defeated by voice vote with one vote in favor.

Senator Manogue, Science, commented that it appears there is quite a lot of curriculum reform in the proposal and questioned what is new or different about the proposal. Fritzell felt that the biggest change was the way in which education is approached, consisting of more integration and by engaging students in the process of developing their own education. There is also an additional internship requirement and a group problem-solving exercise.

Motion 98-539-02 to approve the Consolidation of Two Existing Baccalaureate Degree Programs Into a New Program Leading to the Bachelor of Science in Fisheries & Wildlife Science passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

In relation to the second proposal, Burton noted that every Agricultural Chemistry course above the 400 level has the word "toxicology" or "environment" in its title. There are two basic types of researchers in the department, Environmental Toxicologists and Molecular

Toxicologists. The name change is aimed at bringing the department up to date and to make it consistent with the professional communities.

A comment from the audience indicated that the structure looks like a nightmare and questioned if there has been any consideration to simplify the proposal. Ian Tinsley, Agricultural Chemistry Chair, indicated that toxicology interacts across a wide range of biological emphasis and two centers listed in the proposal have been very involved in the toxicology program for a number of years. He didn't feel the structure was a major issue since faculty in the center programs are already involved in the toxicology program.

Motion 98-539-04 to rename the Department of Agricultural Chemistry to the Department of Environmental and Molecular Toxicology passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Burton then provided an update on the Category I proposals which were postponed in January. The Environmental Sciences proposal is fairly far along and is being studied by the College of Science Curriculum Committee; it is expected to be on the table at the November Senate meeting.

The Natural Resources proposal is not as far along and may take longer to reach the approval stage.

Proposed Changes to Academic Regulations 2 and 14

Marshall English, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, presented proposed changes to Academic Regulations 2 and 14.

English noted that AR 2, as approved in May, contained an error. He proposed the following revision to paragraph c. concerning articulation agreements, as outlined in the May agenda materials [strike-throughs indicate portions to be deleted]:

Credit will be awarded only upon the recommendation of the appropriate department and college, ~~and approval by the Academic Requirements Committee.~~

Motion 98-939-05 to delete the above section of AR 2 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

In his introduction of AR 14, English explained that the proposal originated with the Liberal Arts Curriculum Committee who felt that attendance is fundamental and that the proposed change, below, would clear up ambiguity on attendance [highlighted sections indicate sections to be added and strike-throughs indicate sections to be deleted]:

~~An instructor has the privilege of considering class participation in arriving at a student's grade, but it is not intended that attendance in and of itself shall normally be a factor in measuring a student's academic accomplishment in a course.~~ Attendance is one of the most important factors in students' academic success. Therefore, an instructor may consider attendance in arriving at a student's grade. While attendance should not be the primary factor in determining a student's academic accomplishment in a course, it may be used as a partial measure of performance.

Motion 98-938-06 to approve the proposed change to AR 14 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Difference, Power and Discrimination

President Niess reported that, in light of recent discussion surrounding the Difference, Power and Discrimination (DPD) program funding, the Executive Committee voted to

present a motion to obtain a sense of the Senate concerning support of the program. She then briefly presented background information on the DPD program:

1) July 1991 – President Byrne and Faculty Senate President ZoeAnn Holmes formed the Cultural Diversity Course Development Committee based on a recommendation from the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) and the Executive Committee. The BCC drafted structural elements necessary to make Affirming Diversity an area of the Baccalaureate Core to begin the work.

2) November 1991 – The Committee reported a name change from Cultural Diversity to Affirming Diversity.

3) January 1992 – The Committee reported moving away from the development of a single course to multiple courses. The Committee suggested a change in the title from Affirming Diversity to Confronting Prejudice and Discrimination. The explanation of difference was that cultural diversity seeks to have students and faculty look outward while the proposed course asks individuals to look inward in the context of diversity. Senators recommended a more positive label. The Committee also recommended the need for a full time person to run the program.

4) April 1992 – The Committee announced the summer diversity workshop was developed to deal with cultural diversity, power and discrimination issues for faculty to complete course revisions. Faculty were also reminded that the course will take three of the floating credits in the Baccalaureate Core. The Committee also recommended that the title be Difference, Power and Discrimination since this title is the most descriptive and accurate and has the appropriate connotations. The Committee also proposed a list of six criteria proposed for faculty to use in course development, and recommended selecting a program coordinator (to begin in September 1992) and summer workshop director for Summer 1992.

5) May 1992 – Approval of motion that set the criteria for the DPD category of the Baccalaureate Core and course approval process. The Provost indicated funding commitment for the biennium as this was an institutional priority to move forward. The coordinator position was set at .5 FTE.

6) During ensuing years, the program development was successful in identifying a program in support of faculty development of DPD courses and in teaching these courses. However, the number of courses hoped for was never attained.

7) April 1998 – DPD Advisory Council members indicated there is a crucial need for additional DPD courses in the Baccalaureate Core and for continued support of faculty who teach DPD courses. The Council requested that \$56,396 be placed in the budget for next year to provide the needed support. Prior to this biennium, the program had been funded with approximately \$100,000 per year. Because of funding difficulties, it appeared unlikely that funding would be restored.

8) May 1998 – Faculty Senate President Niess requested the administration reconsider the budgeting with respect to DPD. Recognizing that the general education funds were severely limited, she asked if there were other potential sources of funds that could be used for this important area.

In response to the last concern, the Executive Committee developed the motion printed below. The intent is to record the Sense of the Senate six years after the initial approval for DPD. At the time the motion was developed, DPD funding had not been restored, however, funding has now been identified to support a part-time interim director with the intent of developing a long range plan that is based on an assessment of DPD, the strengths and what needs to be done in order to achieve a sufficient number of DPD courses and provide necessary support for faculty. Much progress has been made through the hard work of the DPD Advisory Committee and faculty in their work with Andy Hashimoto. President Niess commended them for their efforts in changing the direction of the discourse to be constructive and productive.

Sense of the Senate Motion

The Oregon State University Faculty Senate reaffirms its support of the Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD) requirement in the Baccalaureate Core, and strongly urges the OSU Administration to budget funds on an immediate priority basis to fund fully the DPD Director position and the DPD faculty and curriculum development program.

Senator Plant, Engineering, reported that he polled his department and, of those who responded (6-1), they supported courses in the Baccalaureate Core but, in light of finances, they are not in favor of this motion.

Senator Carson, Liberal Arts, emphasized that a director is necessary to continue helping faculty develop courses since the development often involves a rethinking in the ways in which subject matter can be conceptualized. She also noted it is absolutely critical that the director be responsible for running the Center. Her experience as a participant in the DPD seminar was extremely rigorous, as well as invigorating, and it takes money to support faculty who participate in the summer and to support the director, who is a hands-on teacher during the seminar.

Lani Roberts, Liberal Arts, announced that an informal agreement has been reached between the Provost's Office and DPD Advisory Council to fund the program at around \$16,000 for the rest of the biennium and to consider future funding of about \$56,000. This last amount would fund the seminar, stipends, office, and support faculty. She suggested that the "full funding" wording in the resolution was, perhaps, a flexible term. Niess acknowledged that this term was chosen since various funding amounts were being discussed.

Senator Gross, Liberal Arts, added that Associate Provost Hashimoto is seeking outside funding for the program.

In response to Senator Grunder, Science, questioning if the success of the DPD program had been evaluated, Senator Gross noted that is the intent of the director for next year.

Senator Collins, Liberal Arts, was impressed at a recent DPD meeting with the depth of feeling from students of color in terms of what they think DPD is accomplishing to make their life better. Collins felt it was important to support this motion and let the students know the faculty are behind this program.

Senator Plant noted that it's necessary to cut things when times are tight, rather than continue funding everything, and felt that there were enough DPD courses in the catalog to satisfy all the graduates currently in programs. In response, Roberts indicated that the DPD courses began in fall 1994 and seniors graduating this year were not likely to have been required to fulfill the requirement. It probably won't be known until a year from now whether there are enough available courses, or if graduating seniors may be impacted.

Senator Matzke, Science, supported the motion but cautioned that the university would be better off by developing a structure that rewards departments that develop DPD courses so there eventually won't be a need for a director.

Senator Morris, Science, moved to amend the motion to strike the word "fully." The motion was seconded; there was no discussion. Motion 98-539-09 to amend the motion passed with two dissenting votes.

Senator Tate, Science, questioned how long the director position would continue. Senator Gross responded it would continue until there are adequate courses. She also noted that the assessment next year will include the role of the director.

Senator Plant was puzzled why this program needs a director when it wasn't necessary

for the synthesis courses. Senator Coblentz, Agricultural Sciences, responded that courses educating incoming students how to live in a multicultural/multiracial society should be incorporated into the curriculum and instructors need to be taught how to incorporate them. Senator Rodriguez (pro-tem), Liberal Arts, felt that, as a matter of principle, if OSU is going to 1) commit to diversity in its mission statement and 2) open up people's minds against prejudice in its guidelines on the web, then that diversity cannot be tokenism. Those teaching the courses need to understand different ethnic backgrounds.

Senator Gardner, Science, felt it was clear that this body supports diversity, but there are concerns about its direction and the faculty is eagerly awaiting its evaluation. Gardner then called for the question. Motion 98-539-10 to call for the question passed by voice vote with no some dissenting votes.

Motion 98-539-08 to approve the Sense of the Senate motion, as amended, passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Assessment of Teaching Task Force Report

ZoeAnn Holmes, task force member, presented the report for discussion. She briefly outlined each charge to the task force and recommendations and rationale related to each charge:

Charge I. Evaluate and critique the efficacy of the university-wide Student Assessment of Teaching instrument and, if appropriate, propose a revision or replacement of this form.

Recommendation 1: Student assessment of teaching should be conducted in each class every term.

Rationale: Students feel like they are disenfranchised when they don't have a chance to provide formal input on courses. From a faculty perspective, it allows the establishment of a database that statistically gives strength to the assessment tool.

Recommendation 2: For evaluative processes (P&T and other personnel matters requiring evaluation), each college should design a minimum set of survey questions for student assessment of teaching that will be used by all teaching faculty in the college; each department should add questions to the college set to assist in evaluations at the department level.

Rationale: This university is amazingly diverse and one form does not adequately assess all disciplines of the university.

Charge II. Assess 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.

Recommendation 3: Each college should design a minimum set of peer review guidelines to be used for evaluative purposes. Each department should extend these guidelines to meet departmental specifics. Individual faculty members should further clarify with their peers the criteria to be used in the specific peer review.

Rationale: Although there is a peer evaluation in place in most units, it is frequently not in written form and not all faculty are aware of the process. This would allow flexibility for the uniqueness of each unit.

Charge III. Recommend processes for both student assessment of teaching and peer assessment of teaching that consider recommendations for working with faculty to

enhance their teaching.

Recommendation 4: Each college should develop a process for the assessment and evaluation of teaching that utilizes and integrates both student assessment and peer assessment. This process should be clearly described to the faculty and submitted to the Provost who, in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, approves the process as supporting both P&T and the enhancement of teaching.

Rationale: Provides flexibility to the colleges in developing a process that will meet P&T requirements as well as the needs of faculty or graduate teaching assistants for support in the enhancement of teaching.

Recommendation 5: The Provost should establish a minimum of a .5 FTE faculty position (with support personnel) as Coordinator of Teaching and Learning. The coordinator should be a faculty member with the widest possible successful teaching experience in a breadth of courses offered at OSU: services courses (such as Baccalaureate Core Courses), undergraduate and graduate teaching, etc. The coordinator should assist the various colleges and committees in focusing on questions surrounding the appropriate organizational support for faculty in ongoing professional development for the enhancement of teaching and learning.

After two years, the Coordinator should work with the Advancement of Teaching Committee to conduct an evaluation of the teaching/learning processes at OSU and make recommendations for the advancement of OSU's commitment to the support of enhancing teaching and learning.

Rationale: Bring together teaching and mentoring groups and processes available on campus.

Recommendation 6: The Advancement of Teaching Committee of the Faculty Senate will develop a series of forums that should actively engage all OSU faculty in a discussion of the question: "What is effective teaching?"

Rationale: Engage faculty in the debate and clarification of defining effective teaching through a series of forums during the next academic year.

Senator Shor, Engineering, felt that rather than funding a coordinator, the money should be used to support faculty who can assist other faculty to upgrade their teaching. Holmes indicated that responses from focus groups stated this type of activity is now available and the group didn't feel it was necessary to be included in the proposal.

Senator Landau (pro-tem) Science, expressed concern that student evaluations often seem like a popularity contest and felt that students should have responsibility in the process. He objected to students who don't do the homework evaluating whether the instructor was effective; he felt this responsibility should be built into the system.

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, stated that the forms are helpful but felt that they are largely a reaction to how students feel about an instructor rather than a course evaluation. He also suggested that students should indicate whether or not they learned anything in the course.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, felt that peer review can be useful as well as a source of pressure.

Senator Schwartz, task force member, commented that student assessment forms are attitude surveys and are intended to be used in conjunction with the peer review. He felt that few questions that provide legitimate answers. He suggested that the way to determine whether students are learning is to give them entrance and exit exams. He also stated that the task force is insistent that the student assessment be only one

component of the evaluation of instruction.

Robby Robson, Science, stated that the Honors College has an alternate form of student assessment of teaching involving group interviews of students conducted by an evaluator and questioned if this process had been considered. He also noted that it is fairly well accepted in distance education that standard student evaluations are not necessarily appropriate in a distance setting. He suggested there may be a mechanism to set different standards across colleges. Holmes responded that one goal is to be flexible in the evaluation process.

Senator Rodriguez commended the task force on the report. He suspected that the term "clients", used on page 3 of the report, is synonymous with "students" preceding it and suggested omitting "clients." In reference to the "Selected Bibliography" page, he felt there was a certain pattern in the journals being drawn from and suggested that the task force look at others. He also noted that page 5 of the report indicates that "Research supports nine key characteristics," but Appendix A lists only five. Holmes noted that the suggestions would be taken under consideration. She also indicated that the task force talked about the terms "students" and "clients" and they are interested in instruction, regardless of who is being instructed.

Duane Johnson, Promotion & Tenure Committee Chair, stated that his Committee strongly encourages usage of both "students" and "clients" since many off-campus faculty are teaching non-credit courses to audiences and are expected to be evaluated in the same way as faculty teaching in the classroom. He also noted that the university has a focus on excellence in teaching and the process of both this report and the Post-Tenure Review Task Force speak to helping faculty being more effective as teachers; it is not seen as being a punitive process. The P&T Committee also encourages the option of allowing the student or learner to give no opinion; they should not be forced to evaluate a criteria if they do not have an opinion.

Senator Burton, Science, questioned whether the Teaching Portfolio Guidelines in Appendix C were being recommended. Holmes noted that the task force is not recommending the material contained in the appendices. Although the appendices were used in the development of the recommendations, they are not being recommended based on input from the focus groups.

The report will be presented for approval at the October Senate meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- Guidelines to accompany the previously accepted Post-Tenure Review Task Force report will be presented to the Senate for approval in the fall.
- Sandra Woods has resigned from the Executive Committee and, in accordance with the Bylaws, has been replaced by Phyllis Lee who will complete her term through December 1999. President Niess expressed appreciation for Woods' help on the Executive Committee.
- President Niess thanked all committee members and chairs for their efforts during the past year. She also expressed thanks to Senators who will be retiring in June.

REPORT FORM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold's report included the following items:

Dr. Arnold stated that the DPD Advisory Committee will meet on June 12; their discussion will focus on the specifics of implementing decisions made regarding next year, as well as to initiate planning and assessment activities. He noted there has been significant involvement on the part of students in this conversation and felt that ongoing

student input needs to be continued.

President Risser and Provost Arnold have been meeting with college and faculty/staff groups. Questions and concerns emerging from these meetings include looking ahead in terms of the future and what the timing is in terms of a better resource situation for OSU, and the priorities, process and decision-making that will determine how resources are allocated at OSU. These meetings have been helpful in that there are emerging conceptual models to be considered when resources are allocated, such as: 1) looking at benchmark data; 2) strategic investments – where are there opportunities for investments in programs that would generate more net students/revenues; and 3) performance indicators – graduation and retention rate, external support, diversity, etc.

Senator Lundy, Engineering, questioned if there was a sense of how additional revenues would be distributed. Arnold responded that it would be used to off-set deficits, to sustain existing programs and identify a modest enrollment reserve pool to meet course sections that have a high demand.

Senator Morris expressed concern about the quality of students being admitted since the ratio of acceptance has increased. Arnold acknowledged that the acceptance rate has increased due to hard work on the part of admissions folks in all parts of the university to determine where to target efforts in terms of expected yield. The performance indicators indicate the quality is being strengthened. Senator Beach, Associated, stated that the average GPA for first-time freshman is 3.45, which is the highest in the state. Senator Bontrager, Associated, added that the academic indicators for those students are also up.

REPORT FORM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Niess' report included the following items:

Reasons to celebrate:

– Degree candidates approved for commencement; their success is the result of hard work on the part of faculty, staff and students.

– In May, the Senate approved Dr. Bob Bomengen to receive the OSU Distinguished Service Award and Dr. Sally Francis to receive the D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award.

– The University Day program will begin at 10:00 AM on September 16.

– OSU was successful in international competition with two OSU web-based courses being selected for honorable mention.

Concerns surrounding deficits in Athletics and Information Services have been expressed during the past year. Niess felt that these units have responded in a professional way and she appreciated how Curt Pederson, has been receptive to faculty concerns. She also noted that she has been impressed with the care Mitch Barnhart is taking with the reorganization and his concern in trying to reduce the expenditures by over \$2 million next year.

She felt there is still another difficult year ahead, and reminded faculty of the goal to provide a compelling learning experience for students. The University community has worked hard during the past year to deal with the concerns and priorities. Although the direction has not always been agreed upon by all parties, she felt that all have worked together in a professional and productive manner. She urged faculty to celebrate the work of the past year, continue to display professionalism and to prepare for the coming year.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Mike Caudle, ASOSU President, thanked the Senate for passing the DPD motion in a resounding manner. He also encouraged Senators to look carefully at the Faculty Senate President-Elect and noted that the overwhelming support for the DPD program is not shared by the President-Elect. He urged Senators, for the purpose of good governance, to instill some form of recall against Robin Rose. He also strongly encouraged that some form of recall procedures be incorporated into the Bylaws. Caudle moved that the Faculty Senate give its President-Elect, Dr. Robin Rose, a vote of no confidence; the motion was seconded.

The ASOSU Undergraduate Senator from the College of Home Economics and Education stated she spoke with representatives from the college and they supported the motion.

Senator Matzke asked whether the students had spoken with Rose. Caudle stated that three students have made at least three phone calls each and they have not had any response from him.

Senator Rodriguez moved to suspend the rules to allow non-Senators to speak; motion was seconded. Motion 98- 539-12 to suspend the rules passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Senator Field, Science, expressed sympathy with the students' point of view and felt that tolerance for an individual's point of view should be taught, and particularly that one is not removed from office due to a disagreement.

Kelli Koski, ASOSU, stated that she, as well as other students, was very offended by comments made publicly by Robin Rose in The Barometer and in an e-mail from him to Dr. Risser. Koski got the sense that, as a representative of the Faculty Senate, Rose was representing the Senate and that faculty agreed with him.

Caudle made the motion in the hope that the Senate's support for DPD shows that Rose doesn't represent the interests of the Senate.

Cory VanAlstine, ASOSU, spoke in favor of the motion, citing The Barometer article, and urged Senators to approve it if they feel that Rose does not represent their views.

Senator Plant felt that everyone should have a right to express their views and didn't feel that Rose was representing the Senate in the article.

Landau felt that tenure is important to allow faculty to express their point of view, even if it is unpopular.

Senator Rodriguez agreed with the need for an environment of tolerance, but noted that in Rose's e-mail there was clearly a tone of intolerance, which he finds appalling in an intellectual community.

Senator Wrolstad indicated he had not read the e-mail and felt that everyone should have an opportunity to read the documents mentioned before voting.

Niess suggested that the motion could be postponed, which would make it an automatic item for the next regular meeting.

Susan Prock, graduate student, agreed that people have a right to their own opinion.

However, she felt that the e-mail was the most vicious, unprofessional piece of work she has ever seen; she was extremely insulted and absolutely appalled that a professional on this campus acted in that manner.

Senator Morris stated that Senators could be appalled without voting. He felt that by approving the motion, the Senate would send a message that it is intolerant about intolerance; he urged a no vote.

Koski encouraged all to read the article and e-mail. She felt that Rose's message went against the University's mission, it's not good for retention or recruitment, and makes students uncomfortable when he publicly humiliates and degrades students of color and women.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, moved to postpone the motion; motion seconded. Motion 98-539-13 to post-pone the vote of no confidence and bring it before the Senate in October passed by a show of hands with 57 in support and 6 in opposition.

In response to a request for distribution, Niess indicated that the materials previously referred to will be distributed to Senators.

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](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » May 7, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 538

May 7, 1998

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on May 7, 1998, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Maggie Niess. There were no corrections to the minutes of April 2, 1998.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Resolution honoring L.L. and Elizabeth Stewart; Revisions to AR 2; Standing Rules Revisions; Task Force on Post-Tenure Review; and Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees [Motion 9853801 through 06]
- Discussion Item: Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs
- Executive Session: Consideration of award nominees
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Hatch, P. Phillips; Lowrie, D. Johnson; Pereira, R. Robson; Tate, R. Landau; and van der Mars, J. Widrick

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bruce, Carson, Champeau, Coakley, Cowles, Daley, Elwood, J. Field, K. Field, Henthorne, Hooker, Huyer, Isensee, Jepson, Jimmerson, Kerkvliet, Lajtha, Leong, Levine, McDaniel, Mix, Morris, Peters, Powelson, Proteau, Randhawa, Righetti, Riven, Rodriguez, Sanford, Seville, and Williams

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; R. Rose, President-Elect; A. Wilcox, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant

Guests of the Senate:

L. Burns, S. Esbensen, S. Francis, A. Hashimoto, D. Johnson, B. Mate, M. Mate, L. Maughan, P. Muir, D. Nicodemus, J. Root, R. Schori, J. Schuster, B. Strohmeyer, and J. Tanaka

RECOGNITION

Resolution for L.L. and Elizabeth Stewart

Following a reception held immediately preceding the Senate meeting, President Niess noted the Stewart's would receive a journal containing expressions of gratitude from faculty and a framed copy of the following resolution in recognition of L.L. and Elizabeth Stewart's support of OSU faculty development, which was approved by the Senate with no dissenting votes:

Whereas L.L. and Elizabeth Stewart are long term stalwart supporters of Oregon State University; and

whereas among the forms their support has taken is

the L.L. and Elizabeth Stewart Faculty Development Award, funded in 1975; and

whereas since 1975 the L.L. and Elizabeth Stewart

Faculty Development Endowment has disbursed in excess of \$528,000 to support faculty development; and

whereas since 1975 over 330 awards have been given to 265 faculty across Oregon State University in support of diverse forms of professional development; and

whereas the L.L. and Elizabeth Stewart Faculty Development Endowment is material evidence of its benefactors' generosity and commitment to faculty excellence; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate at Oregon State University honors L.L. and Elizabeth Stewart for realizing that faculty development is essential to educational excellence and the quality of students' experience, and for their contribution to faculty development, and expresses warm appreciation to the Stewart's for their ongoing commitment to higher education in Oregon.

President Niess also presented L.L. Stewart with a plaque bearing this inscription:

Presented in recognition of Loren L. and Elizabeth Stewart by the OSU Faculty Senate May 7, 1998 in warm appreciation for their generous and stalwart support of Oregon State University faculty development.

Mr. Stewart noted that he felt very pleased and humble to be able to support faculty and expressed appreciation for the honor bestowed upon him. He also encouraged faculty to continue to apply for development funds.

ACTION ITEMS

Standing Rules Revisions

Laurel Maughan, Committee on Committees Chair, presented recommended revisions to the following Standing Rules for approval by the Faculty Senate; in most cases, only the sections containing the proposed revisions are printed. All recommendations have been approved by the committees involved.

She noted that the proposed changes in committee composition to the Academic Regulations and Advancement of Teaching Committees are a result of recommendations made by the Senate Membership Task Force, as presented in their report last fall.

For purposes of this document, Teaching Faculty are faculty who have teaching and/or advising responsibilities as described in Section II, Faculty Responsibilities, of the **OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**.

The recommended changes to the Administrative Appointments Committee would simplify the procedures and still provide an indication of the level of responsibility that this committee should have.

Approval of the changes to the Undergraduate Admissions Committee would clarify the role of the committee in terms of the existing admissions policy.

The proposed revisions are provided below (highlighted sections indicate additions; strike-throughs indicate deletions).

ACADEMIC REGULATIONS COMMITTEE

The Committee consists of five [Teaching] Faculty, ~~and three Students members~~ and the registrar, ex-officio, non-voting.

ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING COMMITTEE

The Committee consists of five [Teaching] Faculty, ~~and three Students members~~, one of whom must be a graduate student and one of whom must be an undergraduate student, and the Provost and Executive Vice President [or designee] ex-officio, non-voting, ~~or designee, ex-officio, non-voting.~~

There was no discussion on the recommended revisions to the Academic Regulations Committee or Advancement of Teaching Committee; motion 98-538-01 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

In addition to newly created administrative positions, the following positions are to include involvement on the part of the Administrative Appointments Committee:

A. General Administration: [All positions at the Provost, Vice President, Vice Provost and Associate Provost level.] ~~Provost and Executive Vice President; Chief Business Officer; Vice Provost for Research & International Programs; Vice Provost for Student Affairs; Chief Institutional Advancement Officer; Associate Provosts; Dean of the Graduate School; Dean of International Education; Dean of Research; Dean of Students; Registrar; Director of Admissions; Director of Agricultural Experiment Station; Director of Computing Services; Director of the Office of Continuing Higher Education and Summer Term; Dean of Extended Education and Director of Extension Service; Director of Libraries; and Director of Sea Grant College Program.~~

B. College and Deans: [All positions at the Dean level.] ~~Deans of Agricultural Sciences, Business, Engineering, Forestry, Health & Human Performance, Home Economics and Education, Liberal Arts, Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, Pharmacy, Science, and Veterinary Medicine.~~

C. [Other positions of academic significance: Including, but not limited to, University Honors College Director, Undergraduate Academic Programs Director, Admission and Orientation Director, and Registrar.]

The Administrative Appointments Committee consists of nine Faculty ~~members appointed by the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee.~~

There was no discussion on the recommended revisions to the Administrative Appointments Committee; motion 98-538-02 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee ~~passes on any~~ [decides whether to admit any] potential undergraduate applicant, not meeting the stated admission requirements as established by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and who requests consideration by the Committee. Previous academic experience, test scores, recommendations, and other criteria are reviewed in the process of determining which requests for exemptions should be approved. [The Committee also serves as the focal point for discussion and review of policy changes related to undergraduate admissions and makes recommendations to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs or Faculty Senate, as appropriate.] The Committee consists of ~~seven~~ [eight] faculty members, ~~[and] one student, and one person selected at-large.~~ Of the ~~seven~~ [eight] faculty members, there shall be [at least] five from the teaching faculty, one college head advisor, and one representative from International Education. All members should be available to serve during the summer since most of the committee activity, in fact, takes place during the summer. In addition, a representative from the Admissions [and Orientation] Office [shall be ex-officio, voting] ~~should be granted discussion and voting rights for deliberation on student appeals.~~

There was no discussion on the recommended revisions to the Undergraduate Admissions Committee; motion 98-538-03 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Task Force on Post-Tenure Review

President Niess noted that agenda materials identified two additional issues that were not included in the Senate's charge to the Task Force: 1) An effective system of evaluating administrators, as well as faculty; and 2) A minimum campus-wide program for the improvement of teaching as well as a commitment of resources to support scholarly activities.

Michael Oriard, task force committee member, presented recommendations from the report and noted that the substantive changes from the draft report presented at the April Senate meeting were the clarification of review frequency and responsible parties. He mentioned that the task force's concern was to balance accountability with a need to not overburden faculty participating in the review.

Oriard stated that, if the recommendations are approved, two subcommittees will meet to draft language for the Faculty Handbook and to develop model guidelines to assist departments.

The nine recommendations are as follows:

1. The description of the PROF system in the Faculty Handbook should be expanded to include a stronger justification for the process and a detailed description of the consequences of satisfactory and unsatisfactory reviews
2. The Provost should call for the development of written unit-level policies and procedures for implementing the PROF system. Faculty input must occur in the development of these policies and procedures.

3. The Provost's office should provide training for colleges and departments in conducting and administering the review process.
4. Heads of academic units (usually the department head or chair, but possibly the dean in colleges with no departments or the staff leader in off-campus extension offices) shall be responsible for conducting an annual review of all faculty in their units. As in the present PROF system, the unit head will provide a written evaluation to the faculty member, who may attach a rebuttal or explanation. Peer involvement in this process is strongly encouraged; for example, a committee of peers could review the dossiers and written reviews with the unit head to ensure fairness, balance, and conformity with the unit's mission.
5. At intervals of no longer than five years, in addition to the annual review by the unit head, each tenured faculty member will be reviewed by a peer committee of faculty from the academic unit. (A promotion or tenure review that leads to a full peer evaluation at the unit level will satisfy this requirement.) Where appropriate, faculty members from outside the unit may be included on the peer committee. Written evaluations from the peer committee and the unit head will be provided to the faculty member, who may attach comments, explanations, or rebuttal.
6. At any time during the five-year interval between regularly scheduled peer committee reviews, a faculty member or the unit head may request a peer committee review if either deems it beneficial to the professional development of the faculty member.
7. Copies of all reviews will be forwarded by the unit head to the Dean of the College or to the appropriate academic supervisor.
8. Should the peer committee conclude that a faculty member's record is less than satisfactory in teaching, scholarship, or service, a professional development plan will be drafted by the peer committee, the unit head, and the faculty member under review. This plan should include definite steps to be taken to remedy the specific perceived deficiencies. A timetable of no longer than three years should be provided to accomplish the goals of the plan, with annual monitoring to measure progress. The plan must specify the resources to be made available to accomplish the goals. The institution's PROF guidelines will specify the consequences of repeated negative reviews or failure to complete the goals of the development plan.
9. The Faculty Senate will periodically review the effectiveness of the PROF process.

In response to Senator Matzke, Science, questioning what the next step would be following approval, Oriard stated that the recommendations would go to the Provost for action, the two subcommittees would develop language and, presumably, the Provost would hold training sessions to assist in implementing the recommendations.

One person in the audience expressed a concern of allocating resources to a faculty member who is underperforming. Oriard indicated that there are probably not many who are underperforming. He also noted that tenure is a commitment to the promise of long-term contributions and achievements and there is an assumption that this is potentially a productive faculty member who should be given an opportunity to regain their productive levels. He also agreed that resources are an issue and dependent on those resources available within units.

Senator Frank, Liberal Arts, questioned what happens to the faculty member if nothing changes after three years as recommended in #8. Oriard stated that the document indicates that termination is possible.

Senator Hathaway, Extension, proposed the following as friendly amendments to recommendation #4: change "staff leader" to "staff chair" and capitalize "Extension."

Motion 98-538-04 to approve the Faculty Senate Task Force on Post-Tenure Review recommendations, including the friendly amendments pertaining to #4, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

President Niess thanked the task force members for their efforts and noted that the intent was to come back in June with the proposed Faculty Handbook and guidelines language.

Academic Regulations Revisions

Marshall English, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, presented proposed revisions to Academic Regulation 2 which deals with transfer of community college credit, in particular vocational-technical credit transfers. He noted that Leslie Burns, Undergraduate Programs Director, requested the revisions which have been revised and ratified by his committee and reviewed by the Academic Requirements Committee and the Curriculum Council.

In summary, the primary impacts of the proposed revisions would be to: 1) reduce the number of vocational-technical credits that can be transferred, bringing that number into line with other key campuses (UO and PSU); 2) eliminate uncertainty about what transfer credits a student will receive and when they will receive them; 3) establish a policy for articulation agreements currently in use; and 4) shift responsibility for oversight of Articulation Agreements from the Academic Requirements Committee to the Curriculum Council.

The proposed revisions are provided below (highlighted sections indicate additions; strike-throughs indicate deletions).

2. Credit From A Two-Year Institution (Undergraduate Students)

a. College Transfer Credits: Oregon State University accepts for credit toward a baccalaureate degree all college transfer work completed in [at] an Oregon or other accredited community college up to 108 lower-division credits. ~~A student who has completed 108 lower-division credits must obtain approval of a petition in advance before completing additional lower-division work at a two-year institution if credit for such additional work is to count toward graduation.~~ Transfer credits and grades are not used in calculating the OSU cumulative GPA. Students who hold the Associate of Arts [Oregon Transfer] or other transfer degrees or who have 90 or more credits accepted in transfer will be granted junior standing.¹ Students who have received Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer degrees from Oregon community colleges will be considered to have met the Perspectives and Skills (except WIC) areas of the Baccalaureate Core. They must complete the upper division Synthesis areas of the Core. Students transferring from approved institutions of higher education [without Oregon Transfer degrees] ordinarily will be given Baccalaureate Core credit ~~in the Perspectives and Skills areas~~ on a course-by-course basis for work that is judged to be equivalent in content. ~~They must complete upper-division Synthesis courses.~~

b. ~~Block Transfer of Vocational-Technical Credits: Block transfer of vocational-technical credit from accredited or state-approved community colleges into specific departmental programs² at Oregon State University may be awarded up to 45 credits on the basis of proficiencies, work experience, and/or technical courses as determined by the appropriate~~

department, but without assignment of grade. Such credits will apply to the agreed upon transfer program only, and the credit will not be granted until completion of the program by the student, and these credits will not be used to classify students. The 45 credits, or portion thereof, transferred will count as part of the 108 credits defined in paragraph 2a above.

b. [Transfer of Vocational-Technical Course Credits: A maximum of 12 quarter credit hours (8 semester credit hours) of vocational-technical course work applicable in an associates degree or certificate program at an accredited institution can be accepted upon admission to OSU as general elective credit (graded as Pass) and as part of the 108 quarter credit total that can be applied toward a baccalaureate degree.]

c. Transfer of Equivalent Vocational-Technical Course Credits [through Articulation Agreements:] Lower division [OSU] credit [may be awarded] for specific vocational-technical community college courses may be awarded for equivalent OSU course work when [those courses are] equivalency is validated by [articulation agreement with] the [appropriate] OSU department offering the equivalent course work. [This may be above the 12 quarter credit hours of general electives (graded as Pass) allowed when a student is admitted to OSU.] Community college course work is not equated to upper division OSU course work. Equivalent Credit will be awarded only upon the recommendation of the appropriate department and college, and approval by the Academic Requirements Committee. [Community college course work is not equated to upper division OSU course work.] If the vocational-technical community college course and the equivalent OSU course vary in credits, the number of course credits that may be granted will be the lesser of the two. These course credits will count as part of the 108 credits defined in paragraph 2a above. OSU departments [who have articulation agreements with community colleges regarding] offering courses which have been identified as equivalent to designated community college vocational-technical courses shall review the [agreements] equivalency annually and forward a dated list of the [articulated] equivalent community college courses to the Academic Requirements Committee [Curriculum Council].

d. Transfer of Nonequivalent Vocational-Technical Course Credits: In cases where paragraph 2b above is not applicable, up to 24 credits of lower division credit for specific vocational-technical community college courses may be awarded (but without assignment of grade) for nonequivalent OSU course work when the proficiencies, training, or experiences gained by the student are recognized by the appropriate OSU department or college. Credit will be awarded only upon the recommendation of the appropriate department and college, and approval of the Academic Requirements Committee. No more credit will be offered by OSU than was offered by the community college for the course involved in a given transfer. The course prefix and number to be used in awarding of such credit is VocT 100. The 24 credits, or portion thereof, awarded will count as part of the 108 credits defined in paragraph 2a above. The credit will not be granted until completion of the student's program, and these credits will not be used to classify students. In the event the student transfers into another OSU department, the new department will reevaluate the appropriateness of such vocational-technical training or experience. This provision may not be used in combination with paragraph 2b above.

Senator Henderson, Forestry, noted that sometimes several community college courses are equivalent to one OSU credit. Leslie Burns noted that this concern is defined in the Articulation Agreement.

Senator Thies, Science, felt that the wording in Section C of the revision "Community college work is not equated to upper division OSU course work." could be confusing. The sentence by itself is untrue, but is true when applied to vocational-technical courses. Thies moved to amend Section C to read, "Vocational Technical community college work will not be equated to upper division OSU course work." Motion 98-538-06 to approve

the amendment passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. Senator Oriard proposed a friendly amendment to the approved amendment to correct the grammar and place "vocational-technical" after "community college." The friendly amendment passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

In response to Senator Frank questioning if the proposed revisions were discussed with community colleges, Burns indicated a number of community college liaisons were consulted and they fully support the revisions which would make it easier for them to explain to students which courses will transfer to OSU.

Motion 98-538-05 to approve the proposed revisions to AR 2, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees

President Niess explained that the Board's Administrative Rules define criteria and procedures for the imposition of sanctions for cause, including terminations of appointment (OAR 580-21-320 through 580-21-375). If such a sanction is to be imposed, the faculty member is entitled to a formal hearing of charges by a hearing committee to be selected from a faculty panel which has been duly established.

Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees are elected on even numbered years. Nominees for each new panel were randomly selected and ballots were distributed to Senators at the meeting. Those elected to Panel B were: Cheryl Jordan, Paul Doescher, Daniel Arp, Barbara Moon, William Warren, Jr., Neil Christensen, Ronald Guenther, Jeffrey Hale, Joseph Karchesy and Dwight Bushnell. Alternates include: Anne Christie, Jill Schuster, Lucy Shiao-Ling Yu, Donald Armstrong, Willie Rochefort, Jack Bailes, Zinovy Reichstein, Philip Watson, Nancy Wortman and William Ayres.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs

While introducing Bob Burton, Ad Hoc Committee co-chair, President Niess expressed appreciation to the committee for their efforts. Burton thanked everyone who helped prepare the final report, which was printed in the May Senate agenda.

Burton recapped the creation of the ad hoc committee by explaining that, last January, the Curriculum Council sought approval from the Senate for undergraduate proposals for Environmental Sciences and Natural Resources. The proposals were tabled since, as presented, they weren't sufficiently developed at the faculty level and there was concern and confusion expressed about distance education as a whole. The proposals are currently being developed in detail before resubmission to the Senate.

The committee members and co-chairs Burton and Gordon Matzke tried to develop a report on off-site degree programs that was factual rather than editorial. They solicited questions from the faculty and attempted to find answers to those questions. Burton noted they would have preferred to have had broader student input and more systematic avenues of input from faculty who are teaching distance courses.

Senator Landau (pro-tem), Science, expressed several concerns: there is a feeling that money is being taken away from traditional education; it takes more money and time to

develop distance courses than traditional courses; 60% of students enrolled in distance courses are also enrolled in traditional courses; and the more web information available to students, the greater the demand on faculty to help guide them through the materials.

Thies felt that a major issue is that there are a lot of required degree courses that are not available off-site. Burton indicated that the Environmental Sciences degree is close to having most of the courses available off-site; although he acknowledged that some off-site degree programs may not be able to accomplish all requirements off-site. He felt that the distinction between on and off-site will continue to blend.

Sandy Woods, OSU Statewide, noted that over \$500,000 was requested for course development out of an available \$200,000 fund for 1997/98. Courses targeted to receive funds were those that would support statewide degree programs and additional money is expected for next year. Sally Francis, Home Economics and Education, questioned the source of the \$200,000 funding. Woods stated that the Provost provided the start-up funds for this year; it's not clear if these development funds will be recurring. The funds were disbursed with the assistance of a Distance Degree Program Council, consisting of program leaders and the Deans. She hopes to have a general RFP process when the budget is known.

Burton noted that this is an evolving process since the Council referred to by Woods is somewhat ad hoc and there are discussions underway to formalize the Council and to determine the best role for faculty governance and the Faculty Senate.

Senator Matzke expressed the opinion that using a general RFP is a lousy idea. He felt that OSU will make a big mistake if items associated with distance education courses are randomly funded. Instead, it should be made clear what the objectives are and in what sequence they will be achieved for particular degrees so that funds can be targeted.

President Niess encouraged Senators to share the report with their colleagues.

INFORMATION ITEMS

-- A recap of the April Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting was sent to Senators via e-mail.

-- In 1996 there were no Sr/Faculty Research Assistants or Associates serving on Faculty Senate committees. In 1997/98 there were 24 Sr/Faculty Research Assistants and Professional Faculty serving on Faculty Senate committees.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold's report included the following items:

Expressed appreciation for the thorough work by the members of the Task Force on Post-Tenure Review and the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs.

A commitment was made by the President's Cabinet to make certain that an annual review process be initiated for all members of the Cabinet and that evaluations be

performed for all who report to each cabinet member.

Effective immediately, Sandy Woods has been appointed as interim Distance and Extended Education Dean to replace Gretchen Schuette who resigned. Woods will be meeting with the academic deans in this role. There will be a national search for this position.

Jon Root will continue in his role as the Director of Distance Education.

Barbara Moon was named to a permanent position as Director of the Office of Continuing Higher Education, after serving in an interim basis for three years.

Budget Observations -- Provost Arnold felt it was safe to say that: 1) budgets at unit levels will be no worse than 1997/98 levels; 2) increased tuition from the additional enrollment will be reflected in the budget allocation for 1998/99, although the amount of the matching state funds is not known -- at the tuition level, an enrollment reserve is anticipated to respond to critical high demand areas; and 3) a significant increase in additional resources can be expected a year from now. A group will be formed to help determine how the additional funds will be distributed and to look critically at investments that possibly could be eliminated.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, referred to media reports about the budget and asked how OSU will fare under the initially discussed budget model and how the deficit will be addressed under the new budget model. Arnold reiterated that media reports do not necessarily reflect the most current information available. He explained that the Board has adopted the position that: tuition will stay with the institution; the model must differentiate costs of programs as general fund money is distributed; and to bring as much as possible into a model that will express costs on a cost per student basis. Arnold stated that OSU tried to be as conservative as possible about the revenues for next year. He also noted that OSU's enrollment has responded strongly and that needs to be recognized in the budget process.

Senator Rose, Forestry, questioned how faculty salaries will be affected if enrollment is improved. Arnold responded that, for this biennium, the faculty and staff salary resources were set at the beginning of the biennium. If the overall strategy to build a budget model that contains educational, research and outreach opportunities is achieved, it could include a faculty salary component. It will have to be approved by the legislature and would include performance indicators.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Niess' report included the following items:

Faculty have worked hard to increase enrollment, as evidenced by 500 additional students expected for 1998/99.

Appreciation to faculty for turning out to honor L.L. Stewart for his contribution to faculty development.

She assured Senators that faculty input is being seriously taken into consideration by administration to assist them in the decision making process. She also felt that administration was working hard to respond to faculty.

She noted that this has been a roller coaster year and there is possibly another tough year ahead; it is imperative to take control of the roller coaster. Niess urged faculty to focus both on the university as a whole as well as individual units. She also encouraged

faculty to focus on the future of OSU with a vision of providing a first-class education for a diverse student population while advancing the knowledge that supports the health and wealth of Oregon and the nation as the 21st century approaches. She felt that a difference can be made if everyone works together.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Beth Strohmeier, Faculty Recognition and Awards Chair, presented nominees for the Distinguished Service Award and D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award. There was no discussion on the nominees. After reopening the meeting to the public, both nominees were approved via written ballot.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:22 PM.

Recorded by:

***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](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » April 2, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 353

April 2, 1998

For All Faculty

President Maggie Niess called the meeting to order at 3:02 PM. There were no corrections to the March minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Category I Proposals for two study abroad programs and Standing Rules Revisions to Baccalaureate Core and Instructional Development and Technology Committees and University Honors College and Curriculum Councils. [Motion 98-537-01 through 03]
- Committee Report: Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs
- Discussion Item: Task Force on Post-Tenure Review
- Special Reports: PASS Update and Intercollegiate Athletics
- Old Business: None
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Burton, R. Robson; Collins, M. Dempsey; Hatch, P. Phillips; Pereira, K. Krane; and Wander, J. Riddington.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bird, Bontrager, Campbell, Carson, Coblenz, Daniels, Delson, Field, Henthorne, Huber, Huyer, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Leong, Lowrie, Lunch, Lundy, McDaniel, Oriard, Righetti, Savonen, Schowalter, Sorte, Thies, Williams, and Yamada.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; R. Rose, President-elect; A. Wilcox, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

M. Barnhart, L. Friedman, A. Hashimoto, R. Landau, L. Maughan, D. Nicodemus, S. Prellis, M. Sandlin, L. Schroeder, and C. Sproul.

Action Items

Category I Proposals

Len Friedman, Curriculum Council member, presented for approval two Category I Proposals recommended for approval by the Curriculum Council: Proposed NCSA Study Abroad Programs and a Study Abroad Proposal with the University of Arizona-Russian Program Affiliation. Friedman explained that the justification for the proposals was that the study abroad programs are extremely popular and often overbooked. The proposals will expand a very strong program to additional sites.

He noted that the program at the University of Arizona is well established and would probably add only a site in Moscow due to OSU's quarter-system calendar. The NCSA proposal would add sites in Macerata, Italy, Oviedo, Spain and Athens, Greece. There was no discussion on either proposal. Motion 98-537-01 to approve the additional sites in both programs passed by voice votes with no dissenting votes.

Standing Rules Revisions

President Niess explained that the revisions were the result of recommendations from the Task Force on Senate Membership to clarify the membership on six committees in view of the recent inclusion of particular faculty categories. The intent of the proposed revisions have been made to match faculty expertise with the committee responsibilities and to assure appropriate representation. Niess noted that the affected committees/councils and the Committee on Committees have agreed that the

proposed Standing Rules best represent the composition needed for responding to the charges of the particular committees.

Laurel Maughan, Committee on Committees Chair, presented proposed Standing Rules revisions to the following committees: Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC), Curriculum Council, Instructional Development and Technology Committee, and University Honors College Council. She explained that the Task Force used two terms that are being incorporated into the revisions and that the preamble to the Standing Rules will be clarified to include the following, provided the revisions are approved:

For purposes of this document, Teaching Faculty are faculty who have teaching and/or advising responsibilities as described in Section II, Faculty Responsibilities, of the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Regular Professorial Faculty are faculty who hold the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor and who are paid at least in part by state accounts but also including endowed faculty positions at Professorial ranks. Courtesy faculty (except ROTC faculty), visiting faculty, and adjunct faculty are not included.

The revisions to the Standing Rules are as follows (capitalized sections indicate additions; bracketed sections indicate deletions):

Baccalaureate Core Committee

The committee shall consist of seven REGULAR PROFESSORIAL Faculty and two Students.

Curriculum Council

The Council consists of nine TEACHING Faculty and two StudentS [members].

Instructional Development and Technology Committee

The Committee shall consist of six Faculty, AT LEAST FOUR OF WHOM MUST BE TEACHING FACULTY, [and] two StudentS [members], and the Director or Associate Director of the Communication Media Center, ex-officio, non-voting.

University Honors College Council

The Honors Council consists of at least six REGULAR PROFESSORIAL Faculty [members] and at least two HONORS COLLEGE Students[, the students appointed from among the Honors College students].

Senator Drexler, Business, questioned why the BCC is recommending Regular Professorial Faculty and the Curriculum Council is calling for Teaching Faculty. Maughan felt that the BCC tends to be more involved in the development of curriculum and the Curriculum Council would be more involved in the teaching of that curriculum.

Drexler proposed an amendment to change Teaching Faculty on the Curriculum Council to Regular Professorial Faculty; motion seconded. Len Friedman noted that at least one Curriculum Council member objected to this wording since it excludes non-tenured teaching faculty. In response to a question from Senator V. Farber, Liberal Arts, Niess indicated that an advisor who has no teaching responsibilities would be included in the "Teaching Faculty" category for purposes of these Standing Rules.

Motion 98-537-03 to approve the amendment requiring nine Regular Professorial Faculty on the Curriculum Council was defeated by hand vote.

Motion 98-537-02 on the main motion for revisions to all Standing Rules as presented, was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs

Gordon Matzke, co-chair, reported on the status of the committee and provided a URL where faculty can view web courses: <http://osu.orst.edu/fe/extedu/couvia/>

They are currently working on a report consisting of concerns and questions received from the university community and anticipate a written report to the Senate in May. The report is being divided into topic areas based on 30 questions: the wisdom of off-site instruction; quality of instruction issues; resources and faculty workload; market and access issues; and administrative issues. One difficulty they are experiencing is providing alternative, or negative, points of view when

appropriate.

In responding to a question from Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, regarding whether on-site exams should be given for off-site courses, Matzke indicated that there currently is no external examination, but the committee was not asked to determine whether there should be or not. Matzke felt that off-campus instruction was very much the same as on-campus with the instructor being in charge of how the class is administered.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Task Force on Post-Tenure Review

President Niess noted that OSU currently employs 2,187 people on education and general funds, 677 with indefinite tenure (31%), 174 on annual or tenure-track contracts (8%) and 1,336 are fixed-term (61%). Overall there are 4,118 faculty, 21% are tenured, 5% on annual or tenure-track contracts and 74% are fixed-term. She felt that this information is important given the increasing attack on the tenure system at colleges and universities. Public perception is that tenure allows faculty to draw a paycheck without fear of consequences; the university perspective is that the system provides faculty with academic freedom and pursuit of scholarship that leads to advancement of knowledge critical to the university. Periodic evaluations of all tenured faculty provide the protection of the system and are evidence of accountability. A Task Force on Post-Tenure Review was appointed by the Faculty Senate to review the current system and make recommendations to strengthen it; it is the intent that the recommendations be considered for approval at the May Senate meeting.

Ken Krane, Chair, explained that the task force mission was to look at the existing Periodic Review of Faculty System and compare it to other institutions; look at the current status of the relationship between tenure and academic freedom; provide guidance to OSU administrators in conducting the reviews; and to strengthen the system by incorporating opportunities for faculty development and enhancement of professional skills.

Krane noted that post-tenure review is mandated by OAR 580-21-140 which calls for a review of tenured faculty periodically and systematically. It also requires an institutional plan that includes a statement of the objectives, a designation of the person making the evaluation, a designation of the frequency of the evaluation, a description of the plan for relating post-tenure reviews to a reward system and to have a developmental process in place to handle cases where faculty are perceived to be performing less than satisfactory service. Krane pointed out that the OAR does not call for the dean or department head to perform the review, only that the reviewers be designated. It also does not require that reviews be on a specific interval, but does state that professors and tenured senior instructors shall be reviewed at least once every three years.

The task force conducted an informal survey of faculty and administrators to determine how the process is being implemented on campus. The results assisted the task force in compiling the following information.

Characteristics of the current OSU PROF System are: decentralized; highly variable in structure and mechanics; written reviews maintained in unit's personnel files; no systematic evidence of peer involvement; variable interval for intensive reviews (one or three years); and lack of remediation or career development plans. The consequences of a positive review include: merit salary; travel funds; laboratory space; seed money for research; recommendations for promotion; award nominations; and approval of sabbatical leave.

The characteristics of an effective PTR System include: acknowledgement of importance of tenure; clear statement of purpose and outcomes; identify and reward meritorious performance; help underachieving faculty fulfill potential; based on criteria determined at department level; clear appeal and grievance procedures; significant peer involvement; minimal time commitment by faculty; training for peer reviewers and department heads; drafting of professional development plan; identification of resources; clear statement of consequences of repeated negative reviews or failure to achieve goals of development plan; wide discussion by faculty; formative rather than summative; no link to budgets, downsizing; and regular monitoring and review of process.

Preliminary task force recommendations included: expand description of PROF System in the Faculty Handbook; develop written unit-level policies and procedures showing substantial faculty involvement; training for colleges and departments; submission of annual self-assessments; change current three-year cycle to five years; copies of departmental reviews to be forwarded to Dean; development plan for underperforming faculty; and process to be reviewed periodically by Senate. Krane noted that the task force is taking another look at the frequency since they learned that, during a recent accreditation, it was recommended that the U of O conduct reviews every three years.

In response to questions from Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, Krane stated that the purpose is not for OSU to follow the UofO in terms of review frequency but, if OSU goes through an accreditation, the frequency will need to be revised from five to three years as the UofO was instructed to do. As far as limitations on the types of questions that can be asked, Krane felt that a system of peer involvement makes it less likely for abuse. Daley expressed concern about the time involvement for more frequent reviews.

Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, questioned what happens at the end of the three year period if a faculty member's performance is still unsatisfactory. Krane responded that the task force didn't want to address that issue in the report since it is a philosophical rather than implementation document. They are planning to ask the Senate to endorse the final report in May and, presumably, the task force will be asked to draw up a set of model guidelines for the unit level with a set of potential consequences for repeated negative reviews and the failure to conform with a development plan.

Senator Rose, Forestry, questioned if the task force discussed yearly reviews and why self-assessments don't count as an evaluation. Krane felt that an annual review with extensive peer involvement would provide an intolerable additional amount of work for faculty. He also noted that most research or curriculum development projects operate on a slightly longer time scale than one year and felt that a three-year window revealed a better picture of their activities rather than looking intensively every year. Although the formal review would be every three years, the task force is recommending that some type of portfolio be submitted yearly to the department chair to act as an early warning system to bring attention to problem cases. Rose feared that legislators will not accept a three-year cycle. Krane noted that faculty set their own agendas, rather than administrators, and evaluations are based largely on the accomplishment of a research agenda set by the faculty member. Krane added that reviews do occur more frequently than every three years since faculty are reviewed every year for merit salary increases, they are reviewed every term by students, and are reviewed by peers when a manuscript is submitted for publication.

Senator Longerbeam, Student Affairs, stated that most in Student Affairs are currently reviewed annually. She indicated that the purpose is not just to improve negative performance, but to inspire and motivate through conversations with peers. She felt that the time element was the price to be paid for accountability.

Krane mentioned that another reason for peer involvement is that development plans for underperforming faculty are going to involve the assignment and identification of assets within the institution to assist the individual in improving their performance. If department/college resources will be diverted for underperforming faculty, when there aren't enough resources for overperforming faculty, it must be a collegial decision.

SPECIAL REPORTS

PASS Update

Robby Robson, Proficiency Based Admissions Standards System (PASS) Coordinator, explained current reform issues to put his position in context. The education reform in Oregon consists of four state certified systems: CIM and CAM are certificates of mastery awarded in the K-12 system; PREP is a community college placement system; and PASS is Oregon's response to the legislated K-12 education reform system. PASS consists of two elements: 1) admission of college-bound students who go through an educational system different from Oregon's and the need to interpret their data differently; and 2) past experience with difficulty in making valid judgements as to what kind of students are coming to OSU, and going elsewhere, on the basis of grades. There are also three levels to PASS: 1) admission system; 2) public policy; and 3) research project.

Beginning in the year 2001 and phasing in for the next four years, students will be admitted to college on the basis of "demonstrated proficiency in English, Science, Mathematics, Social Science, Visual and Performing Arts, and second languages." Robson noted that SAT's, and other standardized tests, will continue to be used for some time. The standards of proficiency are public, uniform and validated to ensure that current variations in grading between school districts doesn't occur. The data to be used includes standardized tests, such as those being developed for the CIM, oral proficiency interviews and student projects coming out of classes.

Issues that affect OSU directly include a five-point scale: 1B2 = working toward proficiency; 3 = proficient (basis for admission to the university); 4 = superior work; and 5 = work worthy to earn college credit. Levels four and five will not be awarded without verification and validation by faculty at the higher education level (similar to the current AP system).

Issues that PASS raises at OSU:

- The policy is actually a framework that contains public mandates. OSU needs a concrete admission policy and this opportunity highlights issues such as where standards should be set and how underprepared students are dealt with.
- Involvement in the standards for setting advanced placement.
- Credit for prior work.
- Need to respond to changed expectations for students coming to OSU.
- Provides outreach opportunities. In the past, faculty have had no role in setting standards for students.

Robson encouraged faculty to contact him at edreform@orst.edu or check the web site at <http://osu.orst.edu/admin/edreform>. He also referenced the PASS project site, with links to CIM and CAM, which can be found at: <http://pass-ous.oregon.edu>

Senator Landau, Science, expressed concern about whether K-12 teachers would be able to judge whether their students are meeting college level standards. Robson agreed that this is a valid concern, but noted that now there is no way to determine

how students are being judged. Teachers will be required to undergo state-wide training in how to make judgements. No levels of four and five will be awarded without higher education input. Robson noted that these are standards for admission to college, not for high school graduation.

Senator Wood, Health & Human Performance, felt that faculty don't understand how much they will have to change their instruction to accommodate the different kind of students who will be admitted as a result of CIM and CAM. Robson responded that discussions are underway to make expectations clearer.

Senator Rossignol, Health & Human Performance, questioned how PASS will affect incoming students from out of state. Robson responded that they will be admitted based on evaluations used for home schooled students and international students, who also won't have PASS proficiencies.

In response to Senator Fisk, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, Robson said that it would be possible for students to finish PASS requirements before graduating from high school, however, graduation from high school is not a requirement for admission.

Intercollegiate Athletics

Robert Frank, NCAA Representative, and Mitch Barnhart, Athletic Director, updated the Senate on athletic issues.

Frank reported that the CEO's at Division I institutions are concerned about student athlete welfare issues. In particular, the NCAA recently passed legislation allowing student athletes on full-ride to work during the school year. The legislation has been fine tuned and it appears that they will be allowed to earn up to \$2000 in excess of their full-ride. He also noted that there have been efforts to unionize student athletes.

Frank referred to recent deaths nationwide resulting from wrestlers trying to lose weight, which has caught the attention of the NCAA. He reported that OSU Wrestling Coach Joe Wells works with the athletes to determine what their best weight is to avoid having a wrestler constantly struggle to make weight.

A major concern revolves around initial eligibility for student athletes. Since academic requirements have increased, graduation rates have increased, but the number of ineligible students has also increased. Frank reported that a class action suit has been filed on behalf of a number of student athletes by the trial lawyers for public justice challenging the NCAA's use of the standardized test score as a basis to determine eligibility.

Frank explained that a portion of the Athletic Department's increased costs can be attributed to measures to put OSU in compliance with Title IX gender equity requirements.

OSU graduation rates for all entering students in 1990/91 was 63%; for student athletes it was 61%. Graduation rates for student athletes who have exhausted their eligibility was 92%.

The conference has copyrighted "Conference of Champions." While three championships in a single year for any conference is considered notable, last year the PAC-10 won 14 championships out of a possible 32. The PAC-10 also considers themselves to be the strongest academic conference.

In Barnhart's opening remarks, he outlined five things that must be done: manage public relations; abide by the rules; graduate student athletes; manage fiscal resources, both revenue and expenses; and be competitive.

OSU has seven teams in the ranked in the top 25 in the country: both golf teams, both crew teams, wrestling, softball, and gymnastics.

Barnhart met with the athletes and discussed the following accountability issues with them:

- academics - 1) showing up for class, removing caps, taking notes;
- 2) conduct -how they represent OSU while competing and socially;
- 3)gambling - not limited to student athletes;
- 4) competitiveness - accountable to the team and to OSU; and
- 5) opportunity - accountable to the opportunity they were afforded.

Barnhart's general comments indicated pride in the athletes Winter '98 cumulative GPA which was 2.8. Gymnasts led the individual teams with a 3.2 followed by Golf at 3.15 and football at 2.41. He felt that more value needs to be created in the Athletics Department and he plans to work with students, fans, donors and ticket holders to accomplish that goal. Expense reductions must occur, although there is little room to cut. The challenge is to increase revenue to become competitive. He felt that the staff is enthusiastic and working hard and noted that the department will be reorganized in May or June. The coaching staff has worked very hard, with very little, and desperately needs support. The athletes are also working hard and tired of the perception that they are not competitive. Barnhart feels that there is no competitiveness in Gill Coliseum and they

will look at the facility in terms of increasing competitiveness.

The Athletic Advisory Committee will be expanded to broaden the base of support. Barnhart would like to see 12 faculty and 12 business people from around the state.

Senator Rose, Forestry, questioned how many Oregon athletes OSU loses to other schools each year. Barnhart acknowledged that we do lose some, but didn't know the number, and stated that you can't recruit them all. Among the things hurting recruitment is a substantial tuition increase. OSU is recruiting 66% of our athletes outside of Oregon and noted that the population base in the state is very small for Division IA athletes. He emphasized that the last few years OSU has been successful in the recruiting war to attract athletes away from some of the best institutions.

In response to Senator Landau, Science, asking if a prayer policy for athletic events had been established, Barnhart stated that coaches have been told they are not allowed to lead a prayer effort. However, student athletes do have the option of participating in prayer if it is self-initiated. Barnhart indicated that groups such as Athletes in Action may participate in a game, but will not be allowed to make testimony after the game.

Senator Krane (pro-tem), Science, questioned why the NCAA bestowed a monetary settlement and letter of apology on Jerry Tarkanian. Frank felt that the NCAA was convinced that they would lose in court.

REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold commended the Task Force on Post-Tenure Review for their work and the process they followed. He acknowledged that administrator reviews need to be done better than in the past. He also commented on an earlier question related to protection of an individual and noted that the existing Promotion and Tenure Guidelines refer to evaluation of performance in relation to what a faculty member was hired to do. He felt that this theme would carry forward to the process under consideration by the task force.

Arnold acknowledged comments made by Duncan Wyse yesterday at the Century Club regarding the two Board committees, Budget and Finance and Governance and Structure for OUS, in which Wyse feels there will be more change occurring in OUS than in the last 25 years. Clearly the budget model will change and the tuition will stay with the institution. There will also be differentiation of distribution of the state general fund dollars to identify difference in level and program costs (it won't be as complex as the existing BAS model), and peer review comparisons will continue. Results of the Governance and Structure Committees will include less involvement of detail by the Board. Discussion by the Board regarding a Board of Trustees for each institution, is now turning to a formal campus level advisory board -- details are still being worked out.

The Board is continuing its plan to put in place a set of performance indicators for each institution which will include many student related issues, such as number, quality, diversity, graduation rates, etc. There will be a small component in the new budget model that will be based, in part, on a set of performance indicators and targets established for each institution.

There were no questions.

REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Niess acknowledged that this year has been difficult and congratulated faculty for persevering and making it through.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:18 PM.

Respectfully submitted by:
Vickie Nunnemaker

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](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » March 5, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 536

March 5, 1998

For All Faculty

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 PM by President Maggie Niess. There were no corrections to the February minutes.

Meeting Summary

- Discussion Item: Quality of Distance Education Courses, Gordon Matzke
- Committee Report: Instructional Development and Technology Committee, John Block
- Action Items: None
- Old Business: None
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Chambers, P. Primak; Delson, L. Jodice; Hale, R. Foster; and Wood, B. Cusimano.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bontrager, Brodie, Cheeke, Collins, Cowles, Cromack, Farnsworth, K. Field, Grunder, Huber, Jones, Kerkvliet, Longerbeam, Lowrie, Mallory–Smith, Mix, Peters, Randhawa, Reed, Rielly, Righetti, Rodriguez, Sanford, Savage, Savonen, Schowalter, Williams, and Yim.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; R. Rose, President–Elect; A. Wilcox, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

J. Block, L. Burns, J. Caspers, J. Dorbolo, S. Francis, D. Johnson, M. Merickel, C. Pedersen, L. Pribyl, J. Root, R. Schori, and L. Schroeder.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Quality of Distance Education

Gordon Matzke, Ad Hoc Committee on Off–Site Degree Programs co–chair, provided a brief update of committee activities and led a discussion related to the current university policy that all OSU distance education courses should be of equivalent quality to those taught on campus.

Matzke noted that the committee has received quite a few questions and will work toward categorizing the questions and identifying answers.

In regard to concerns surrounding the tabled Environmental Science and Natural

Resources Category I proposals, Matzke felt that the issue of quality is a judgement to be made by each faculty member. One concern related to the limited time available to discuss issues of quality when proposals are brought forward. In response to that concern, this item was placed on the agenda to enable the faculty to better evaluate quality issues.

In response to the university policy that specifies that the quality of OSU off-site courses shall be the same as the quality of on-site courses, Matzke reported that President Risser turned the argument around and indicated that the reverse must be true in that on-campus courses be up to the quality of off-campus courses.

Ann Messersmith, Nutrition and Food Management, reported that, in comparing the same course on and off-campus, the outcomes are greater for off-campus students. Tools used to measure quality outcomes include projects, learning, interest and complications. Distance education has allowed students from Spokane and Alabama to collaborate on projects.

Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, questioned a reference to distance education allowing opportunities that could never be accomplished in an on-campus classroom. Matzke responded that he has been informed that the off-campus students are more likely to be mid-career professionals who bring to the classroom a much different perspective and set of experiences than do 18 year old students typically found on campus. There is more collaborative teaching among older students not found with younger students.

Henry Sayre, Art, is currently teaching a live two-way audio/video distance education course and felt that it is the best class he teaches because he has to prepare the hardest for it. He noted that he does have to prepare a very complete syllabus and stay close to it. One advantage is that off-campus students form cadres and can formulate group questions without interrupting the lecture since they don't appear live until they push a button. It creates a great advantage when the class turns into a live discussion group.

Senator Rosenberger, Liberal Arts, also teaches distance education courses and agreed with Sayre that preparation time is increased. She felt that there isn't the ease in back and forth exchanges, and long discussions become awkward when not face to face. Sayre agreed with Rosenberger and felt that only certain types of courses should be taught via distance education, primarily lecture courses. Most of all, the courses should be multi-media driven since television is deadly if the screen doesn't change a lot. Sayre felt that, since current library resources are not adequate, distance courses can't require use of the library. He gave the example of not expecting students in Madras to be doing heavy library research.

Sally Francis, Apparel, Interiors, Housing and Merchandising, questioned the type of copyright permission required for the use of slides in a distance course. Sayre responded that the Attorney General ruled that, as long as the course is a live, closed circuit, two-way audio/video, there is no issue.

Jean Caspers, Valley Library, agreed with Sayre that library resources are an issue. She explained that, in most cases, a 10-week course does not allow students time to learn how to order materials, receive them and have enough time to use the materials before the end of the course. She noted that there is a greater success rate for graduate courses since most have more flexible deadlines. Messersmith agreed that 10-week courses are hard when library research is required. She sent a questionnaire to her off-campus students regarding library resources and the responses ranged from "marvelous" to a student who doesn't use library resources at all.

Leslie Burns, Academic Affairs, teaches a graduate course on-line on the web and felt that students are much more invested in the class and the class is more challenging for her as an instructor since the exchanges are at a much higher level than those occurring in a traditional classroom.

Senator Gardner, Science, felt that students with disabilities will be more highly

represented in distance education courses than on-campus courses. Since distance education makes heavy use of technology, we are in the early stages of what he hopes will result in better education.

Mark Merickel, Education, teaches graduate courses over the web and agreed with Burns' comments. He has found that web-based delivery is a much greater vehicle for synthesis level courses and allows for greater strength within the course. He felt that quality comes down to methodologies and strategies and these courses have allowed him to expand on his methodologies.

Matzke expressed concern that this discussion was turning into a love feast for distance education and called for the skeptics in the audience to express their thoughts.

Senator Thies, Science, noted that in years past students indicated that distance delivery was not quite as good as being in the classroom live, but felt it was advantageous to them compared to not being able to access the course at all.

Robby Robson, Math, teaches courses on the Web and noted that distance education has been occurring for about 40 years. A Canadian study has found that there is no significant difference in the performance of students whether on-campus or at distance delivery sites. He felt that it is necessary to be careful in how quality is measured. Perhaps the quality of education should be measured rather than the quality of distance education. On the issue of libraries, he urged the ad hoc committee to learn from the experiences of others. He cited the University of Oregon which has a person specifically responsible for enabling students with disabilities to access Web courses and mentioned their criteria to make Web pages accessible.

Senator Rose, Forestry, asked Sayre to expand on his experiences with discipline-oriented courses, personality needed, time required, etc. Sayre noted that the Liberal Arts experience was really sobering in that not everyone wants to teach distance courses and, of those who want to, not everyone can. He felt it takes a unique kind of person with a unique kind of classroom presence. He noted that the wrong person behind a TV camera can be disastrous, and equally disastrous is the wrong person monitoring a Web site and discussion group. Sayre doesn't feel that the university is currently putting enough attention toward course development given the amount of time, effort and energy required to develop good distance education courses. If faculty are going to put forth the effort to develop and maintain the courses, they should be adequately compensated. He noted he is teaching distance courses because he is interested in the technology and to personally learn how to operate in this environment. He doesn't feel he would be teaching via distance if it was just a part of his every day experience. Matzke thanked Sayre for his comments and added that he has been told over and over that distance education is not cheaper or easier and that the reason to do it is that it works in their class.

Sayre mentioned that Penn State had probably the most interesting, positive and powerful distance education he's ever seen and felt that a lot could be learned from their model.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, felt that the problems include getting lab experience to students in the biological and chemical sciences and arranging for discussion groups and interaction among students since it was necessary to have an assistant physically present at the course delivery site, which requires ongoing fiscal resources.

Senator Shor, Engineering, indicated that technology has been developed for some labs, but doesn't see how all labs could be accommodated. She noted that she had to obtain grants to purchase necessary resources to make the course available for distance education.

Senators Woods, Engineering, commented that lab requirements could be accomplished by having students come to OSU for weekend classes. In this way, courses could incorporate both interactive and Web models.

On the subject of field trips, Matzke noted that one instructor developed a field trip on the Web for an on-campus course since it was impossible to take 450 students on a field trip. The student downloads the program and takes a self-guided field trip and reports their findings in class.

Senator Coblentz, Agricultural Sciences, felt that distance labs would be difficult to accomplish in a number of the natural resource and biological sciences. He also noted that, depending on the number of labs required and students participating, it may be difficult, given family responsibilities for both the students and faculty members, to dedicate very many weekends to a particular course.

Senator Tate, Science, felt that the prime goal is to improve education on campus as a whole. She expressed concern about political pressure translating improvement of education to distance education, when it can mean many different things. In her department, any effort toward distance education must be done at the expense of courses already being offered and they don't have the resources available to provide the technological support needed for distance courses.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, referred to Baccalaureate Core courses, in particular WIC and DPD which includes in-class writing. This requires students to process information and results in dead television air time, which is not engaging nor constantly changing. He felt it may work better on the Web. He also felt that DPD courses, which require soul searching intellectual engagement and is dependent on a certain level of trust and communication that must be developed, would be difficult to accomplish via an electronic classroom. Dick Schori, Mathematics, was concerned about justifying using limited resources for a small number of students. He has created an option of teaching a distance course to two distance students and has enhanced the course for on-campus students with one lecture and one recitation per week. His plea was to increase the resources available to continue to create distance courses. In response to Matzke's concern about exams, Schori indicated that, in lieu of homework, he has on-line quizzes which account for a small portion of the grade. He also gives two in-class monitored mid-terms and a monitored final which are administered by a representative at the distance location.

Robson noted there are serious administrative issues since Web courses are not readily identified when students are registering. Banner also does not offer students the option of registering for Web courses when classroom courses are full.

Senator Manogue, Science, is feeling pressure from this university to convert their whole major, which requires many labs, to distance education. She acknowledged that there may be an occasional major that is appropriate to be offered via distance education. She is also disturbed that students may never have the opportunity to take a class from someone of the opposite gender or from a different ethnic group. She felt that distance courses were appropriate for those who have already received their undergraduate degree in a university setting.

Matzke thanked those who participated in the discussion and commented that it isn't the medium used that will create a quality experience for students, rather it is the quality of faculty at Oregon State University.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Instructional Development and Technology Committee

John Block, Instructional Development and Technology Committee (IDTC) Chair, reported on their activities and the Technology Resource Fee process.

Block explained that, in the past, the committee has had about \$300,000 available to grant to faculty from the Technology Resource Fee. Cutbacks in Information Services

(IS) has reduced that amount to about \$62,000 this year. Applicants are being asked to focus on Baccalaureate Core courses that have high enrollment. One consideration will also be whether there will be departmental or college matching funds. The process will be for pre-proposals to be submitted in late March and selected applicants will be asked to provide full proposals. Grants between \$500 and \$5000 will be awarded. Information about the proposals can be found at:
<http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/fs/idtc/idtcproposal.html>

Block noted that a Technology Resource Fee Allocation Committee has recently been formed and it is unknown whether the IDTC will continue to participate in allocating the resource fee. He reminded Senators that the Technology Resource Fee is a fee assessed to the students and the guidelines state that allocation of the money must benefit students.

A concern was expressed earlier this year about the amount of money being spent to print, primarily, lecture notes in student labs. The IDTC discussed the issue and forwarded their comments to a committee chaired by Sandie Franklin studying this issue. The committee identified the following issues:

- 1) A cost shift is occurring since departments don't have money to print materials and faculty are being asked to post notes on the Web.
- 2) In the past, faculty have sold notes at the Bookstore and materials would be available usually 12–24 hours after receipt. This procedure is now more time consuming since all materials must go through Printing and Mailing Services due to copyright concerns. To avoid the time delay, some faculty are placing their notes on the Web.
- 3) The committee discussed asking faculty to question whether placing their lecture notes on the Web is really an appropriate use of the Web as compared to links to sites that students may not normally have access to.
- 4) There is a need for IS to explain to faculty and students what is appropriate, where are costs allocated, and whether routinely printing large amounts is something students would normally expect from the \$50 Technology Resource Fee.

Senator Morris, Science, questioned where the balance of the money goes if there is only \$62,000 available this year. Block responded that the IDTC receives an allocation of the Technology Resource Fee from IS and this was the amount left after reductions.

In response to Senator Lee, Science, questioning why it may not be appropriate for lecture notes to be placed on the Web, Block responded that there is a cost issue involved and the committee wondered if there was another way that would be just as effective at a lower cost.

Senator Coakley, Science, felt there was a conflict since faculty are being asked to use the Web and then being told that it costs too much to use the Web. She also finds it odd that some sort of printing or copying metering device is not in place. Block responded that some places do meter copies.

Senator Brooks, Business, felt that since there is a zero cost to print copies, students print more than is necessary. If this were an economic choice where students had to pay a marginal cost for copies made, they would choose the most economic route.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, noted that some students are in a marginal economic status. He was concerned about asking them to pay an additional fee.

In response to Senator Burton, Science, expressing his feeling that it would be a huge step backwards to take course materials off the Web, Block indicated that was not a recommendation.

Block responded negatively to Rose who questioned whether there was any discussion of professors distributing their notes on disk.

Jon Dorbolo, Information Services, felt that printing is related to quality. He has found from teaching on the Web that students who print materials don't print pages that show activity, rather they look for activity and, when absent, they default to the print button. Robson agreed with Dorbolo and hoped that the IS committee could provide guidelines for appropriate use of the Web medium.

Jane Huyer, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, commented on the cost issue and felt that reading is a very cost effective way to learn things, but reading on the screen is difficult, time consuming and ties up an expensive resource in labs. She suggested it may actually be cheaper for the university to print pages rather than queue up to use computers.

Caspers serves on the Commuter Committee and hears frequently that students who commute don't always own computers or have access the Web at home and aren't able to sit for long periods of time to get notes from computers in the labs.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Recap – The IFS February recap was distributed via e-mail to all Senators.
- Faculty Awards Deadline – Awards selected by the Faculty Awards and Recognition Committee to be presented at University Day are due March 6.
- Committee Interest Forms – Forms allowing faculty and staff the opportunity to volunteer for committees will be distributed after Spring Break and are due in the Faculty Senate Office on April 10.
- Post-Tenure Review Task Force – The Task Force is sponsoring open sessions on March 11, 12, 16 and 19 to gather input on the draft report that is available on the Web at: www.physics.orst.edu

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold congratulated the Senate on what he felt was an excellent discussion regarding distance education. He reported on the following items:

- Budget process and performance measures – An earlier version of the performance measures called for "participation in OSU Statewide." The present wording has been expanded to provide more context and perspective and the orientation has been reversed away from participation to the issue of access. In an effort to capture a number of concerns, it now reads "expand Statewide access to OSU credit and degree programs in areas of OSU strengths where evidence of need and demand support cost effectiveness." He noted this was not necessarily the final version.

An additional section has also been revised from "evidence of working collaboratively across the university" to "increase university-wide collaboration and external partnerships where appropriate and responding to needs and demands of Oregonians and to opportunities for significant revenue generation." This revision clarifies that there must be some need or demand we're responding to and takes cost into account.

- The work of the two State System Board's committees is continuing. Mark McCambridge will represent OSU on the Committee on Budget and Finance. Provost Arnold is participating on the Governance and Structure Committee. The two committees will be working together to integrate their comments. It is expected that there will be significant changes as a result of the process.
- Textbook Orders – There was a great deal of concern about administration monitoring textbook orders as a result of a message indicating that copies of orders must be sent to the Provost's Office. Dr. Arnold explained that this is a long-

standing policy and OSU is required by law to make book orders available to any vendor in the community since the OSU Bookstore does not have an exclusive opportunity to sell textbooks to students.

Senator Frank, Liberal Arts, questioned the rewriting of one performance measure concerning sponsored research and asked if the intent was to recognize only sponsored research. He noted that many units spend most of their time working on unsponsored research. Arnold noted that the wording had been changed from "increase in number and success of research proposals" to "increase in dollar amount and success rate of external funding requests for research, outreach, and teaching and learning projects and programs." He acknowledged that Frank was correct in his assessment and mentioned that it was discussed at the recent Academic Deans meeting and they will work on wording that identifies the contribution of scholarship generally.

Senator Manogue asked Arnold to comment on why the proposed performance standards don't seem to address the quality of the teaching community. Arnold acknowledged that that discussion has taken place and language needs to be included to address the importance of quality teaching. He noted that the performance measure document is a work in progress. Arnold emphasized that the measures are not aimed at the performance of specific individuals, but at the outcome of the process. The performance measures being defined will look at students, graduation rates, retention rates, time to degree, and impact of economic development which are all the result of the faculty collectively.

Senator Shor, Engineering, questioned if certain performance measurements are desired, wouldn't it be more appropriate to convert the reward structure for faculty to something more in alignment that helps the university. Arnold agreed with her and noted that the current process can only help, but he also felt that it is important to identify items that are relevant to the public that supports us.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Niess felt that, with all the negativism being reported about OSU, faculty and administration need to focus on getting out the message that we are working together to provide a compelling learning experience. OSU's leadership and quality educational and research programs that support the Oregon economy should be receiving positive media attention to help achieve support for higher education in Oregon. She referred to several positive things that happened in the past month:

- In response to library concerns, Information Services is moving ahead with using \$100,000 from an endowment and \$200,000 in new money from OSU's limited reserves to buy more books. They are also putting together a budget proposal for next year that reflects needed changes required for Association of Research Libraries (ARL) status.
- Individual units are supporting each other through difficult financial times. OSU will probably receive additional funding from the state system this year due to increased Student Credit Hours based on the efforts of the collective institution.
- The Athletic Director search has resulted in the hiring of Mitch Barnhart who recognized that the entire university needs to work together and support each other.
- A recently developed program, Science Connections, connects OSU scientists with high school science teachers and acts as a mechanism for students to see the quality of the faculty at OSU. This effort is positively marketing OSU as a quality learning institution. OSU needs to be marketed better overall to make sure that prospective students understand the real strengths we have to offer.
- The news received by President Niess concerning the tabled Category I proposals is that the primary goal is to make sure that the distance offerings are of quality comparable to the on-campus offerings. In general, the offerings will differ from on-campus offerings largely in that fewer courses will be available to choose from.

The groups working on these proposals are very close to having at least one course in each of the core areas. She felt that the action taken by the Senate in January has led to a responsible clarification of a decidedly different delivery approach that has the potential of providing a compelling learning experience while meeting the needs of a diverse and extended student body. This is another example of supporting each other and OSU.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 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](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » February 5, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 535

February 5, 1998

For All Faculty

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

Meeting Summary

- Special Report: Conversation with President Risser
- Committee Report: Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs, Bob Burton
- Action Items: None
- Old Business: None
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Champeau, J. Schindler; Isensee, P. Brown; Jimmerson, K. Murphy; Primak, C. Sproul; and Reed, J. Hino.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Biwan, Cheeke, Coakley, Cowles, Farnsworth, J. Field, Frank, Grunder, Hathaway, Henthorne, Huyer, Jepson, Jones, Kerkvliet, Leong, Mix, Savage, Williams, and Yim.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; R. Rose, President-Elect; A. Wilcox, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

R. Born, L. Burns, A. Christie, S. Francis, E. Fritzell, A. Hashimoto, R. Landau, J. Nishihara, C. Pederson, K. Ritenour, and J. Schuster.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Ad-hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs

President Niess explained that the Executive Committee (EC) had given a lot of thought to the Category I proposals tabled in January and to the general direction of off-site degree programs. The EC felt that prior to removing the actions from the table, the academic units needed to provide additional information to Senators to consider. The Deans of the affected units have been requested to provide specific information about: control of the program; specifics about the option(s) offered; faculty agreements for developing and teaching courses in a specific option; program advising; budget information supporting development and teaching; and commitments for offering the courses. Responses to these concerns will be reviewed by the Curriculum Council prior to providing an addendum to the current Category I proposal. Once the information is presented, it will be up to a Senator to remove the items from the table under Old Business.

The EC also considered the need for more information and general conversation about off-site degree programs and what it means for Oregon to be OSU's campus. In response to this concern the EC established an Ad-hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs, co-chaired by Bob Burton and Gordon Matzke. The charge is to support a discussion of the issues, questions and recommendations involving OSU's commitment to off-site degree programs. Monthly reports will be made to the Faculty Senate and an executive summary will be prepared of the discussions, to be presented at the June Faculty Senate meeting.

Bob Burton reported that the ad-hoc committee is beginning to collect questions and encouraged Senators to contact them at: faculty.senate@orst.edu Most questions received so far fall into three categories:

- 1) program quality – some people have the assumption that the quality of distance programs will be less than on-campus instruction: is it really a correspondence course; don't we need face-to-face human interaction?
- 2) resources – who pays and what help is available?
- 3) market – do enough students exist to pay for the programs and make the effort worthwhile?

The committee is in the process of collating and organizing the questions and will next send them to those who can provide answers.

SPECIAL REPORTS

Conversations with the President

OSU President Paul Risser began his discussion by reminding Senators that OSU has historically been underfunded. Of all the institutions in the 11 western states, Oregon is ranked last in per capita funding and starts 32% below the average of other states.

There are major deficits at OSU in Athletics and Information Services due in part to the budget process that has evolved in the units which are expected to responsibly manage their own budgets. This process works if there are adequate reserves to cover a unit that doesn't stay within budget or if good leadership ensures that the budget is adhered to. Unfortunately, due to the effects of Measure 5 and significant underfunding, OSU has very few reserves left and there have been problems with budgets being managed responsibly. Several safeguards have been put in place to avoid these problems in the future: 1) a different accounting procedure has been implemented to track funding in all units; and 2) the President's Cabinet, deans and budget directors now meet quarterly to study the budget and expenditures across the university to determine potential problem areas. In addition, the President's Cabinet looks at these figures each month. Risser felt he could guarantee "with absolute certainty" that there will not be surprises such have occurred in the past.

In regard to Athletics, Risser reported that they are now using the same accounting process as the rest of the university, a new business manager will soon be appointed, and all expenditures over \$100 are being approved by the Athletic Director. In addition, a new procedure in Athletics calls for a monthly accounting to be provided to the Faculty Senate Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee (B&FP) chair to track the budget. A committee of three (B&FP chair and two from outside the university who are familiar with accounting, recommended by the Foundation Board) will help Athletics begin to build a zero base budget. He reported that Lee Schroeder has moved permanently from Vice President for Finance and Administration to Athletics. His knowledge of the university will be an asset to the new Athletic Director and to Athletics overall.

Risser felt that Curt Pederson is doing a superb job with the challenges facing Information Services (IS). Erasing the debt means that IS spends less than in the past. He felt that the deficit recovery is on track and can be repaid in three years.

He noted that the colleges of Home Economics and Education and Science will not meet their budgets; administration will work them to build a zero base budget.

He predicted that the university overall will have a positive cash balance at the end of the year, probably about \$900,000. Ending the year with a positive balance means that some things will have to be deferred. It is imperative that every account be in compliance with the budget.

Risser stated that the Library has been underfunded for years, which has contributed to it not being afforded ARL (Association of Research Libraries) status. He noted the irony of a \$45 million library being constructed, but not enough funding for adequate materials. The Library's obligation of the IS debt is \$625,000. He felt that the book budget was a concern to all. The Library is facing a \$126,000 reduction, or 4%, of the almost \$3 million materials budget. The reduction distribution favored journals over books since journals have been cut in the past.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, noted that the majority of the Athletics deficit has occurred in the last year and questioned why, given the new safeguards, they will continue to go further into debt. Risser responded that, although Athletics has been in debt for a long time, the deficit ballooned in the last two years and will continue for one more year. Every area of the budget has seen an increase, including salaries, expenditures, administration, and scholarships which have increased 80% and accounts for a large portion of the budget. He felt there are opportunities to cut costs, especially in management, but it will take a long time to cut expenditures, probably 6–7 years to pay down the debt. He noted that Athletics is required to pay interest on their debt, student fees account for about \$875,000 of the Athletic budget, and about \$2 million comes from the general fund.

Senator Thies, Science, questioned whether there was a commitment to placing an appreciable fraction of the revenue generated from increased enrollment into the teaching of courses since there will be more students to teach. Risser responded that funding will increase next year based on this year's enrollment, but he didn't feel that the money should automatically be placed where cuts were made this year due to possible changes in the university direction.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, felt that the current economic problems are actually political in nature and asked what has and can be done to contact legislators to address this issue. Risser referred to two points: 1) an unacceptable discrepancy between the per capita funding for higher education in other states and the low per capita funding in Oregon; and 2) methods to get Oregon to change its behavior. The legislature can be blamed for the trend up until the last year when OSU lost money due to decreased enrollment. He referenced Governor Kitzhaber's two higher education task forces on access and the economy. The task force on higher education and the economy resulted in recommendations of sweeping changes, including: each institution should be fairly autonomous; each institution should consider its own board; and money shouldn't go back to the central pool. The recommendations spoke only to redistribution of funds rather than to increased funding. OSU drafted a blueprint in response to the recommendations which resulted in a few key points: instead of comparing higher education funding to previous years, it compares higher education funding to other states; each university should have its own board of trustees that understands the needs of individual institutions and can relate to the public at large, and becomes an advocate for the university. The State Board has two committees looking at funding and government structure. Risser will present the blueprint document to the funding committee on February 13. He felt that the governor has made it clear to the Oregon University System that the board needs to make some changes. Risser noted that he wants difficult issues discussed and the need for the campus to come together to talk about the needs that OSU satisfies in the state and the values provided.

Senator Lee, Science, heard that a full-time student generates \$8–9,000 revenue and questioned how it's determined as to what fraction of that amount follows to where the student is taking courses. Risser referred to a discussion last fall when it was suggested that five things should occur: 1) peer panels look at departments; 2) look at how we

offer courses; 3) increase OSU Statewide; 4) look at ways to make research visible to the State; and 5) think carefully about internal money allocations. In the past money has been allocated to deans with little accountability. After discussing the issue with deans, two things are expected to be finished by the end of February: 1) a small group is trying to determine the criteria for allocating money based on productivity; and 2) deans have been asked to think about how the colleges relate to the university criteria and are there special criteria within different colleges. Risser felt that enrollment clearly should be one of the criteria.

Immediate Past Senate President Wilcox explained that the Faculty Senate has a task force to study the Information Services deficit, which is proving to be a difficult task. He mentioned a previous reference by Curt Pederson that the library may be held accountable for a greater proportion of the payback, at least in the first year, than the percent of the deficit they incurred. Wilcox expressed strong feelings to preserve the library budget, and encouraged looking elsewhere for areas to cut. Risser responded that, since there are no reserves and little room for maneuvering, he felt that the actions being taken are the right things to do. He noted that there should be a \$100,000 savings from roof repairs that could be put into books.

In response to Senator Tate, Science, questioning the degree of faculty input in arriving at the five steps referenced earlier, Risser indicated a year was spent talking with people across campus, alumni and the business community.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, expressed the feeling that, in the spirit of inviting faculty and legislators to think about things differently, he encouraged the university community to think about the library and book budget in different ways also. He noted that cuts in the library budget preceded the Information Services deficit. Oriard felt it was appropriate to rethink the library's place in the institution, not just in terms of its budget, but as the center of a research institution. He suggested that the library be made a top fundraising priority for a several year period. Risser felt his sentiment was a good point, and that the budget process will allow for that next year.

Senator Matzke, Science, felt that the university can't wait for the library's long range plan and raised the possibility of removing the library from the Information Services deficit and distribute that portion of the shortfall more widely across the university. Risser responded that that would be done.

Rubin Landau, Physics, expressed concern about each institution creating a Board of Trustees which would facilitate communication and recalled that the State Board was created because the existing communication channels between the legislature and university were not good. He was also concerned about another layer of bureaucracy and that faculty were not being included on the Board of Trustees. Risser felt that a strength of the State Board is that it doesn't advocate for any university, but it also doesn't allow individual universities to articulate values to the State. He acknowledged that another board does mean another layer but he'd rather take the risk of managing our own board and have the benefit of having a board articulate the university to the public. He felt there was a better chance of faculty input to a local board than to the current State Board.

Senator Rose, Forestry, questioned the amount of money needed to get completely debt free. Risser felt it was importation to reiterate that there are four units that aren't towing the line, but the rest are doing a good job. The total debt will be about \$14 million on June 30. Mark McCambridge, Vice President for Finance and Administration (Interim), stated that, by the end of the fiscal year, it was believed that the university would be close to \$1 million in the plus column.

In response to a comment from the floor, Risser declared that funding is absolutely fair among the institutions in the sense that no university is either advantaged or disadvantaged. He felt that institutions bring harm to themselves by quibbling amongst one another which gives the legislature excuses to withhold funding. Risser's proposal would allow each institution to keep their own resources and generate state resources

from a straightforward formula.

Senator Woods, Engineering, questioned the funding formula for colleges such as Pharmacy and Engineering that have higher costs. Risser agreed that there were bonafide differences in educational costs in various areas. He felt that people now realize that the funding formula has to include the cost of education.

Senator Oriard questioned the strategy to deal with the legislature and build support from the business community, given that we're dealing with "two Oregons." Risser stated that the business community is clearly dominated by the Willamette Valley and Portland metro area, although the legislature does have people in key positions from the rural areas. He felt that OSU covers the topical areas of the state since natural resources appeals to the Eastern part of the State and Business, Engineering, Science and Oceanography appeals to the rest of the state. More difficult to overcome is the argument that public institutions need to cut expenditures, state government needs to be cut, and taxes need to be lowered. He made the point that if you look at individual earning power since 1980, only those with bachelors degrees have been able to keep up with inflation.

President Risser feels wonderfully optimistic about where OSU is going and noted there are lots of ways to measure quality: the competitive rate of outside funding ranks 8th in the country compared to state funding which ranks 43rd. The institution has to change and he feels that the university is willing to think about things differently. He feels there is a tangible change in thinking about higher education in the state.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- OSU Policy on Electronic Delivery of Instruction
- Educational Reform Coordinator/PASS Timeline
- Distinguished Service Award

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

- Faculty have been involved in the search and interview process for the new Athletic Director.
- Two of the Board's committees have discussed funding models. He cautioned Senators to understand that this falls under the heading of a public discussion committee and sharing information posed to that committee. Just because it appears in print, doesn't mean that decisions have been made; the process will continue to unfold.

REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Niess' report included the following items:

- During her first month as President, she has been impressed with the willingness of faculty and administrators to work together to get questions out and get answers to begin dialog. She noted the delicate balance of variables operating within higher education; how each variable affects another and creates a ripple effect.
- She was impressed with the response from those looking at ways to assist the Royal Thai Scholars to remain at OSU.
- The Athletic Advisory Board met with Lee Schroeder and will arrange a meeting with the new Athletic Director. The Board will continue to ask questions about the Athletic budget and how the deficit will be repaid. They have been assured that

academics are very important to athletes.

- Expect the Information Services Task Force to report at the April Faculty Senate meeting.
- Input is being received on the Assessment of Teaching Task Force draft report and she encouraged faculty to continue to forward their input.
- Niess noted that a cost associated with placing lecture notes on the Web is university paper used to print the notes at a rate of \$40,000 per year. The Instructional Development and Technology Committee has been asked to collect information and prepare a recommendation for Senate consideration. She urged faculty to contact John Block if they have pertinent information.
- There is a graduate student sponsored library petition available in the Faculty Senate Office.
- Since Niess could not find any committee that faculty could provide input to regarding distance learning or extended education, the Ad-Hoc Committee on Off-Site Degree Programs was created. She is asking the Committee on Committees to review the committee structure and Standing Rules to determine if a committee could be reconfigured to allow for two-way communication on this issue.

OLD BUSINESS

Sally Francis, Home Economics & Education, referred to Provost Arnold's comment about faculty input on the Athletic Director search committee and noted that she was actually a member of the screening committee rather than a search committee.

Leslie Burns reported that plans are underway for OSU's new student orientation, Connect '98.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:43 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](#) » [1998 Minutes](#) » January 8, 1998

Faculty Senate Minutes

1998 No. 535

January 8, 1998

For All Faculty

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

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports: Information Services, Curt Pederson and Martin Luther King Teachin, Ken Krane
- Action Items: Installation of elected officers and Senators; Approval of Parliamentarian; Category I Proposals - Delivery of Baccalaureate Degrees in Environmental Sciences and Natural Resources as Statewide Programs [Motion 98-535-01 through 03]
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Carson, S. Rubert; Chambers, H. Polensek; Christensen, D. Myrold; Coakley, D. Clark; Daniels, G. Hightower; Henderson, D. Keszler; Rielly, L. Maughan; and Seville, P. Hsieh.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Bontrager, Breen, Burton, Cowles, Elwood, Graham, Gregerson, Jepson, Jones, Lee, Levine, Locke, Mallory-Smith, McDaniel, Righetti, Rivin, and Winograd.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

M. Niess, President; R. Rose, President-Elect; T. Wilcox, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

S. Bloomer, L. Burns, P. Doescher, J. Dorbolo, S. Francis, E. Fritzell, K. Green, A. Hashimoto, D. Johnson, K. Krane, A. Messersmith, P. Muir, D. Nicodemus, F. Obermiller, J. Root, L. Schroeder, G. Schuette, J. Schuster, B. Thielges, T. White, and. B. Winner.

Action Items

Installation of Elected Officers

Anthony Wilcox recapped his year as president in opening remarks. He felt that one of the most significant accomplishments of the 1997 Faculty Senate was to extend eligibility to Faculty Research Assistants and all Professional Faculty.

Wilcox reported he formed an Information Services (IS) Review Task Force in December to analyze how and in what units the deficit occurred and relate that to the proposed IS deficit repayment plan. The task force members are: Bruce Sorte, Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee; Gary Beach, Library Committee; John Block, Instructional Development and Technology Committee; and Wilcox. Associate Provost for Information Services, Curt Pederson, has pledged full disclosure in working with the task force. The task force will report to the Senate when their work is completed.

Wilcox expressed appreciation to: Provost Arnold for his candor and integrity in his dealings with the Senate; the 1997 Executive Committee; Parliamentarian Trischa Knapp; and Vickie Nunnemaker.

President Maggie Niess was installed by Anthony Wilcox, who wished her much success. Niess thanked him for his leadership, and example of leadership, and noted that he was a great champion of the faculty. She then presented him with a Myrtlewood plaque on behalf of the Senate which read:

Anthony Wilcox
Oregon State University

1997 Faculty Senate President
Given in appreciation for his leadership,
judgement, compassion, wit and dedicated service
to the faculty of Oregon State University.
Wit is the rarest quality to be met with
among people of education.
- William Hazlett

Niess then installed President-elect Robin Rose; Executive Committee members Jim Foster, Gordon Matzke and Sandra Woods; and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative Antonio Torres. Niess expressed appreciation to past president Ken Krane for his valuable interaction on the Executive Committee. She also thanked the retiring Executive Committee members: Cheryl Jordan, Don Reed, and Ken Williamson; and the retiring Senators. She then asked newly elected Senators to stand and declared them installed.

Approval of Parliamentarian

Robert Iltis, Speech Communication, was confirmed as the 1998 Parliamentarian. Niess thanked Trischa Knapp for her commitment to the Parliamentarian duties in the past.

Category I Proposals

Sherm Bloomer, Curriculum Council member, presented for approval two abbreviated Category I proposals for distance delivery of existing degrees as part of OSU Statewide - the B.S. degree in Natural Resources and the B.S. degree in Environmental Sciences. The proposals have been approved by the Curriculum Council and the Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee.

Bloomer noted that there are two separate proposals, but they are being presented together since they have been discussed together, and they share common threads: both are interdisciplinary, they have somewhat similar structures, and a number of courses are common to both degrees.

The proposals are to offer two existing interdisciplinary BS degree programs statewide, initially at five sites: Central Oregon Community College, Mt. Hood Community College, Eastern Oregon University, Southwestern Oregon Community College, and the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. Students would complete the first two years at the offcampus sites and complete the last two years of their degrees using distance education offerings from OSU. Distance students will be expected to fulfill the same requirements as for on-campus students. The difference between on-campus and off-campus offerings is that the choice of options and courses will be more limited for distance students.

Bloomer summarized what he felt were the most important questions raised by the Curriculum Council in reviewing these proposals:

Funding for development of distance offerings? There is now a budget for development of the program, approved by the Provost, that includes support for development of about 35 courses over four years. Development costs are estimated at \$15,000 for an interactive course and about \$-22,0-00 for a web or video course; costs include faculty salary and support. The budget also includes costs for some support staff. Additional course development will be supported by grants in some units.

In what format will the courses be offered? Courses will be offered in a variety of formats, including interactive TV, video-work-books, and web-based courses. The budget assumes that twice as many video courses as web courses will be developed. The appropriate mode of delivery will be determined by faculty and program committees, as facilities and resources allow.

How will advising be done? Distance students would initially be advised by the Office of Continuing Higher Education (OCHE). Students would be assigned an advisor in an appropriate unit once they select an option or specialization.

Will the WIC component be included? The core classes or options will have to include a WIC course when they are selected.

Will the DPD requirement be fulfilled? Yes. If one of the distance sites does not have such a course, it will have to be provided as part of the OSU course offerings.

How will student services, access to the library, and student support be supported? These services will be provided or coordinated by staff in OCHE.

Will there be special modifications of requirements for the distance degrees? Not currently. If necessary, it will be put forward through the usual curriculum review process.

What are department responsibilities and returns? The costs of development for these courses will be funded centrally; the costs of delivery will be the responsibility of the departments. Initially the credit hours for the distance education students will be accrued to OCHE. The Council understands that the eventual plan is to have the student credit hours accrue to the department offering the courses.

Which options will be offered? The proposal does not specify which options or specializations are to be offered. That decision must come from the faculty and steering committees involved in each degree; the Council understands that, with the support of appropriate deans, discussions about the specifics of those courses are ongoing. The distance degree offerings are planned to be phased in over a two to three year period. Students currently interested in the program are taking the preparatory work; they would need core courses next year, and option courses the year after.

It was the Council's opinion, after much discussion and review, that this was a reasonable degree of specificity for a proposal like this. It seems logical to offer the degrees to interested students throughout Oregon; if that is true, it seems to the advantage of the University to move forward and lead the efforts to expand the opportunities we can offer to Oregonians. Waiting until each course is online would mean a two-year delay; the Council was convinced that the implementation of these distance degree offerings can go forward simultaneously with the development of the specific courses for the program.

President Niess explained that the Executive Committee (EC) had questions about the proposals and chose neither to endorse nor reject the proposals, but decided to bring them to the Senate because of the desire for a debate about the issues surrounding these proposals. The EC was particularly concerned about several issues:

Resources to support the release time for faculty course development and for teaching the actual courses. There is support the first four years, but it's not clear that adequate funding will be available for effective development and delivery after that point. What happens when funding is no longer available and units must continue the program development within its existing budget? How does this funding affect the depleted budgets of the units? How will units make decisions about this program and other for which they are responsible?

What part of the program will be delivered to the distance students since not all options were identified as being available. Will students have elective choices in WIC and DPD courses that oncampus students have? Will students have the breadth of elective courses desired in the baccalaureate core in designing their programs?

Who is in charge of the programs? Who does the advising? Are these proposals in too much of a rush to hasten the expansion of OSU Statewide? Has there been adequate consultation of faculty, department chairs, and deans?

Niess noted that the EC recognizes that these proposals are the first wave of many such Category I proposals to come before the Senate through OSU Statewide. The EC considered the issues of positioning OSU as a major university leading the development of such programs, rather than following the paths developed by others. The question is, should and will OSU be a leader in this direction? Since OSU already has the degree authority for these programs, these proposals are not for new degrees. Since Category I proposals are not required when courses on campus change to webbased course delivery rather than classroom lecture, doesn't OSU already have the authority to provide the distance delivery? At what point will distance delivery cease to be recognized as the essential feature of the program and, thus, no longer require a Category I route? At this point, the Oregon State System of Higher Education requires that it be involved with any changes of magnitude with the degree program. The EC asked, at what point is the process considered micromanaging? Niess explained that the EC has only just begun to debate these issues and felt it necessary for the issues to have a full airing before the Senate. She emphasized that the Curriculum Council and Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee have recommended approval after a much longer study and analysis.

Sandra Woods, faculty member in Environmental Engineering and former Faculty Associate to the Provost on the extended education team, explained that the proposals are requesting permission to avoid coming before the Faculty Senate every time a site is added, not just for the five sites listed. She felt it was important to offer science-based programs to placebound students in areas with large populations for the first sites. The courses are offered in clusters to make it easy for students to add specific courses to the basic requirements to obtain a degree. It will also be possible for students to accomplish the bulk of their coursework via distance delivery and come to campus for 6-12 months to complete options.

Woods stated that the institution should not be expected to provide all course development funding. Current efforts to bring in external funding for distance courses has resulted in \$1 million so far.

She gave a comparative enrollment example for EOU of 700 unduplicated distance students per term. If those students were at OSU, they would generate over \$2.5 million. Oregon's community colleges offered 832 distance courses during 1996/97 with 19,217 student enrollments, which translates to 1,324 FTE. She noted that this program would enable thousands of

place-bound or time-bound Oregon students, who have completed AA degrees, to obtain a baccalaureate degree.

In the past, there was no incentive for units to teach distance courses because it wouldn't be reflected in their budget. She noted President Risser's reference to the importance of looking at our internal budgeting process and she noted that the hope is that a system is developed for internal budgeting that will contain a strong link between departmental budgets and whether they participate in distance education.

Senator Wood, Health & Human Performance, questioned where the monitoring function is. Bloomer responded that measurements will be similar to an oncampus degree program, such as number enrolled, number graduating, evaluations, etc. Students will be given the same feedback as oncampus students.

Senator Morris, Science, was concerned that departments would be driven to have to develop distance courses to add to their recurring budget. He expressed concern about maintenance costs and what happens to the budget after the fourth year. Woods stated that the reason the budget stops at four years is because the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee requires new proposals to submit a budget for only four years. She noted that the reason the budget is decreased in the fourth year is that most of the courses will have been developed by then. Bloomer added that the Curriculum Council was concerned that there was no maintenance budget to improve the courses after the first year. Bloomer felt that the maintenance costs were not known since this has not been done before.

Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, questioned the cost of delivery and, since there is no revenue on the budget, there is no way of assessing revenue vs. costs. Bloomer responded that the budget is based on a formula developed by Jon Root in Distance Education, which includes the development of a course in its initial offering, faculty release time, use of technical expertise, and costs of Ed-Net and reproduction of videos. Also included is the cost for OCHE to be the node through which exams from instructors to students would pass. The costs in terms of faculty time and effort, except for release time, are not included.

Provost Arnold noted that these proposals posed a number of very complex questions, with the resource area being the most interesting. There are a number of OSU units already effectively delivering distance education courses and they find that it is cost effective using the mechanism through OCHE. Arnold noted that the current method only brings the tuition resources to the campus to support OCHE, delivery costs, and faculty time costs involved in offering a particular course or program. He felt the system was clearly headed toward distinguishing less between on-campus vs. distance students. He noted that units are currently offering distance education that is supported by tuition revenues alone and resources will be available to the institution when a state subsidy or match is based on numbers of students served. He acknowledged that it's well understood that we're missing the mechanism to assure that the generating unit receives the resources.

Senator Frank, Liberal Arts, questioned whether student credit hours from distance delivery would be used to bump OSU up one or two enrollment corridors to allow OSU to be eligible for additional enrollment revenues. Arnold responded that the understanding is that we need to move to a model where all students served are being counted in the overall enrollment figures and OSU's budgetary allocation would be based on all students served. He noted that the commitment is there and that the state system has had that discussion. There is a set of principles endorsed by both the governor's task force and OSBHE that indicates the OSBHE budget model should allow access to students anywhere, has allowances for subsidies, and that reallocation of resources in the next legislative session will clearly be for targeted investments that have specific expected outcomes that can be tracked. The OSBHE has asked the Chancellor's Office to do further work on the principles.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, supports distance education and stated that it is something that OSU must and should be doing and noted that one third of the faculty in his department are engaged in distance education. However, he felt that a serious hidden cost of the proposal is the additional workload surrounding distance delivery courses that will be accomplished at the cost of departmental majors and residential students. Bloomer responded that this point was not lost in Curriculum Council debates. He noted that the proposals contained a straw set of courses that provided an example of courses that could be developed and, possibly, the particular courses listed aren't the right ones to choose. The participating academic units need to determine which course or courses can be offered as a group course and within the resources of the unit providing the courses. He noted that no course has been identified to be offered by distance education until that discussion occurs. The proposals were put together with the knowledge that that discussion had not happened, because it was felt that the risks were worth it, but that the risks had to be talked about by the participants.

Senator Lajtha, Science, didn't like the proposal because she felt the risks associated with the proposals were too great since there is reliance on many department chairs to be successful. Since the specifics have not been worked out, she's not sure she wants to spend a great deal of time developing a course and then find out that the time spent was wasted. She questioned why the proposals were being presented before the specifics and options were worked out. She felt that those discussions should take place long before the proposals are presented. She is also nervous about leadership for the proposals, since that has not been defined. Bloomer responded that the options were not specified since it would take two years to specify the courses and options, develop them, and have them online. The Curriculum Council felt it would be a mistake for the institution to wait that long. His understanding was that the academic deans from the involved units are committed to work with the departments to offer the requisite courses.

Laurel Maughan, Valley Library, wanted to stress the idea that the library is another hidden cost. She feels it would be difficult to provide the necessary services unless the university is willing to provide some funding.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, is a proponent of distance education, but felt that these proposals have no connection between resources listed in budgets that are seen and those responsible for carrying out the courses. As a result, it ends up being a burden on either the faculty member, department head, or dean. He questioned the position of the involved deans and department chairs, given that the budgets expire in four years. Dean Horne, Science, stated that he doesn't know what the budget will be from year-to-year, but the assumption is that we will not continue to have historical budget and across the board cuts. The incentive for these proposals is that the money generated will come back to the units.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, referred to the Liberal Studies model and questioned 1) whether the proposed 70 students is enough to return the expected costs and 2) what is the actual expected participation in the programs to justify the costs. Woods responded that Liberal Studies and OCHE are self-support and can't run a deficit; they don't offer courses that don't generate enough revenue. Woods has been told that the cut-off number is 7-12 depending on actual expenses for a particular course.

Woods referred to the proposed course list and clarified that, although multiple courses from one department may be listed, the courses listed in bold are those that appear in both majors and would be the most logical ones to be developed. She noted that it doesn't mean that all the courses listed would need to be developed for the proposals. There are 40 courses required for both degrees, with about 20 departments in four or five colleges participating in the two degrees. She stated that OSU does not have to prepare all the course work since there are many already developed, high-quality courses that can be licensed. She also noted that there are community college instructors with Ph.D.'s who would love to teach these courses and OSU could pay them far less than OSU faculty are paid. She indicated that OSU could choose to offer the programs on a self-support basis, but it would not provide the desired quality. Bloomer added that the Curriculum Council felt that the academic content of these degrees needs to be under the control of the participating academic units.

Senator Manogue, Science, felt that faculty were being pushed from many different directions to offer these types of proposals, but stated that the Senate needs to think about quality. She felt that individual courses can be effectively taught via distance education, but not entire degree programs. She added that OSU has research faculty involved in active research that gives them perspective on these subjects that community college faculty don't have. She questioned whether students would be receiving a quality OSU education if they never step foot on this campus.

Coblentz indicated that he could never support the proposals since the Senate was told by Woods that OSU could become a mail order institution or hire community college instructors to teach OSU courses. Woods clarified that she was citing an example related to resources showing that we can afford the proposals. She stated that the revenue generating ability is there, but there was never any idea that this example would happen. The curricula and courses are under control of the academic units and colleges. Bloomer stated that the understanding of the Curriculum Council was that these are to be OSU degrees, meaning that 300 and 400 level courses are taught by and controlled by the academic units on this campus. This could mean that adjunct faculty are hired by the academic units.

Senator Shor, Engineering, spoke about the quality of distance education and expressed concern that other top universities are offering distance education classes, and companies often tend to prefer to have their students take courses at the employer's site.

Senator Grunder, Science, questioned how many students it would take to break even on a distance course. Bloomer responded that about 10-12 would cover the maintenance cost, but not the development cost.

In response to Senator Frank asking if successful distance education courses were looked at, Bloomer indicated that the Curriculum Council did not look at comparators. He added that these are degrees that OSU is uniquely suited to offer. Woods stated that she did travel to various parts of the country to review other distance courses that are successful and that do generate revenue. Provost Arnold stated that marketing was an important tool for other successful programs. He noted that a sense of urgency is present in these proposals since it is difficult to market programs with a "pending approval" disclaimer. A built in advantage to collaboration with community colleges is that they are willing to market OSU's programs with their own.

Senator Drexler, Business, called for the question; motion seconded. Motion 98-535-03 to end debate did not pass by a two-thirds majority through a show of hands.

Paul Doescher, Agricultural Sciences, felt that the option area is the greatest challenge from a quality standpoint. He also felt that the incentives mentioned earlier are only a small step in the right direction toward the development of a quality offering and doesn't feel that we're yet there.

Senator Yamada, Science, wondered why the residency requirement of the last 45 credits or 45 of the last 60 credits being earned on-campus is not applied to distance learners. She questioned how students could learn very complicated, interactive systems without having hands-on experience in the form of upper division labs or field work. Bloomer responded that the

Curriculum Council's understanding of the requirement translated into OSU-offered upper division courses where residency didn't mean physically taking courses on campus. He felt that the point about hands-on experience was very good and indicated that was a concern of the Council. He acknowledged that only a few of the options in each degree could be offered if students never set foot on campus.

Senator Lajtha commented that weekend trips would be written into the program to provide interaction between the student and instructor.

Senator Grunder questioned how can we market a degree for which there are no upper division distance courses. She felt that the philosophy of the programs was too ambitious and it would be wiser to determine a specific set of courses for which one would have guaranteed enrollment because there would only be one choice and build it from there rather than trying to offer a fully existing degree program.

In response to Senator Rose, Forestry, questioning whether it was true that the Natural Resources program does not require chemistry, Bloomer indicated that there was no chemistry requirement, but reminded Senators that this is an existing program. The Curriculum Council did not debate the content of the degrees, instead they debated whether the existing degrees should be offered in the distance format.

Jon Dorbolo, Information Services, stated he had been teaching web-based courses for four years. He has 70 students in one section and regularly corresponds with them one-on-one, which would be absolutely impossible to do on a face-to-face basis. He felt it was important to not equate quality with a face-to-face meeting. He thought it was important to distinguish face-to-face from person-to-person. He encouraged anyone who has a concern about the quality of using the internet to contact him.

Senator Morris felt that the discussion was jumping all over some very innovative ideas. He noted that OSU has received recognition for its electronic innovations and didn't feel that the Category I debate was even properly directed since they are already existing programs. He felt it should be an internal discussion within participating departments. President Niess responded that a significant change to an existing program, such as off-campus delivery, does require approval from the Senate. Senator Beach, Associated Faculty, stated that OSSHE requires submitting an abbreviated Category I to the Academic Council and the Chancellor's Office for delivering existing courses to distance sites. The institution is also expected to have this debate and review by the accrediting agency. Provost Arnold observed that the Board will be informed of the proposals but will not vote on them since they are already approved degrees. OSU's process for forwarding proposals to the Chancellor's Office requires that it follow the curricular procedures process. He suggested that future proposals might contain language indicating that they may be offered as an extended program, if it is cost effective, to avoid having to present the proposal twice.

An individual from Student Affairs remarked that she hadn't heard the discussion address the issue that this is an opportunity to give more access to Oregonians which may result in having them support higher education. She was unsure if it was wise to turn our backs on community colleges that were offering to partner with OSU. She sees it as an issue of action and maintaining quality.

Senator Manogue thanked the Executive Committee for allowing Senators the opportunity to have this debate. She has no doubt that distance education is appropriate in some circumstances, that it can be done well, and that OSU can do it, but it's necessary to think hard about how to do it and about the cost. She would like to see this body develop a set of guidelines for distance education. She then moved to table the main motion; motion seconded. Motion 98-535-02 to table action on the Category I proposals passed by visible vote.

Leslie Burns, Director Undergraduate Academic Programs, stated that distance education guidelines had been created by the Curriculum and Graduate Councils and were already in place.

Administrative Introductions

Orcilia Zuniga Forbes, Vice President for University Advancement, and Wilson C. "Toby" Hayes, Vice Provost for Research, were both introduced to the Senate and each briefly spoke.

Zuniga Forbes, who began her appointment January 1, indicated she had served in a similar capacity at the University of New Mexico. -She thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak and explained that her office is dedicated to furthering the strategic goals of the institution and nurturing OSU's relationships with internal and external constituencies.

Hayes will officially begin May 1, but will be working on campus in a transition mode until then and can be reached via email at . Hayes felt it was an incredibly exciting and energizing opportunity to assume this position. He noted he has been a faculty member of various institutions for 25 years and hopes that experience will serve him in good stead in his advocacy role in support of faculty research. He emphasized his general impression of the robustness, breadth, and depth of the research enterprise underway at OSU. He also felt there were significant opportunities to expand and enhance research activities, specifically, to expand non-federal research dollars. Additionally, OSU needs to look at ways to support under-

graduate research and he hopes to expand and enhance OSU's relationship with OHSU. In the coming months, he is planning to focus heavily on private sector funding and technology transfer and hopes to closely coordinate activities with Zuniga Forbes.

Information Items

-Martin Luther King Jr. Celebration - Teach-in - Ken Krane spoke on behalf of the committee to urge faculty to participate in the celebration. He felt it was important to show students that faculty care about these issues. He referred to political events that occurred in 1968 and noted that issues of diversity and non-violence are before us today, perhaps even more so than in 1968. He suggested commemorating the event with a class discussion, video, or group reading of one of King's speeches. Packets were available for faculty to take back to colleagues to assist them in presentations.

-Faculty Awards Deadline - OSU Distinguished Service Award nominations are due in the Faculty Senate Office February 6. March 6 is the deadline for the following awards: D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service, OSU Alumni Distinguished Professor, Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor, Dar Reese Excellence in Advising, OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence, Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching, OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement, and OSU Outstanding Faculty Research Assistant. Criteria for these awards may be obtained from the Faculty Senate Office at 737-4344.

-If continuing Senators would like an update for their Faculty Senate Handbook, please contact the Faculty Senate Office.

Reports from the Provost

Provost Arnold's report included the following:

-He called attention to the very keen interest and activity expressed by two government task forces on higher education issues. One relates to access and the other to the efficiency of higher education. Governor Kitzhaber challenged the State Board to seriously consider implementation of the recommendations; essentially, the Board can do it or they can be accomplished in other ways. Arnold hoped that OSU could help lead the way within OSSHE.

-Provost Arnold read a letter from President Risser regarding administrative appointments: In a move to strengthen ties between athletic and academic programs, Dr. Lee Schroeder will become the Sr. Associate in Athletics when the current Athletic Director search is completed. Duties will include senior advisor for administration to the Athletic Director, assisting with sports management, event promotion and fundraising activities, and will lead the project to install the new grass playing field in Parker Stadium. The Athletic Director search is in the semi-finalist stage. It is hoped that an appointment will be made later in January. Mark McCambridge will continue to serve as interim Vice President for Finance and Administration. A national search for a permanent appointee will be initiated later in January.

Reports from the Faculty Senate President

President Niess reported on the following items:

-She thanked the Athletic Department for allowing the Faculty Senate to use the facility for our meeting and for being so helpful in making sure our needs were met. Niess reported that the recent renovation of the Valley Football Complex resulted in the facility size being tripled. She also noted that the beams in the meeting room were developed by post-graduate Forest Engineering and Research students and produced in Creswell, Oregon. The rooms on the third floor were designed to highlight the beams.

-Niess clarified an article in the December 27 Gazette-Times regarding Information Services incorrectly reported that the deficit of \$5.6 million would be repaid at a rate of \$660,000 annually over six years. The correct information includes three parts to the debt: the budgeted general funds are about \$3.9 million which the \$660,000 annually will repay; the self-sustaining operations is about \$1.2 million; and the Technology Resource Fee debt is \$-500,000. The last two debt areas have a two-year payback plan.

-Niess particularly wanted to thank Immediate Past President Tony Wilcox for the lunches during the past year to assist her in getting to this point.

New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:36.

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](#).