

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 1999 Minutes

This file is 70 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 2, 1999](#)
- [November 4, 1999](#)
- [October 7, 1999](#)
- [June 3, 1999](#)
- [May 5, 1999](#)
- [April 8, 1999](#)
- [March 4, 1999](#)
- [February 4, 1999](#)
- [January 7, 1999](#)

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](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » December 2, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 552

December 2, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on December 2, 1999, at 3:03 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Kenneth Williamson. There were no corrections to the minutes of November 1999.

Meeting Summary

- Special Report: Election Results
- Action Items: Executive Committee Election; Faculty Salary Resolution; Access to Senate Listserv [Motion 99–552–01 through 03]
- Discussion Item: Post-Tenure Review, P. Risser
- New Business: Finals Schedule

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

K. Hardin, J. Leklem; H. Koenig, D. Herrmann; M. Lowrie, D. Connell; P. Nelson, S. Woods; D. Plaza, M. Edwards; R. Robson, H. Parks; and B. Warner, C. Langford.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Azarenko, Biwan, Breen, Brodie, Bruce, Burke, Candolfi, Carson, Daley, Denning, Esbensen, Farber, J. Field, K. Field, B. Frank, Green, Gross, Hemphill, Hooker, Huyer, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Krause, Lajtha, Lomax, Lundin, Peters, Plant, Powelson, Righetti, Sanford, Strik, Tesch, Thompson, Trehu, Tynon, White, and Yim.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; G. Matzke, President-Elect; Ex-officios: R. Arnold, C. DeKock, and P. Risser; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Staff.

Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, L. Burns, I. Delson, D. Erickson, and A. Hashimoto.

SPECIAL REPORT **Election Results**

Gordon Matzke, President-Elect, thanked those who agreed to candidacy and reported that Henry Sayre (Professor, Art) was elected President-Elect and Bruce Sorte (Professional Faculty, Agricultural Sciences) was elected Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative.

In addition to Matzke, the Ballot Counting Committee consisted of Kent Daniels, Rubin

Landau, and Sylvia Yamada.

ACTION ITEMS

Executive Committee Election

Executive Committee candidates were: Paul Biwan, Stella Coakley, Vicki Collins, Jennifer Cornell, Jack Drexler, Rubin Landau, Tom Plant, Ann Rossignol, and Richard Thies.

Ballots were distributed and counted during the meeting. A run-off ballot was necessary due to a tie between third and fourth place. Those elected to two-year terms were: Stella Coakley (Professor, Botany & Plant Pathology), Vicki Collins (Associate Professor of English and Director of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Program), and Rubin Landau (Professor, Physics).

Faculty Salary Resolution

Steve Davis, Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee Chair, presented the following resolution:

Whereas, Faculty salary increases at OSU in the 1990`s have been few and generally small; and
Whereas, Faculty salaries at OSU are significantly below the mean of our peer institutions (in `98/`99 the OSU average salaries were 84.3%, 89.7%, and 94.1% of the peer institution averages for the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor, respectively); and

Whereas, The OUS has developed a model for bringing faculty salaries up to the mean of our peer institutions over the next three biennia; therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate and University Administration form a Task Force whose charge would be to examine models by which salaries will be increased to equal the mean of our peer institutions and select a reasonable model and time frame to achieve these goals. This Task Force should report to the Faculty Senate and the Administration no later than June of 2000.

Following very little discussion, motion 99-552-01 to approve the Faculty Salary Resolution passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

President Williamson thanked the committee for preparing the resolution and noted that the Faculty Senate would work with administration to create a task force, as called for in the resolution.

Access to Senate Listserv

Senator Burton, Science, presented Motion 99-551-05, made by Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, that was carried forward from the November 1999 meeting:

To allow all Faculty Senators to have access to the Faculty Senator e-mail list.

Senator Burton explained that Senator Daley was unable to attend the meeting, but had agreed to Burton's alternate motion:

That all Faculty Senate Senators have access to electronic communication within the

Faculty Senate.

President Williamson accepted Burton's motion as a friendly motion, and noted that he had a letter from Daley agreeing to Burton's motion. Senator Thies, Science, seconded the motion.

Burton explained that, if his motion passed, the current Senators list would still be accessible only by the Senate Office and a new discussion list would be created where Senators could unsubscribe themselves, if desired.

Motion 99-555-02 passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes. Williamson thanked Senator Daley for the motion and noted that the Executive Committee had discussed how to handle this issue prior to Daley's motion.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Post-Tenure Review Guidelines

While introducing OSU President Paul Risser, President Williamson outlined the events leading up to this discussion item. The Task Force on Post-Tenure Review presented a report in 1998, containing guidelines, which was approved by the Faculty Senate and forwarded to President Risser. Questions arose during the October 1999 Senate meeting regarding document changes made by Dr. Risser which resulted in inviting him to explain his rationale.

President Risser felt that the document was excellent and that the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Guidelines are a model for other institutions. He noted that when institutional PTR documents were presented to the State Board, OSU was the only institution to have virtually no questions posed by the Board.

Risser explained that the changes were made for reasons of credibility and responsibility. Changes were made only in the five-year review section and no changes were made in the annual review process.

Credibility - The original wording allowed for only the faculty member calling for a review. Risser felt that either the unit head or the faculty member should have the prerogative of requesting a review before the end of the five-year interval. The added wording is capitalized:

If a faculty member OR UNIT HEAD so requests, at any time during the five-year interval between regularly scheduled peer committee reviews, a peer committee review will take place.

Responsibility - The document provided for a peer committee to determine less than satisfactory performance and drafting of a professional development plan. Risser changed the wording since a peer committee would have no institutional responsibility or accountability but could place the University at financial and legal risk. Decisions regarding changes in responsibilities or sanctions must be made by the unit head who has line responsibility to the University. The added wording is capitalized, the stricken wording is in brackets:

Should the peer committee OR UNIT HEAD conclude that a faculty member's record is less than satisfactory in teaching, scholarship, or service the UNIT HEAD, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE peer committee and the faculty member under review, [in consultation with the unit head,] will draft a professional development plan. In the event of repeated unsatisfactory reviews and failure to achieve the goals of an agreed-upon development plan, the [peer committee] UNIT HEAD (in consultation with the [unit head] PEER

COMMITTEE) may recommend redistribution of effort, reassignment within the unit, or the imposition of sanctions,...

Senator Landau, Science, explained that his main concern was with the process and felt that it should be much closer to the way the tenure process is handled. He felt that the changes take the faculty out of the decision-making process and that faculty should be the ones helping to develop the plan. His second concern was wording in Dr. Risser's cover memo indicating that faculty do not have institutional responsibility. Risser responded that he felt there was great faculty responsibility built into the document since there is a parallel review by both the unit head and faculty. The process switches to the unit head having primary responsibility only when one's performance is judged to be unsatisfactory.

Senator Doescher, Agricultural Sciences, felt that the changes in responsibility conveyed too much power to the unit head. He suggested that the section read 'Should the peer committee and unit head conclude that a faculty member's record is less than satisfactory...'. He expects a backlash across campus because faculty are not well informed and doesn't think they realize how much time and effort is involved.

Senator Leklem, Home Economics and Education, preferred the original wording since he, too, felt that too much power was being given to the unit head and stressed the importance of better checks and balances. He also felt that the information needs to be disseminated to faculty. Risser felt that the document had been widely distributed. Williamson suggested that additional forums could be held to help disseminate information in the guidelines.

In response to President-Elect Matzke questioning when the document will be implemented, Provost Arnold noted that the State Board has not taken action since some institutional documents are not complete. Risser felt that it did require Board approval.

Senator Gardner, Science, did not agree with the administration on the changes. He also expressed difficulty with the word 'and' proposed by Doescher since it isn't clear whether the peer committee's decision would be a majority, unanimous, two-thirds, etc. He felt that inserting 'and' would have to be seriously thought through.

In response to concerns about checks and balances, Senator Sayre, Liberal Arts, noted that the faculty member who was dissatisfied with a recommendation could file a grievance against the decision. Risser agreed that there are several checks in place: the peer committee, a college-level committee, the Provost, then the Grievance Committee. Senator Landau didn't feel this was a valid argument since he referred to the committee's annual report which indicated that the Grievance Committee members didn't feel that the Committee works properly. He prefers that the peer committee and unit head make separate recommendations. If the two recommendations are not in agreement, it would be up to the supervisor of the unit head to review the recommendations.

Senator Langford (proxy for Warner), Liberal Arts, expressed nervousness about the underlying assumption that somehow the judgment of the unit head is somehow better than that of a peer committee. He also agreed that checks don't always work.

Senator Doescher moved that the 'or' preceding 'Unit Head' in the second change be replaced with 'and'; motion seconded. Motion 99-552-03 to approve the above motion was declared defeated by President Williamson after a voice vote with many in support. After a hand count was called for, the motion was declared defeated by a count of 49 in opposition and 27 in favor.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- Faculty Senate's at the University of Oregon and Southern Oregon University have approved the PEBB resolution approved by the OSU Faculty Senate in November, and Western Oregon University will soon be voting on the resolution.
- A reception for Senators hosted by President and Mrs. Risser immediately followed the December Senate meeting.
- Annual reports for most 1998-99 Faculty Senate committees/councils are available on the Senate website at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/comm.htm><

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold's report contained the following items:

- Congratulations to those elected to Senate leadership positions.
- Thanks to those members and officers completing their terms.
- Administrative Searches:

Provost - Dean Tim White, Health and Human Performance, will assume the responsibilities of Interim Provost and Executive Vice President on January 17. A search will be initiated immediately.

Dean of Distance and Continuing Education - Currently in the final stages of negotiations with an external candidate.

College of Forestry Dean - Currently engaged in conversation with the candidate recommended by the search committee.

Alumni Executive Director - Currently working with an executive search firm.

Senator Rossignol, Health and Human Performance, felt that Arnold has done a wonderful job as Provost. The ensuing applause echoed her sentiment.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Williamson's report included the following items:

- Improving Diversity - Williamson felt that this was a faculty issue and that a process needs to be institutionalized. The Executive Committee needs faculty involvement in three initiatives they are putting forth:
 - 1) The Faculty Senate is sponsoring a Diversity Forum on January 19 from 3:00-5:00 PM in MU 206. The Forum will address students' concerns and training opportunities presently available. Faculty input is needed to determine future directions.
 - 2) The Committee on Committees has been asked to examine the possibility of creating a Faculty Senate Diversity Council.
 - 3) The Advancement of Teaching Committee has been asked to examine the possibility of adding a diversity question to the present teaching evaluation form. The purpose of the question would be to flag concerns by students related to the diversity climate in the classroom.
- Strategic Planning - The difficulties associated with last year's budget process have resulted in an effort to define a strategic planning process for the university. The hope of this effort is to produce a framework for decision-making in the budget allocation process and for the possible reductions in programs and activities.

President Williamson felt it is important that the resulting strategic planning process incorporates faculty concerns. He outlined the following difficulties associated with the process that the Faculty Senate and its leadership will need to be ever vigilant about in the coming year.

1. The time scale to develop the strategic planning is short.
2. Strategic planning often fails.
3. Strategic planning for growth is different than strategic planning for reductions.
4. The university's activities of teaching, research, service, and outreach are going to be difficult to contain under a single strategic plan.
5. Strategic planning usually requires strategic investments which requires discretionary funding.
6. Present planning is centered on growth which will be difficult to displace by any strategic plan.
7. The external environment is changing so rapidly that it will be difficult to create a strategic plan from within that will be adequately responsive, visionary, iconoclastic, and radical.

Senator Thies indicated that many faculty already feel that they are expanding beyond the levels available. Senator Ahern, Science, questioned the University's priorities.

– Athletics - Williamson acknowledged the outstanding accomplishments of Mitch Barnhart in his short tenure. When Barnhart arrived, the financial situation in athletics was critical. The deficit was \$8.6 million and, at the income and expenditure rates at the time, the deficit would have exceeded \$12 million. During the past three years, Mitch has reduced the deficit to \$6 million. The annual budget is now balanced, although it must be recognized that this was accomplished with additional university funding of \$2 million per year. A plan is presently in place that will eliminate the remaining deficit with an identified revenue stream.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Brooks, Business, expressed concerns about the finals schedule. He explained that there is a half hour break between finals at other campuses and he suggested last year that this be looked into at OSU and has heard nothing. He didn't feel it was fair to students to allow only ten minutes between finals. Brooks requested that someone look into this issue and report back at an upcoming Senate meeting. Williamson reported that this has been discussed during several meetings of the Academic Advising Council. Since the finals schedule is tightly constrained, there would not be enough time during the week to schedule the necessary finals if a half hour was inserted between each final. Brooks noted that other institutions can schedule a half hour between finals and questioned why it was not possible here. Williamson indicated that the issue was referred to Barbara Balz who reported that it would not be possible; the Senate will invite Balz to explain the reasons why it is not workable.

Senator Thies mentioned two additional factors: 1) not all faculty understand that a two-hour final actually lasts only one hour and fifty minutes, and 2) many universities are on a semester system and fewer courses may be offered.

IFS Representative DeKock noted that OSU may differ from other institutions since the number of available classrooms is low.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

*Vickie Nunnemaker
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

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

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

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

Valid [xhtml](#).

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » November 4, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 551

November 4, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on November 4, 1999, at 3:02 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Kenneth Williamson. There were no corrections to the minutes of October 1999.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Apportionment Report; Slate of Nominees; Ballot Counting Committee; Category I Proposal to Establish Two Departments in the College of Pharmacy; and a PEBB Resolution [Motion 99–551–01 through 04]
- Special Report: Graduate School Review, B. Rettig
- Discussion Item: OSU Budget, R. Specter
- New Business: Access to Senator e-mail List [Motion 99–551–05]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Avery, L. Maughan; Brooks, M.A. Seville; Caughey, L. Burns; Hooker, Larry Rosenkoetter; Koenig, P-H Hsieh; P. Lee, E. Luttrull; Sanford, J. Schuster; and Sproul, S. Crust.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Arp, Azarenko, Bliss, Breen, Budd, Burke, Carson, Christensen, Crateau, Farber, J. Field, K. Field, Gregerson, Gross, Hemphill, Henthorne, Huyer, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Krause, Lajtha, Lundin, McDaniel, Nelson, Neumann, Peters, Plaza, Reed, Righetti, Rosenberger, Strik, Thompson, Trehu, White, and Wrolstad.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; G. Matzke, President-Elect; M. Niess, Immediate Past President; C. DeKock, IFS Representative; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, S. Bloomer, I. Delson, D. Erickson, W. Kradjin, T. White, T. Wilcox, and S. Woods.

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of 2000 Apportionment Table

OSU Faculty FTE in the ranks of Instructor or above, including Professional Faculty, Research Associates, and all Faculty Research Assistants as of November 3, 1999, together with student credit hours apportioned to individual units, resulted in 2,525.77 FTE/Senator and 17,672.64 SCH/Senator. (Apportionment is based on 75% FTE and 25% SCH with a cap of 132 Senators.)

Senator Landau, Science, moved to accept the Apportionment Table; motion seconded. Motion 99-551-01 to approve the 2000 Apportionment Table passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Nominations and Elections

Maggie Niess, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented the slate of nominees for elected positions:

President–Elect – Robert Burton (Professor, Mathematics) and Henry Sayre (Professor, Art)
Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Representative – Laurel Maughan, (Associate Professor, Valley Library) and Bruce Sorte, (Professional Faculty, College of Agricultural Sciences)

Executive Committee – Paul Biwan (Professional Faculty, Human Resources); Stella Coakley (Professor, Botany & Plant Pathology); Vicki Collins (Associate Professor, English/WIC); Jack Drexler (Associate Professor, College of Business); Tom Plant (Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering); Ann Rossignol (Professor, Public Health); and Richard Thies, (Professor, College of Science).

There were no nominees from the floor for the first two positions. Senator Landau, Science, nominated Jennifer Cornell (Assistant Professor, English) and Senator Tate (Science) nominated Rubin Landau (Professor, Physics) from the floor for the Executive Committee. Both Cornell and Landau agreed to have their names placed on the ballot. The nominations for each category were declared closed.

Niess explained that the Executive Committee discussed a voter's pamphlet, but decided that questions would be elicited from faculty to be asked of the President-Elect and IFS candidates. Two questions will be selected for each group to respond to; the responses will be posted on the Faculty Senate web site.

Niess reminded Senators to review the attendance summaries located at <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/attend99.htm> to determine representation by Senators eligible for re-election.

Ballot Counting Committee

Senators Kent Daniels, Rubin Landau, and Sylvia Yamada, volunteered to assist in counting President-Elect and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative ballots on December 1.

Category I Proposal to Establish Two Departments in the College of Pharmacy

Irma Delson, Curriculum Council member, presented the Category I proposal and explained that the proposal would decentralize the college and develop two departments each with its own chairs. The current structure consists of a dean, three assistant deans and no department heads while the proposal allows for a dean, one assistant dean and department chairs in Pharmaceutical Sciences and Pharmacy Practice.

The justification for the proposal contained several components: to acknowledge the increasing size and diversity of the college; to reflect the administrative philosophy of the new dean; to effectively implement the new professional program; to address anticipated expansion; to give necessary attention to Pharmacy Practice faculty and students at the OHSU site; and to support the changes in the duties of dean. The primary functions of

each department would be teaching, research and service. The general objectives of each department are identical, but the specific objectives reflect their different academic foci.

Delson noted there were letters of support from OHSU and OSU's College of Health and Human Performance and Public Health Department. The proposal received unanimous approval from the Curriculum Council.

Senator Frank, Liberal Arts, moved to approve the proposal, which was seconded.

President-Elect Matzke questioned where faculty would reside. Dean Kradjin responded that there will be faculty at both the OSU and OHSU sites.

Motion 99-551-02 to establish two departments in the College of Pharmacy was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

PEBB Resolution

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, President Williamson presented the following resolution in support of developing an OUS specific health care benefit governance arrangement:

Whereas, The creation of a unified Public Employment Benefits Board (PEBB) has altered the faculty benefits offered as compensation for service to Oregon State University;

and

Whereas, The planning of benefit packages under PEBB has largely ignored the frequently expressed critical needs of the faculty of this university;

and

Whereas, The current PEBB benefit system contains a structure of subsidies that discriminates against faculty-preferred benefit options (as revealed in PEBB surveys);

and

Whereas, The PEBB administered benefits represent a substantial reduction in benefits and an increase in costs for most faculty;

and

Whereas, Faculty as a group represent a relatively low cost pool of beneficiaries;

and

Whereas, The originating legislation (SB 271) said the System "...may elect, at the discretion of the State Board of Higher Education, to provide alternative benefits plans to its employees, should the same level of benefits be available at a lower cost..."; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University approve a petition to request that the Board of the Oregon University System work with due haste to develop and implement a plan to separate faculty health care benefits from PEBB control by developing a system of benefits governance that is more responsive to faculty concerns and more cost effective in meeting faculty health care needs.

Williamson provided background for the resolution: during the past two years Faculty Senate leaders attended PEBB-led meetings and noticed that PEBB was heading toward HMO-type benefits; PEBB received input, including an overwhelming number of questionnaires, from OSU indicating that HMO's were not the choice of faculty, but this input was met with no results; health care costs have dramatically gone up; options preferred by faculty were eliminated or reduced; and faculty are basically dissatisfied with the direction of PEBB.

Senator Frank questioned if other institutions have discussed this issue. Williamson indicated there has been discussion at the OUS level and institutions seem to be in favor

of the proposed direction.

Senator Longerbeam, Student Affairs, expressed concern on behalf of staff since staff and faculty have joined together, which creates a larger risk pool, but may also increase staff rates if OUS splits off from PEBB.

Senator Thies, Science, felt it was discriminatory to subsidize the HMO plans only. Senator Daniels, Associated, felt there was an obvious bias against Blue Cross.

IFS Representative DeKock was the only one who indicated he was happy with the health benefits plan.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, expressed concern about the possibility of legal action against public institutions in relation to HMO subsidies.

Williamson noted that, within two years, opt-out and cash back will not be a PEBB option and the loss of the opt-out, cash back option could mean as much as \$400 per month for a couple both employed at OSU. Vice President Specter added that opt-out and cash back were only retained this year due to the efforts on behalf of OUS representatives. Specter also expressed concern that plan costs have increased significantly and noted that PEBB cannot maintain the level of benefits at the same cost as in prior years.

Senator Morris, Science, questioned what the Executive Committee envisions happening as a result of this resolution. Williamson indicated that the purpose is to help the administration in their efforts to either get a better deal with PEBB or to break away from PEBB. This can be seen as a show of support for the administration's efforts.

Senator Landau was disturbed about the PEBB situation and doesn't want to see benefits deteriorate in the same direction as salaries.

Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, was concerned that faculty may get adequate health benefits at the expense of classified staff and students.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, noted that this resolution may help get the attention of the PEBB Board to make them realize they are public officials and are responsible for individual's health care

Senator Coakley, Science, pointed out that whatever health plan faculty work for would also benefit the classified staff since all in OUS would be eligible for the plan.

President-Elect Matzke mentioned that SB271 states 'employees,' which would include classified staff, but noted that the Faculty Senate can only speak for the faculty since classified are unionized. He then moved the question; motion seconded. Motion 99-551-04 to move the question passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 99-551-03 to approve the PEBB resolution as written passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

SPECIAL REPORT

Graduate School Review

While introducing Bruce Rettig, Graduate School Review Committee Chair, President Williamson noted that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee requested that administration perform a review prior to hiring a dean.

Rettig explained that information regarding the review can be found at:
<http://arec.orst.edu/gsr/>

The committee charges include: assessing the Graduate School and its function and reaching out for input from stakeholders.

Committee members are: Dan Arp, Chris Bell, Leslie Burns, Lisa Ede, Erik Fritzell, Dana Hicks, Jo-Ann Leong, Kinsey Green, Mary Prucha, and Tony Wilcox.

Rettig reported that the Graduate School recently developed a Strategic Plan which can be found at: [http://www.osu.orst.edu/ Dept/grad_school/intro/ mission.htm](http://www.osu.orst.edu/Dept/grad_school/intro/mission.htm). Past President Niess questioned whether the Strategic Plan was new and to what extent were faculty involved in its creation. Rettig indicated that the document was created since Interim Dean Francis was appointed and that it explains activities and functions of the Graduate School, as well as providing a basis for assessment. He could not provide an answer as to the extent of faculty input. He did note that the term 'Strategic Plan' may not be accurate.

Senator Collins, Liberal Arts, questioned whether this was the right time to start making changes in the Graduate School while the review committee is in the process of evaluation. Rettig explained that the committee has discussed this issue, but are not preoccupied with it.

Senator Prucha, Associated, reported that Dean Francis put the Strategic Plan together in an effort of engaging the Graduate School and laying out what the goals were for the year. The unit also felt that the document would provide background for the review team.

In response to Senator Rossignol, Health and Human Performance, questioning the time frame, Rettig indicated that a draft report should be ready in December.

Senator Witters, Agricultural Sciences, asked whether the scope of the review committee's charge is internal or external. Rettig responded that committee members are meeting with faculty at other institutions. There is a preference to understand better how graduate schools at peer institutions operate.

Rettig noted that the committee encourages input and feedback.

DISCUSSION ITEM

OSU Budget

Rob Specter, Vice President of Finance and Administration, outlined OSU's budget allocation.

Specter noted that the budget process began by moving toward an enrollment driven, goal oriented allocation model. Due to numerous challenges, including decimated unit budgets, it became difficult to implement the budget and a transitory approach was developed. The university will move toward full model implementation in as few years as possible. He felt that the process was very participatory since there were committees developing the budget principles and allocation approaches. Faculty Senate committees, deans, and the President's Cabinet were also involved in decision making.

He reported that OSU is receiving almost \$13 million more this year than last which fueled tremendous expectations that needed to be countered by how far OSU had fallen in terms of resources against obligations. Specter noted that the budget allocation decision was student and faculty centered.

Specter distributed hand-outs outlining the following budget figures. The breakdown for the proposed FY 2000 revenue of \$164,068,700 includes:

General Fund - \$83,992,988

Tuition - \$55,295,612

Total Other Resources: \$24,780,100

The breakdown for the proposed FY 2000 operating budget totaling \$164,350,000 includes:

Continuing Services Level Base Budget - \$152,900,000

Univ. Education & General Allocation - \$3,293,100

Academic Units Allocation - \$5,131,300

Student Services, Recruitment & Retention - \$1,384,500

Institutional Support - \$4,641,100

Faculty salary increases are budgeted at \$850,000 and include a 2% increase in January 2000 and 2.5% in January 2001. As indicated previously, the \$2,000,000 incremental investment in Athletics is included in Institutional Support. There is also a contingency holdback of 2% across the board for a total of \$3,281,300.

Specter noted that the approximately \$965,000 from the fire settlement of the former Printing and Mailing Services building will go into the budget stabilization reserve. He also mentioned that there is an opportunity to receive additional general funds for increased enrollment since OSU has already exceeded the May 1999 enrollment projections.

Senator Rossignol inquired about budgeted funds to accommodate disabled individuals. Specter responded that in addition to the \$28,000 budgeted, there are capital funds to assist with maintenance and small projects. An additional \$28 million from the Chancellor's Office has not been fully distributed among OUS institutions for capital projects.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, questioned why federal government allocations are missing from the budget. Specter stated that state-wide public service units are budgeted separately from the budget process are not represented in this budget, nor are direct costs and auxiliary enterprises represented.

Senator Lee, Science, questioned what was anticipated for future years budgeting. Specter noted that the unusual distribution of funds (50/50 this biennium compared to 1/3 and 2/3 in previous years) is cause to be concerned that there are sufficient funds for the second year. He reiterated that the university has more obligations in the long term than can be handled and the institution is over-extended. He commented that an institutional strategic program review would begin in November to result in a more accurately aligned budget.

IFS representative DeKock questioned how much money the Foundation (budgeted at \$800,000) generates for OSU and if good plans are in place for a real campaign. Specter didn't know how much money comes to the university, but stated that the Foundation's assets are in the \$400 million neighborhood. He did note that the Foundation is in the process of being restructured and discussions are beginning which should result in a greater degree of alignment between OSU and the Foundation.

INFORMATION ITEMS

– University Awards -- Materials have been sent to Deans, Directors, and Department Heads/Chairs containing information for the OSU Distinguished Service Award and the following awards:

Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching
D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service
OSU Alumni Association Distinguished Professor
OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement

OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence
Outstanding Faculty Research Assistant
Dar Reese Excellence in Advising
Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor

A cover letter, guidelines for preparing nomination packets, and criteria for each award can be found at <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/naward.htm>. All nomination materials for the above awards must be submitted to the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee, c/o Faculty Senate Office, 107 Social Science Hall, Corvallis OR 97331-6203 by March 6, 2000; February 5 for the OSU Distinguished Service Award. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Laura Connolly, at 737-3025 or laura.connolly@orst.edu. – Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Recap – The October IFS minutes were sent to Senators via e-mail and can be found at:

<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/3oct99.html>

- Senator Representation Summary for 1998/99 – A summary of Senator attendance by both apportionment unit and individual senator for academic year 1998/99 can be found at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/attend99.htm>. Faculty members are invited to view both reports, particularly the individual reports, if a Senator is eligible to be re-elected to the Faculty Senate or is a candidate for elected office to determine the representation received from Senators during the past year. Please note that the Bylaws state, "In the event of a Senator's absence, without providing a substitute, for three meetings during one year, the position will be declared vacant by the apportionment unit and filled by the nominee with the next highest number of votes at the most recent election."
- Instructions for Nomination and Election of Faculty Senators – Upon receipt of all materials, the Faculty Senate Office annually transmits Senatorial nomination and election instructions to Heads of all voting units; a sample letter can be found at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/instruc.htm>

– Student Appointments to Faculty Senate Committees/Councils – Students are important members of many Faculty Senate committees and councils and there are currently vacancies in several areas. Help would be appreciated in identifying students who are interested in serving on the following committees and councils. Students may be approached individually, or announcements may be made during class sessions. Anyone interested in serving should be referred to the Faculty Senate Office, 737-4344, for additional information.

Academic Regulations Committee
Academic Requirements Committee
Academic Standing Committee
Advancement of Teaching Committee
Baccalaureate Core Committee
Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee
Computing Resources Committee
Graduate Council
Library Committee
Student Recognition and Awards Committee

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Williamson's report included mostly budget related items:

- President Risser will discuss changes in the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines at the December Senate meeting.

- The Faculty Senate leadership participated in the budget process and tried to convey faculty concerns to administration. He thanked university administrators for listening.
- The fact that a reduction in current service levels as a contingency holdback was required to fund services to new students and other budgetary needs was a surprise to almost all involved, including Faculty Senate leadership. In addition to deferred maintenance, the hold back will be used to sustain university programs and services. OSU must also respond to external forces in the forms of legislative mandates, the Chancellor's Office, and accreditation boards. Increased growth has not generated the increased revenue that was expected. Decisions have been made to fund programs that have a potential for high returns but are very expensive. Finally, programs now funded through partnerships cannot be reasonably rejected.
- Some aspects of the budget process are positive and should be encouraged in future budget effort: 1) The budget process was opened up to allow significant input; 2) Colleges that achieved increased enrollment have been rewarded; and 3) The short-term effects of increased enrollment were at least partially accommodated through access funds that will become part of departments' base budgets.
- The entire budget process has painfully exposed the fact that the university is over-committed. Williamson believes that the realization is that OSU will now become better primarily by increased focus and greater efficiency. The administration has committed to a strategic planning effort.
- The future of OSU will largely depend on us. Future budgets are going to require significant change of OSU. One of the biggest Faculty Senate challenges for the coming year is to make sure that OSU's faculty become meaningful contributors to the direction of that change.

Past President Tony Wilcox questioned if there was an amount or percentage set aside for faculty salaries. Williamson responded that \$11 million was set aside for faculty salaries with \$9 million going toward benefits which left \$2 million for the system. The salary increase was deferred from July 1, 1999 to January 1, 2000 which saved about \$1 million. He noted that the Executive Committee will present a recommendation to create a task force to study faculty salaries.

In response to Senator Sayre, Liberal Arts, questioning what the \$9 million was going toward, Williamson stated that it was for PEBB increases.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, requested access to the Faculty Senate e-mail list to facilitate discussions between Senate meetings. He moved to allow all Faculty Senators to have access to the Faculty Senate e-mail list; motion seconded. Senator Burton reminded the Senate that motions presented under New Business are to be considered at the next meeting. Senator Daley agreed to defer his motion. Motion 99-551-05 will be on the December agenda.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:17 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](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » October 7, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 550

October 7, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on October 7, 1999, at 3:02 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Kenneth Williamson. There were no corrections to the minutes of May or June 1999.

Meeting Summary

- Discussion Item: Graduate Student Unionization, S. Francis, A. Hashimoto and J. Rudolph; and AAUP Concerns Regarding Post-Tenure Review, R. Landau
- Special Report: Budget, R. Specter
- Committee Report: Bylaws and Nominations, M. Niess
- Action Items: [Motion 99–550–01through 03] Approval of Resolutions of Sympathy for Dwight Bushnell and David Nicodemus; and Reaffirmation of Senate vote approving Post-Tenure Review Guidelines
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Avery, P. Isensee; Brooks, M.A. Seville; Drexler, C. Cogliser; Ede, A. Helle; Jimmerson, S. Ellinwood; Johnson, V. King; McDaniel, L. Goddik; Plant, J. Van Vechter; Sproul, L. Hampton; and Witters, B. Braunworth.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Azarenko, Barth, Budd, Burke, Burton, Cornelius, Cromack, Daniels, Denning, Esbensen, Farber, J. Field, K. Field, Fisk, Frank, Green, Gross, Heidel, Henthorne, Hooker, Huber, Huyer, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Krause, Lajtha, Lomax, Lowrie, Merickel, Moon, Nelson, Neumann, Nishihara, Powelson, Prucha, Righetti, Sayre, Trehu, Yamada, and Yim.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; G. Matzke, President-Elect; M. Niess, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; R. Arnold and C. DeKock, Ex-Officios; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

L. Burns, S. Francis, A. Hashimoto, J. Higginbotham, D. Johnson, P. Repko, J. Rudolph, R. Sanderson, J. Schuster, R. Specter, and S. Woods.

RESOLUTIONS OF SYMPATHY

President Williamson presented the following Resolutions of Sympathy for approval:

The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University expresses deepest sympathies to the family of Dwight Bushnell upon his death on September 29, 1999. Dwight was a highly respected member of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Oregon State University for 23 years. He was an active teacher and researcher, and was known for his involvement with students. He had been recognized with the Carter Teaching Award, the Austin Paul Award for inspiration to students, and the Burlington Resources Foundation Faculty

Achievement Award. Dwight was active in faculty governance and was serving as a Faculty Senator at the time of his death. We will miss his presence in our faculty and in this body.

* * * * *

The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University wishes to recognize the long service of David Nicodemus who died this last June. Dave served as a faculty member in the Department of Physics and was known for his excellence in teaching. He served as Dean of the College of Science and as Dean of Faculty. It was through the leadership of Dean Nicodemus that the present system of faculty governance through a Faculty Senate was established. OSU remains deeply indebted to him for all that he gave to this institution over his nearly 50 years of service.

Motions 99-550-01 and 02 to approve both resolutions passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Graduate Student Unionization

Sally Francis, Interim Graduate School Dean, Jacque Rudolph, Human Resources Director, and Andy Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, discussed the graduate student unionization plans and impacts, if approved.

Francis explained that graduate assistantships are considered as a form of financial aid that supplements graduate education. She noted that graduate assistants should be regarded as students providing service as part of a learning experience rather than as an employee whose education is secondary.

The formal move to unionize graduate assistants began with the OSU Coalition of Graduate Employees (CGE) and became affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT Oregon, AFL/CIO) in April 1998. A card campaign occurred in Winter 1999 that indicated more than 30% of graduate assistants preferred to be represented by a union. The election to determine unionization will take place in Fall 1999 under the supervision of the Employee Relations Board (ERB).

Rudolph reported that those eligible to vote include all GTA's and GRA's with .15 FTE, with a minimum of .10 FTE devoted to service as an employee, as of 10/1/99 and still employed on 11/4/99. Those excluded by law from eligibility include: those in supervisory positions, confidential (in relation to collective bargaining) or managerial employees or graduate assistants with appointments who are teaching or performing research primarily to fulfill an advanced degree requirement.

The campaign began on October 1 and will continue through the 20. On October 21, ERB will mail ballots to each eligible voter; ballots are due November 4 and ERB will tally them on November 5.

The CGE stated that the following issues were important to them:

- free health insurance, including dental and vision
- student fee cap
- safe working conditions
- TA training and resources
- equal access to posting of TA positions
- working environment conditions
- grievance procedures
- lobbying for graduate student employees
-

Rudolph explained that, if the unionization is successful, the above issues may or may not be bargained relative to the definition of what is a mandatory subject of bargaining (related to terms and conditions of employment) and what is permissive (management's rights in other areas outside of employment, such as academic areas).

She reported that information (Frequently Asked Questions, a time line, a letter from Provost Arnold, and questions asked by faculty) was available on the web, at:
<http://osu.orst.edu/admin/hr/gradstud/gradmenu.htm>.

Rudolph noted that there is a system-wide task force looking at student health insurance relative to all

graduate students. Larry Roper and Susan Longerbeam are representing OSU on the task force.

Hashimoto discussed potential impacts if unionization is approved, including the need to rewrite position descriptions each term as duties/expectations change.

Hashimoto encouraged faculty to have a dialogue with students and noted that faculty could talk about facts but are not allowed to threaten students or make promises to them.

In response to a question from Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, of whether graduate students were invited to the Senate meeting, President Williamson explained they were not invited since the presentation was to primarily provide information to faculty; the purpose was not to debate the merits of the issue.

Senator Cornell stated that the CGE had objections to what was posted on the web site and felt that they should have been invited to participate in the discussion. Rudolph noted that the CGE is not a recognized university group since they have chosen to become affiliated with an outside group. By law there are certain parameters that set forth the relationship between the institution, the CGE/AFT and how the campaign is conducted. Like OPEU, the CGE is not allowed to use university resources.

In response to President-Elect Matzke asking what information is available to students, Rudolph stated that students will receive a letter and information from Provost Arnold via US mail.

In response to Senator Thies, Science, questioning taxable income for graduate students, Rudolph responded that unionization may change what is considered to be taxable.

AAUP Concerns Regarding Post-Tenure Review

President Williamson provided background for the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines document: March 1997, the Task Force on Post-Tenure Review was appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee; December 1998, the Faculty Senate approved Post-Tenure Review Guidelines which were sent forth as a recommendation OSU President Risser; May 1999, President Risser responded to the Executive Committee indicating he had made the following changes to the Guidelines:

- 1) The Guidelines stated that a faculty member could receive a review at anytime, or at a five-year interval. Risser changed that statement so that either a faculty member or unit head could ask for a review at any time.
- 2) The Guidelines read that if the Peer Review Committee determines that less than satisfactory performance is occurring a development plan will be drafted. Changed to read that the unit head could determine if less than satisfactory performance is occurring and could draft a performance plan for the faculty member.
- 3) The Guidelines proposed that a Peer Committee would recommend redistribution of efforts or reassignment of sanctions for unsatisfactory progress on the development plan. The change was that the unit head would recommend redistribution as efforts, or reassignment, as sanctions for unsatisfactory progress on the development plan.

Williamson reported that the Executive Committee discussed President Risser's changes with Ken Krane, Task Force on Post-Tenure Review Chair. Krane indicated that the task force had discussed at length the three changes and he felt that the task force was ambivalent and split on the issues. The draft task force report submitted to the Senate was in the same form as President Risser's changes and was changed prior to the final draft. Williamson explained that the Executive Committee did not send back a letter of opposition to the changes. He reminded Senators that reports from the Faculty Senate are recommendations only.

Rubin Landau, speaking as a Senator and as an AAUP Board Member, noted that some faculty received letters indicating that changes had been made to the Guidelines. There were three issues he wished to address: the actual changes in the Guidelines, the role of faculty at the university, and one of process in the Faculty Senate.

Landau felt that the Post-Tenure Review process is weakened by having the unit head make decisions as described in the first change. The second change seems to indicate that faculty no longer have institutional responsibility or accountability and are no longer agents of the University. He felt that misunderstandings were raised in the memo regarding the role of faculty at the University. He also thought that there might be some confusion as to the legal standing of the document. In regard to the third change, he noted that the task force and Senate worked hard on the process and was saddened that the changes were not discussed in the Senate.

Landau then called for a motion to reaffirm the vote taken by the Senate to approve the report as presented. Senator Cornell moved to reaffirm the Faculty Senate's original wording on the Post-Tenure Review document and to request a discussion with President Risser as to why the changes were made, motion seconded.

In response to Senator Morris, Science, questioning the point of the motion, Landau explained that the point was to have a discussion of the changes to the Guidelines.

Andy Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, commented that institutional responsibility and accountability refer to supervisory responsibility and, as far as the process, each institution was asked to develop Post-Tenure Review Guidelines which were forwarded to the Chancellor's Office for review and, ultimately, to the Board who will approve the Guidelines.

Motion 99-550-03 to reaffirm the Senate vote that originally approved the Guidelines and request a discussion with President Risser passed with some dissenting votes.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Bylaws and Nominations Committee

Maggie Niess, Bylaws and Nominations Committee Chair, discussed the nomination process for Faculty Senate President-Elect, Executive Committee members and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative. She requested nominations for elected offices be forwarded to the nominating committee no later than October 8. A slate of nominees for each office will be presented to the Senate at the November meeting.

SPECIAL REPORT

Budget

Rob Specter, Vice President for Finance & Administration, provided an overview of the budget allocation to OSU and noted that very good news has been received regarding the budget and, along with it, a cause for optimism for the future.

He explained that the new budget model was accepted by the Legislature, although it was not fully funded. OUS received about 75 cents on the dollar of stated need. New money, beyond continuing service levels (CSL), is 5.8%, which is a significant increase. The statewide programs received an increase of just under 10%. Current enrollment is up about 8% for a total of 15,784 students, which is up significantly from the anticipated 5.5% enrollment increase. The enrollment increase translates to an increase of over 11% in tuition receipts. A settling-up process, resulting in additional revenue, will occur later in the year based on the difference between the 5.5% projection and actual enrollment figures. The Emergency Board allocated \$700,000 for performance funding for next years budget.

One challenge is that the CSL need is higher than available funding. Administration received \$53 million in project requests from OSU units that must be considered in the allocation process. Due to the decreased level of reserves, it is imperative that reserves are funded in preparation for decreased enrollments and consequent loss of general funding from the system. An additional challenge is that the allocation money from the Chancellor's Office is split closer to 50/50 for the first and second biennia rather than a 1/3 and 2/3 split as usually happens.

The time table for the draft allocation includes completing discussions by October 8 with the President and Vice Presidents. The following week the Deans and President's Cabinet will review the proposed allocation plan before it is made public. Specter invited comment from the Faculty Senate on the plan. He anticipates the budget will be finalized no later than the end of October.

Senator Lee, Science, questioned whether units are expected to self-fund faculty raises. Specter responded that he couldn't answer that yet since the allocations are not finalized. He did note that since faculty funding received from the State was less than needed, other resources must be used to fund salaries.

Maggie Niess, Past President, questioned the allocation of funding to the units, including targeted funds. Specter responded that OSU is receiving about \$84 million in general funds, of that \$72 million is considered enrollment driven monies. The remaining money is dedicated to program priorities that were specifically funded in the process by the Higher Education Board. The priorities include items such as: sponsored research, research faculty salaries, and campus public service programs.

In response to IFS Senator DeKock asking if money will, at any time, be allocated to units based on student credit hours, Specter stated that administration plans to work toward that model in years two, three and four.

INFORMATION ITEMS

– Curriculum Proposal Workshop - Those involved with Curriculum Development or Review are invited to attend a Curriculum Proposal Workshop on Friday, October 15, from 9:00-11 AM in 122 Crop & Soil Science Building.

– Faculty Senate Fall Elections - Maggie Niess, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, is accepting recommendations for 1) President-Elect, 2) Executive Committee members, and 3) Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representatives. Nominations may be forwarded to her in Science & Math Education or via electronic mail at niessm@ucs.orst.edu. Deadline for nominations is October 8. NOTE: If Senators wish to make a nomination from the floor at the November meeting, they must have prior approval from the nominee.

– Faculty Senate Calendar - Scheduled 1999-2000 Faculty Senate meetings follow. All meetings are scheduled to begin at 3:00 PM; check your agenda for location. November 4, 1999; December 2, 1999; January 6, 2000; February 3, 2000; March 2, 2000; April 6, 2000; May 4, 2000; and June 1, 2000

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold commended the efforts of many people across campus to make the beginning of the school year a positive experience for students. He reported on the following items:

Administrative Searches and Appointments -

Graduate School - Sally Francis has been appointed interim Dean

College of Science - Sherm Bloomer has been appointed Interim Dean

College of Veterinary Medicine - Bill McCulloch, an external candidate, was appointed interim dean in mid-August and resigned in late September due to personal and health reasons. Arnold has met with the college faculty and discussed a possible solution for an interim dean as an OSU person originating from outside of the college.

College of Forestry - The dean search is in a continuing phase. Bart Thielges is serving as interim dean.

Distance and Continuing Education - Sandy Woods is serving as interim dean. Finalists will be interviewed during October.

Alumni Executive Director - The search is continuing.

Personal Comments - Dr. Arnold expressed thanks for the encouragement he has received during his recovery from cancer.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Williamson's report included the following items:

– Diversity and Our Campus Climate – In summarizing recent discussions surrounding diversity issues, Williamson reported the following real perceptions:

– Many students of color do not feel 'safe' or comfortable in our classrooms;

– Many students of color feel isolated, alone, and set apart especially when racial or ethnic issues are discussed in our classrooms; and

A perception exists that faculty have reduced expectations of success for students of color.

Williamson wants to initiate a process where the faculty will participate in a conversation related to diversity in the classroom. He will be organizing a meeting of faculty and interested parties to discuss what can be done to improve this situation. Attendance by Faculty Senators was encouraged.

– Graduate Student Unionization – It was suggested that Senators encourage unit heads to convene a meeting of faculty and graduate students to provide information and answer questions. Human Resources and the Graduate School have information available to serve as the basis for discussions.

– Health Benefits – Open enrollment ends the first week of November. He emphasized that ALL faculty must submit a form specifying their choice for coverage.

– OSU Branding of Courses – Information Services is proposing that OSU brand about 250 non-credit courses offered by CBT with subsequent profit sharing. The Curriculum Council is reviewing this proposal.

– e-Commerce – This proposal would allow OSU to link its home page to commercial home pages and OSU would collect some portion of the commercial sales generated through this connection. The Computing Resources Committee has expressed faculty concerns to Curt Pederson related to e-Commerce.

– Task Forces – The DPD and Athletics Task Force will meet throughout the term. Alexis Walker and Tony Wilcox are the respective chairs.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:01 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](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » June 3, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 549

June 3, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on June 3, 1999, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Kenneth Williamson.

Meeting Summary

- Discussion Item: Internal Budget Allocation, R. Specter
- Action Items: Consideration of Degree Candidates, B. Balz; Standing Rules Revisions, J. Reeb; Curricular Proposals, L. Friedman; Faculty Salary Resolution, [Motion 99–549–01 through 18]
- Special Report: OSU Foundation, R. Cole
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Bruce, B. Balz; Cornell, H.B. Hackel; Hoogesteger, L. Henry; Johnson, M. Wogaman; and McCambridge, B. Thorsness.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Arp, Azarenko, Biwan, Bliss, Breen, Brooks, Burke, Burt, Burton, Bushnell, Champeau, S. Daniels, T. Daniels, Farber, J. Field, K. Field, Fisk, Gardner, Gomez, Hemphill, Huyer, Jepson, Jimmerson, Jones, Kerkvliet, Klein, Krause, Levine, McDaniel, Moon, Moore, Morris, Nishihara, Plant, Powelson, Righetti, Rosita Rodriguez, Sproul, Thies, Trehu, Tynon, White, and Wood.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; G. Matzke, President-Elect; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; R. Arnold, Ex-Officio; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

T. Bentley-Townlin, L. Burns, L. Friedman, A. Hashimoto, D. Healey, S. Helmick, G. Kersey, J. Schuster, K. Spikes, and J. Van de Water.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Internal Budget Allocation

Rob Specter, Vice President for Finance and Administration, addressed the Athletic Department deficit and funding options.

Specter reported that the Higher Education Executive Board has been reviewing monthly the financial records of OSU. In April President Risser, Specter, and Athletic Director Mitch Barnhart presented the financial picture to the Board which then mandated that

the \$8.2 million deficit be reduced to \$6 million by June.

OSU received authorization in 1999 to apply \$2 million in institutional funds to assist in balancing the debt. An additional \$1.5 million was applied to the debt in 1998. There was initial hope that the \$2 million would be paid back to the university; Specter told the Board that would not happen. If something is not done regarding the Athletics deficit, the university administration will lose the confidence of the Board and year-end bailouts will continue.

The objectives are to provide a debt recovery plan that is workable and achievable. Specter will go back before the Board in June to present a plan. He felt that there is no way to reduce the debt without institutional funds and will probably need assistance from student fees. He anticipated that student fees would need to increase beginning fall 2000 and again in fall 2001.

The Athletic Department is working to cultivate large gifts with the hope of achieving the \$6 million debt reduction through gifts. He acknowledged that it is difficult to attract donors to pay off a debt. He noted that scholarship gifting has tripled and season ticket sales have soared since the hiring of Dennis Erickson. He felt that Athletics has a role on this campus and the impact on enrollment and the political power base cannot be ignored.

Specter explained that Athletics is funded through a variety of funding sources and will not be self-sustaining, and noted that many units are subsidized. He was hopeful that, at some time, some portion of the student fee support and institutional support can be eliminated. He noted that many programs in the conference run debts and cited a \$17 million debt at Berkeley that was written off.

In response to President-Elect Matzke's query about the size of the debt, Specter explained that an unanticipated expense was the change-out in the football coaching staff amounting to about \$500,000.

Senator Shor, Engineering, expressed her preference of providing student waivers if Athletics needs to be funded.

Senator Landau, Science, expressed the opinion that Athletics matter and academics don't. He would like to see the same schedule applied to the academic pay-back.

In response to Senator Ede, Liberal Arts, questioning if there was an opportunity for faculty input, Specter noted that some components are less set than others, however, the \$2 million figure is a fairly strong number. How the debt is reduced, as well as fee waivers, is less set.

In response to Senator Witters, Agricultural Sciences, questioning about academic units in financial difficulty and how academic issues will be dealt with, Specter noted that most of those discussions took place prior to his arrival. He then went on to discuss individual units:

Information Services – A multi-year plan for reductions in operational budgets was made to reduce and eliminate the deficit while minimizing instructional impact.

College of Home Economics and Education – This deficit was significantly more manageable. Foundation accounts were dedicated to cover most of the deficit and the college administration is working to eliminate the remainder of the deficit.

College of Science – This deficit is a huge challenge. They are paying careful attention to laying a healthy groundwork which includes a new approach to the financial management and leadership of the college. The college's finances are being carefully monitored; it's very critical that no mis-steps are taken. They are setting the stage for recovery through incremental funds from the institution and increased enrollment.

Athletics – The debt is in excess of one-third of its overall operating budget.

Senator Robson, Science, found raising student fees to be an extremely disturbing

option. He felt that would create an extreme problem with public relations and would send a bad message to students. Specter responded that OSU's student fee contribution is lower than the University of Oregon, or Portland State. Administration will be conducting discussions with students during the next year regarding the proposed student fee increase.

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 3,335 students who were candidates for 3,416 degrees which included: 2,644 Bachelors, 567 Masters, 166 Doctors and 39 Professional Doctor degrees. There were also 77 students who were candidates for two degrees and two students who were candidates for three degrees.

The Class of 1999, OSU's 130th graduating class, had 538 seniors who qualify for Academic Distinction and included 285 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50-3.69), 149 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70-3.84), and 104 'summa cum laude' (gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 99-549-01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Proposed Standing Rules Revisions Jim Reeb, Committee on Committees Chair, presented Standing Rules Revisions for the following committees/councils: Academic Requirements, Bylaws and Nominations, Committee on Committees, Faculty Status, Instructional Development and Technology, Library, Promotion and Tenure, and Student Recognition and Awards Committees and the Graduate and Research Councils. Capitalized sections indicate proposed additions and bracketed sections indicate proposed deletions. Only those sections of the Standing Rules containing proposed revisions are printed below.

Academic Requirements Committee

The Committee consists of seven Faculty WITH AT LEAST ONE UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ADVISOR, [and three] TWO Student [members] (ONE GRADUATE, ONE UNDERGRADUATE) and the Registrar (or representative), ex-officio, non-voting.

Motion 99-549-02 to approve the proposed revisions to the Academic Requirements Committee Standing Rules passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Bylaws and Nominations Committee

EACH FALL, THE COMMITTEE SHALL NOMINATE CANDIDATES FOR FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT-ELECT, THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AND THE INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE (IFS), IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROCEDURES DESCRIBED IN THE BYLAWS.

[Each Fall, the Committee shall nominate candidates for elective office in the Faculty Senate. At least two candidates shall be nominated for the position of Senate President-Elect, each of whom shall be, or shall have served as, a Senator. The Committee shall also nominate candidates from the current Senate membership for elective positions on the Executive Committee. There shall be at least two nominations for each position available. Also, the Committee shall nominate candidates from the Faculty-at-large to represent OSU on the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS). There shall be at least

twice as many nominees as positions available. All nominations shall be reported to the regular November meeting of the Faculty Senate.]

IN RESPONSE TO A CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FROM THE IFS, THE COMMITTEE SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOMINATING MEMBERS OF THE OSU FACULTY TO SERVE ON THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION. THE SLATE OF NOMINEES FROM OSU SHALL BE ENDORSED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRIOR TO FORWARDING TO THE IFS. THE IFS OVERSEES THE PROCESS BY WHICH THREE OREGON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY ARE NOMINATED TO THE GOVERNOR FOR THE APPOINTMENT.

The Committee consists of four faculty members. [Three of these shall be appointed by the Executive Committee for three-year terms.] The fourth member shall be the Immediate Past Senate President, who shall serve as Chair.

A friendly amendment to delete "The fourth" and insert "One" in the last paragraph was agreed upon. Motion 99-549-03 to approve proposed revisions to the Bylaws and Nominations Committee Standing Rules, as amended, passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.
Committee on Committees

The Committee on Committees maintains a continuing study of the structure and effectiveness of University councils and committees and of their relationship to responsibilities of the Faculty Senate; proposes and reviews proposals for new Senate standing committees; and makes recommendations on committee reorganization and functions to [appropriate] THE FACULTY Senate [and University officers].

The Chair of each Committee/Council of the Faculty Senate shall, at five-year intervals, report to the Committee on Committees about its activities. This report must demonstrate activities which have enhanced the functions and objectives of the FACULTY Senate AND UNIVERSITY. When no clearly useful functions can be identified, the abolishment of the Committee/Council shall be recommended. The Committee is composed of six Faculty [and two Student members].

Motion 99-549-04 to approve the proposed revisions to the Committee on Committees Standing Rules passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.
Faculty Status Committee

The Faculty Status Committee [develops] EXAMINES policies regarding academic freedom and tenure, appointment, and termination, procedures for review and appeals, and promotion, and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate, Executive Office, Provost's Council, and Deans and Department Heads. It maintains SOME LEVEL OF liaison with other faculty affairs committees. The full Committee TYPICALLY meets [monthly] QUARTERLY; subcommittees may meet more frequently DEPENDING UPON THE NATURE OF ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION. The Committee is composed of nine Faculty members representing all segments of the University[, three being appointed annually for three-year terms].

Motion 99-549-05 to accept the proposed revisions to the Faculty Status Committee Standing Rules passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.
Senator Landau was concerned that the word 'develops' was being stricken. In response to Senator Shor's query, Provost Arnold explained that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education develops policy and asks for input from institutions.

Motion 99-549-06 to delete the wording 'some level of' in the second sentence passed by voice vote.

Graduate Council

The Council consists of one graduate faculty member from each College [appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee,] and [a] ONE graduate student [representative selected by the Graduate Student Association]. The Chair shall be a faculty member with immediate prior experience on the Council. The Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School and the Chair of the Graduate Admissions Committee shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

Motion 99-549-07 to approve the proposed revisions to the Graduate Council Standing Rules passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Instructional Development and Technology Committee

[Instructional Development and Technology Committee] COMPUTING RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The [Instructional Development and Technology] COMPUTING RESOURCES COMMITTEE reviews and recommends policy concerning [instructional] technology AS USED BY FACULTY IN INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE ON CAMPUS AND OFF-CAMPUS [resources and their application to the teaching/learning process and curriculum change]. It assists in planning and advocating for the necessary technology to maximize student learning AND ENHANCE FACULTY RESEARCH AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES TO OSU AND THE WIDER COMMUNITY. IT ACTS TO ADVISE OTHER COMMITTEES AND INFORMATION SERVICES AS WELL AS PROVIDING LEADERSHIP IN ADOPTION AND EFFECTIVE USE OF COMPUTING FOR INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE. [Included within technology resources are instructional services, training, and distance and extended campus learning opportunities.] 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,] VICE PROVOST FOR INFORMATION SERVICES, ex-officio, non-voting. THE VICE PROVOST FOR INFORMATION SERVICES MAY RECOMMEND A RESOURCE PERSON FROM INFORMATION SERVICES AS ANOTHER EX-OFFICIO, NON-VOTING MEMBER. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IS ENCOURAGED TO LOOK FOR BROAD REPRESENTATION IN THE APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE IN ORDER TO PROVIDE DISCIPLINARY DIVERSITY.

It was pointed out that the correct title should be Associate Provost for Information Services; this change will be made.

Motion 99-549-08 to approve proposed revisions to the Instructional Development and Technology Committee Standing Rules passed by voice vote with two dissenting votes.

Senator Strik, Agricultural Sciences, suggested that the word 'service' in the first sentence be changed to 'Extended Education'. President Williamson noted that 'service' was taken from the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, went on record as saying that he and Past President Mike Martin were ten years ahead of time when they proposed this change in 1989.

Library Committee

The Library Committee advises the [Director of Libraries] UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN in (1) meeting the LEARNING, INSTRUCTION, AND RESEARCH needs of [the] students, [and the instructional and research] FACULTY, AND staff; (2) formulating library policies in relation to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and (3) interpreting the needs and policies of the library to the University. The Committee consists of nine Faculty members and three Student members, including AT LEAST ONE UNDERGRADUATE AND one graduate student, and the [Director of Libraries] UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Motion 99-549-09 to approve the proposed revisions to the Library Committee Standing Rules passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.
Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee studies statements of policy[,] AND advises on matters pertaining to THE promotion and tenure PROCESS of faculty [and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee]. The Committee [is entitled to] observeS the annual promotion and tenure process in the Executive Office, [and to] readS the dossiers AND PROVIDES INPUT ON THE PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISION PROCESS THROUGH ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND TO THE PROVOST'S OFFICE. The Committee shall file an annual report with the Faculty Senate THAT [This report will] includeS a summary of the previous year's promotion and tenure actions. The Committee shall consist of six faculty who have been granted tenure at OSU, whose appointments are primarily in teaching, research and EXTENDED EDUCATION [service] and extended education who reflect the diversity of the University. Whenever a committee member is under consideration for promotion, he or she will be ineligible to serve on the committee DURING THE YEAR IN WHICH THE REVIEW IS SCHEDULED. THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE WILL PROVIDE LEADERSHIP FOR CAMPUS-WIDE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS AND FACILITATES ON-GOING DIALOGUE ABOUT THESE MATTERS. MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ARE AVAILABLE TO RESPOND TO PROCEDURAL AND INTERPRETATIVE QUESTIONS FROM FACULTY, DEPARTMENT HEADS, DEANS, AND DEPARTMENT AND COLLEGE COMMITTEES.

Motion 99-549-11 to delete 'of faculty' in the first sentence failed due to no second. Senator Sayre, Liberal Arts, moved to amend the proposal to move the word 'faculty' at the end of the first sentence and delete 'of' so the sentence reads '...pertaining to the faculty promotion and tenure process.' Motion 99-549-12 to amend the proposal was seconded and passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Senator Ede, Liberal Arts, moved to amend the first sentence of the second paragraph by deleting the word 'will' and changing 'provide' to 'provides' so the sentence reads 'The Promotion and Tenure Committee provides leadership for...' Motion 99-549-13 was seconded and passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

It was pointed out that 'extended education' was repeated in the fourth sentence; it will be deleted.

Motion 99-549-10 to approve the proposed revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Standing Rules, as amended, passed by voice vote with one dissenting votes.

Research Council

The Research Council establishes policies for matters pertaining to [grant, contract, general, and exploratory] SPONSORED research [activity] ACTIVITIES. It promotes, stimulates, and facilitates research activity, disseminating information about availability of grant funds and procedures for applying. It assigns priorities for distribution of [General Research and Exploratory Research Grants] VARIOUS INTERNAL FUNDING PROGRAMS AND FOR EXTERNAL SOLICITATIONS THAT REQUIRE LIMITED SUBMISSIONS FROM THE INSTITUTION. The Council consists of nine Faculty members WHO ARE SELECTED FROM THROUGHOUT THE UNIVERSITY [appointed by the Executive Committee]. The Administrator [administering] OF the Research Office OR DESIGNEE shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Council. The Chair shall be a Faculty member with immediate prior experience on the Council, appointed annually by the Executive Committee.

Motion 99-549-14 to approve proposed revisions to the Research Council Standing Rules passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Student Recognition and Awards Committee

The Student Recognition and Awards Committee conducts such investigations as may be necessary to determine student beneficiaries of the various Institutional recognitions and awards that are all-University in character. It also plans and conducts, WITH THE SUPPORT OF THE EX-OFFICIO, an assembly or other appropriate program for the presentation of these awards to their recipients. THE EX-OFFICIO WORKS CLOSELY WITH THE COMMITTEE AND IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE TASKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ALL-UNIVERSITY RECOGNITION AND AWARDS PROGRAM. The Committee serves as the Institutional registry for all recognitions and awards within the University; all recognitions that are listed in official publications, or the recipients of which are listed in official publications, are registered with the Committee. The Committee consists of eight Faculty, [and] eight Students [members] AND THE COORDINATOR, UNIVERSITY SCHOLARS PROGRAM, EX-OFFICIO, NON-VOTING.

Motion 99-549-15 to approve proposed revisions to the Student Recognition and Awards Committee Standing Rules passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Curricular Proposals

Leonard Friedman, Curriculum Council, presented for approval curricular proposals for new study abroad sites at the University of Ghana and Macquaries University (Australia). Friedman reported that both proposals are budget neutral and both provide new opportunities to students. The Curriculum Council unanimously approved both proposals.

Motion 99-549-16 to approve the University of Ghana proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 99-549-17 to approve the Macquaries University (Australia) proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Faculty Salary Resolution Steve Davis, Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee Chair, presented the following salary resolution for approval.

WHEREAS, Faculty salary increases in the 1990's at OSU have been few and generally small;
WHEREAS, Faculty salaries at OSU are significantly below the mean of our peer institutions (in '97/'98 the OSU average salaries were 84.5%, 89.8%, and 92.0% of the peer institution averages, respectively, for the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor);

WHEREAS, The Oregon University System (OUS) has developed a model by which OSU faculty salaries would be increased to equal the mean of the peer institutions over the next three biennia; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the faculty request that President Risser and Provost Arnold make faculty salary increases a top priority in the 1999/2000 biennium. Be it further resolved that the administration adopt and implement the salary increase model developed by the Oregon University System which would bring OSU faculty salaries of all ranks up to the mean of our peer institutions over the next three biennia.

Davis explained that a 2% salary increase will not address inequities. Provost Arnold noted that, although the OUS goal was to reach parity, that goal will not be met due to under funding. It remains a goal of the Board over three biennia.

In response to Senator Frank, Liberal Arts, questioning if OSU could choose to use funds for salaries, Arnold noted that it was not perfectly clear if that could be done.

Senators Tiedeman and Landau spoke in support of the resolution.

Motion 99-549-18 to approve the above resolution passed by voice vote.

SPECIAL REPORTS

OSU Foundation

Rebecca Cole, OSU Foundation Director, noted that she is anxious to learn about OSU. She reported that the primary focus of the Foundation is for consolidation of all aspects of fundraising at OSU. Their goal is to generate as much external support as possible, and they plan to cultivate regional as well as national contacts.

There are several components to expanding the donor base, including: cultivation of a prospective donor by explaining the university to them; engage them in a discussion of options available; an actual solicitation; and finally, stewardship of their donation.

Cole felt that faculty are overlooked in the process and Foundation staff will be contacting faculty appropriate to potential donors.

Senator Frank questioned why constituency-based fundraising is being eliminated. Cole responded that the university is going back to a central base that provides a coordinated approach. She assured Senators that each unit will be represented.

President-Elect Matzke questioned whether departments will still be allowed to raise money for departmental purposes. Cole responded that the Foundation would like to be informed of what departments are doing to avoid multiple contacts.

INFORMATION ITEMS

– Annual Reports - Annual reports for all Faculty Senate committees/councils are due July 15.

– Promotion and Tenure Committee Response - Included in the agenda was a response from the Promotion and Tenure Committee regarding 'Processes to Resolve

Disagreement on Position Descriptions'

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

Administrative Appointments –

Forestry Dean – A candidate will soon arrive for a second round of interviews.

Graduate School Dean – It is anticipated that an interim dean will be announced within the week.

Distance and Continuing Education – The announcement for a Distance and Continuing Education Dean has been issued and candidates will be reviewed beginning July 1.

Veterinary Medicine Dean – Group and individual input has been sought. It is hoped that an external person can be found who is willing to serve in an interim basis while an external search is conducted.

Science Dean – A message has been sent to department chairs requesting faculty input to identify nominees. The screening committee has received the names of 39 individuals for interim dean.

Executive Director of Alumni Relations – It is expected that the search committee will begin reviewing candidates in June or July.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Williamson's report included the following items: Campus Climate – Training opportunities need to be made available to all faculty to increase skill and comfort levels in dealing with diversity issues. The Executive Committee proposes that an additional question be added to the student evaluation form to flag classroom situations that have offended some students. This proposal will be forwarded to the Advancement of Teaching Committee for their consideration.

Position Descriptions – In relation to an earlier Senate discussion, the Promotion and Tenure Committee has reaffirmed that, while position descriptions should be worked out in cooperation between the faculty and administrative heads, the administrative head has the final responsibility for assigning tasks and distributing time commitments between tasks.

Effective Teaching – President Williamson's written report contained ten common themes from the effective teaching forums.

Graduate Assistant Unionization – Faculty were strongly encouraged to become knowledgeable about the graduate assistant unionization efforts and to discuss its full implications with colleagues and graduate students.

Institutional Funding of the Athletic Department – Williamson outlined the history of institutional support to Athletics: 1994, \$1.6 million; 1995, \$1.6 million; 1996, \$2.7 million; 1997, \$2.8 million; 1998, \$3.7 million; and 1999 \$3.2 million.

The proposal is to raise institutional support for future years to \$4.4 million annually. An

additional proposal is to increase student fee support from the present \$0.9 million to \$3.05 million per year by the year 2002. Under this plan, the combined institutional and student support in the year 2002 would be \$7.45 million or 35% of the total Athletics revenue.

Although the Athletics pay-back plan is driven by a mandate from the State Board, it is an uncomfortable situation for all involved and this is a situation where losses will be felt by many.

On the up side, OSU now has both an Athletic Director and Head Football Coach who are extremely competent and capable. Williamson noted that the loss of either of these individuals in the near term could be devastating to recovery of the Athletics Department.

Senator Flahive, Science, expressed disappointment that the information on the Athletics funding transfer was not known earlier.

Senator Daniels, Agricultural Sciences, felt the time may be right to start asking questions about whether OSU should be in the PAC-10. Along this line of thinking, Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, suggested that a committee could be appointed to determine the implications of OSU leaving the PAC-10.

President-Elect Matzke questioned whether the Athletics funding would take away from academic programs, to which President Williamson responded that there are many unknowns.

Senator Sayre thought that tuition deferral needs to be discussed. Williamson did not feel that tuition deferral would gain anything since it would result in deferrals versus transfer of institutional funding.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:10 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](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » May 5, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 548

May 5, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on May 5, 1999, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Kenneth Williamson. There were no corrections to the minutes of April 1999.

Meeting Summary

- Special Reports: Legislative Update, K. McCann; Microsoft Task Force, N. Lederman; and Information Services Ad Hoc Committee, H. Sayre
- Discussion Item: Internal Budget Allocation, M. Niess
- Action Items: Bylaws Revisions [Motion 99–548–01 through –14]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Brooks, M.A. Seville; Bruce, N. Hoffman; Drexler, P. Hsieh; Ede, V. Collins; Hardin, J. Ridlington; McCambridge, B. Thorsness; McDaniel, L. Goddik; and Warner, C. Langford.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Azarenko, Barth, Bird, Biwan, Bloomer, Brodie, Burt, Bushnell, Champeau, Crateau, Cromack, S. Daniels, T. Daniels, deGeus, DeKock, K. Field, Fisk, Graham, Green, Gregerson, Hathaway, Hemphill, Henthorne, Hoogesteger, Huyer, Jepson, Jimmerson, Jones, Kaneps, Kerkvliet, Klein, Krause, Lajtha, Levine, Lomax, Longerbeam, Merickel, Moore, Morris, Murphy, Peters, Prucha, Righetti, Rosenberger, Tesch, Trehu, and Tynon.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex–Officios and Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; G. Matzke, President–Elect; M. Niess, Immediate Past President; R. Arnold, Ex–Officio; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, S. Francis, D. Johnson, K. McCann, P. Montagne, J. Schuster, and T. Wilcox.

SPECIAL REPORTS

Legislative Update

Kevin McCann, Community and Government Relations Director, provided an update on legislative issues.

McCann reported that the Ways and Means Committee had passed the Higher Education budget during the last week of April with an additional \$86 million above the continuing service level. About \$5 million was moved to a separately funded bill for engineering education and about \$2 million for OSU state–wide public service programs was also

moved to a separate bill.

He noted that this is a time to be patient and a time to thank those who voted yes for their support and to thank those who voted no but made complimentary comments on the floor for their support. There is good support from both sides in the Legislature.

ACTION ITEMS

Bylaws Revision

Anthony Wilcox, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented proposed revisions to the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Capitalized sections indicate proposed additions and bracketed sections indicate proposed deletions.

Article IV, Members, Sec. 2

The revision is to remove the requirement that faculty be stationed in Oregon at the time of apportionment to be eligible to be elected.

Elected Members. There shall be 132 elected members as determined and apportioned according to the provisions of Article V, Sec. 1. ALL Faculty, as defined in Article III, Sec. 1 AND WHO ARE INCLUDED IN SENATE APPORTIONMENT, shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate [providing they are stationed within the State of Oregon at the time Senate apportionment is determined annually].

Motion 99–548–01 to approve changes to Article IV, Sec. 2 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Article V, Member Nominations and Elections, Sec. 1 Proposal would reflect current practice following the reorganization of Extension and Extended Education.

In the determination of representation of each apportionment group, all Faculty members who hold academic rank or FTE in one such group shall be included in that group, whether engaged in instructional, research, or extension work, with the apportionment determined accordingly. ON–CAMPUS EXTENSION FACULTY SHALL BE INCLUDED WITH THE COLLEGE OR OTHER APPORTIONMENT UNIT THAT IS THEIR ACADEMIC HOME. [Agricultural Research and on–campus Extension Faculty shall be included with the College of Agricultural Sciences; Home Economics Research or on–campus Extension Faculty members with the College of Home Economics and Education; Engineering or Forestry Research Faculty members with the Colleges of Engineering or Forestry, etc.]

Motion 99–548–02 to approve changes to Article V, Sec. 1 passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Article V, Member Nominations and Elections, Sec. 2

Proposal would make eligibility to vote the same as eligibility to serve as a Senator (Article IV, Sec. 2), and to correct a misreference to officers.

Voting. All Faculty, as defined in Article III, Sec. 1., AND WHO ARE INCLUDED IN SENATE APPORTIONMENT IN THEIR APPORTIONMENT UNIT, shall be eligible to vote in the nomination and election of [Senate Officers] SENATORS.

Motion 99–548–03 to approve changes to Article V, Sec. 2 passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Article V, Member Nominations and Elections, Sec. 7

Proposal would clarify process of filling vacancies since deleted wording was ambiguous.

[Vacancies shall be filled from the list of names appearing on the ballot of the previous election, from the time they occur until the next election by a majority vote of the Senators of the apportioned group.] A VACANCY SHALL BE FILLED FROM THE TIME IT OCCURS UNTIL THE NEXT ELECTION BY THE UNELECTED NOMINEE WHO RECEIVED THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF VOTES IN THE MOST RECENT ELECTION. The unexpired portion of any vacant term that extends beyond the next election shall be filled at that election.

Motion 99–548–04 to approve changes to Article V, Sec. 7 passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Article VI, Officers, Sec. 1

Proposal would require a Senator who is elected President–Elect to vacate his/her Senate seat since the President–Elect represents all OSU faculty.

Sec. 1. The officers of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following: (a) Senate President, who has served as Senate President–Elect during the preceding term and (b) Senate President–Elect, an elected member of the Faculty who is now or has been a Senator. IF THE PRESIDENT–ELECT IS SERVING AS AN ELECTED SENATOR, THAT SEAT SHALL BE DECLARED VACANT AND FILLED BY THE APPORTIONMENT GROUP IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE V, SECTION 7.

Motion 99–548–05 to approve changes to Article VI, Sec. 1 passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Article VI, Officers, Sec. 3

Proposal would provide clarification in declaring the winner in the election of the President–Elect.

Election shall be by mail ballot in the month of November in a manner designated by the Executive Committee, which shall report the election results at the regular December meeting. THE NOMINEE RECEIVING THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF VOTES SHALL BE ELECTED. TIE VOTES SHALL BE RESOLVED BY MAIL BALLOT IN A RUN–OFF ELECTION. All persons eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections shall be eligible to vote for a Senate President–Elect. A method for absentee voting shall be designated by the Executive Committee.

Motion 99–548–06 to approve changes to Article VI, Sec. 3 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Article VI, Officers, Sec. 4, paragraph 6

Proposal clarifies determination of a vacancy in the office of the President or President–Elect and proposes a recall process for these officers.

[The Faculty Senate may declare a vacancy of office upon an officer's inability to discharge the duties of office, or resignation.] THE POSITION OF AN OFFICER OF THE SENATE SHALL BECOME VACANT BY: (1) RESIGNATION, ON THE EFFECTIVE DATE SPECIFIED IN A LETTER OF RESIGNATION; (2) LEAVE OF ABSENCE, ON THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF A LEAVE FROM THE UNIVERSITY IN EXCESS OF ONE MONTH; (3) TERMINATION OR RETIREMENT, ON THE EFFECTIVE DATE; (4) RECALL OR RESCIND. THE ELECTION OF A PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT–ELECT MAY BE RESCINDED FOLLOWING RULES SPECIFIED BY ROBERTS RULES OF ORDER NEWLY REVISED (CHAPTER XX, ARTICLE 60). A RESCIND MOTION REQUIRES FROM THE SENATE (A) A TWO–THIRDS VOTE, OR (B) A MAJORITY VOTE IF NOTICE OF INTENT TO MAKE THE MOTION HAS BEEN GIVEN AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND THE MOTION IS PUBLISHED AS AN ACTION ITEM ON THE AGENDA OF THE SENATE MEETING AT WHICH IT WILL BE INTRODUCED. VOTING ON MOTIONS TO RECALL THE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT–ELECT SHALL BE BY WRITTEN BALLOT.

Motion 99–548–07 to approve changes to Article VI, Sec. 4, paragraph 6 passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.

Article VI, Officers, Sec. 4, paragraph 8

Proposal outlines an order of succession in the case of a vacancy in the office of the President–Elect.

A vacancy in the office of Senate President–Elect shall be filled for the remainder of the term of office by a special election following the procedures as provided in Sec. 3 of this Article, but not restricted by November dates for nomination and election. DURING THE INTERIM FROM WHEN THE VACANCY OCCURS TO WHEN A NEW PRESIDENT–ELECT IS INSTALLED, THE IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT SHALL PERFORM THE FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT–ELECT. IF THAT PERSON IS NOT AVAILABLE, THE NEXT MOST IMMEDIATE AND AVAILABLE PAST–PRESIDENT SHALL SERVE.

Motion 99–548–08 to approve changes to Article VI, Sec. 4, paragraph 8 passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.

Article VIII

This newly proposed article would describe the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and how it relates to the OSU Faculty Senate.

ARTICLE VIII: INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE SEC. 1. THE INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE (IFS) SERVES AS A VOICE OF THE FACULTIES OF THE OREGON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (OUS) INSTITUTIONS IN MATTERS OF SYSTEM–WIDE CONCERN, CONSIDERS STATE–WIDE POLICIES AND MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS THEREON, AND ENDEAVORS TO STRENGTHEN THE PARTICIPATION OF FACULTIES IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE VARIOUS OUS INSTITUTIONS. IFS IS COMPOSED OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES FROM EACH OF THE OUS CAMPUSES. OSU IS REPRESENTED BY THREE (3) SENATORS.

SEC. 2. DUTIES. IFS SENATORS ARE THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OSU FACULTY IN MATTERS THAT CROSS INSTITUTIONAL LINES. IFS SENATORS SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR SEEKING OPINIONS OF THE OSU FACULTY AND THE OSU FACULTY SENATE AS A BODY.

SEC. 3. ELECTION PROCEDURES FOR IFS SENATORS. THE COMMITTEE ON BYLAWS AND NOMINATIONS SHALL NOMINATE AT LEAST TWO CANDIDATES FROM THE FACULTY FOR THE OFFICE OF IFS SENATOR. ALL FACULTY, AS DEFINED IN ARTICLE III, SEC. I AND WHO ARE INCLUDED IN SENATE APPORTIONMENT, SHALL BE ELIGIBLE FOR ELECTION TO IFS.

THE COMMITTEE SHALL REPORT TO THE REGULAR NOVEMBER MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE. ADDITIONAL NOMINATIONS FOR IFS SENATOR MAY BE MADE FROM THE FLOOR AND THE NOMINATIONS SHALL BE CLOSED. THE FACULTY SENATE OFFICE SHALL PUBLISH THE NAMES OF THE NOMINEES IN THE STAFF NEWSLETTER, OSU THIS WEEK, NO LATER THAN THE THIRD WEEK OF NOVEMBER.

ELECTION SHALL BE BY MAIL BALLOT IN THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER IN A MANNER DESIGNATED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WHICH SHALL REPORT THE ELECTION RESULTS AT THE REGULAR DECEMBER MEETING. THE NOMINEE RECEIVING THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF VOTES SHALL BE ELECTED. TIE VOTES SHALL BE RESOLVED BY MAIL BALLOT IN A RUN–OFF BALLOT. ALL PERSONS ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN FACULTY SENATE ELECTIONS SHALL BE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE FOR THE IFS SENATOR.

SEC. 4. TERM OF OFFICE. IFS SENATORS SERVE THREE–YEAR TERMS BEGINNING IN THE JANUARY FOLLOWING THEIR ELECTION. THE TERMS FOR THE THREE IFS SENATORS FROM OSU SHALL BE STAGGERED.

Motion 99–548–09 to approve Article VIII passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Article III, Authority and Responsibility, Sec. 4

This section was proposed to be deleted since it is incorporated in the newly approved Article VIII.

[Sec. 4. Interinstitutional Faculty Senators shall be responsible for seeking opinions of the OSU Faculty and the OSU Faculty Senate as a body.]

Motion 99–548–10 to approve changes to Article III, Sec. 4 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Renumbering

Motion 99–548–11 to renumber succeeding sections of the Bylaws now numbered incorrectly since passage of the new IFS Article passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Internal Budget Allocation

Maggie Niess, Budget Allocation Advisory Committee Chair, presented the Internal Budget Allocation Process Development and Outcomes report found in the agenda. Niess worked with the Committee to gather information related to the new budget process and its outcomes. She also thanked the members of the committee for their assistance: Erik Fritzell, Gordon Matzke, Bruce Sorte, Vic Tremblay, Alexis Walker and Tony Wilcox.

The report recommended nine 'Likely Faculty Priorities':

1. Access to and quality of educational experience
2. Capacity
3. Cross Campus Initiatives
4. Diversity
5. Faculty retention
6. Graduate students
7. Library
8. Research
9. Reserves

The report ended by reflecting on the process and suggesting improvements for the 2000–01 budget process:

1. A comprehensive strategic plan should be the basis of the budgeting process.
2. The strategic planning process should be a consensus building process that encompasses the whole campus community.
3. The strategic planning process should begin immediately in order to assure that the budget process for the fiscal year 2000–01 is able to reflect a strategic plan.

Senator Langford, Liberal Arts pro-tem, felt that the time line should allow more time in the budgeting process for faculty input, perhaps one additional month.

Senator Landau, Science, commended the committee on the report and offered the following comments:

1. Money should follow the students;
2. feels that different schools receive different amounts of money based on enrollment and should be reviewed;
3. commended distance education comments;
4. should never consider self-funded faculty salaries; and
5. stop drain of money going to athletics and being taken from academics.

Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, questioned if there would be an opportunity in the process to prioritize the recommendations in the memo. Niess responded that the committee wanted to make sure that all items were included and were in no rank order. She urged Senators to recognize that the process is through the colleges and units.

In response to Senator Langford, President Williamson indicated that the Executive Committee would ask the Budget Allocation Advisory Committee to redraft the memo to incorporate comments made during the Senate discussion.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, moved to accept the report and forward the redrafted report to the OSU President and Provost; motion seconded. Motion 99-548-12 to accept and forward the report passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Microsoft Task Force

Norm Lederman, Microsoft Task Force Chair, reported on committee findings and presented the Task Force's final report for Senate endorsement. The purpose of the task force was to consider the issues surrounding the question of whether OSU should enter into a Microsoft Campus Agreement (MCSA) and to research and report the pros and cons of adopting the MCSA campus wide. The report, distributed in the agenda, did not offer any recommendations. The task force members were: Courtney Campbell, Jon Dorbolo, Dan Edge, Roy Haggerty, Paul Montagne, Michael Quinn and Lani Roberts.

Lederman reported that about 70% of OSU departments have already entered into an MCSA which determines cost based cost on FTE. The contract allows a department to terminate a contract at any time.

Pros (in no rank order):

1. Cost
2. Saves time and money in upgrades
3. Minimizes legal issues
4. Software can be used at home
5. Students keep the software after they graduate
6. No major infrastructure changes
7. Contract is yearly
8. Potential for greater incorporation of computer technology in classrooms since all are using the same software

Cons (in no rank order):

1. May be more costly for smaller departments
2. Will there be pressure against using competing software that may be more appropriate in classes?
3. Additional resources may be needed for duplication distribution of various products

Ethical Considerations – Will the arrangement:

1. Generate a conflict of interest for the university;
2. Risk subordination of the university's identity to industrial interests (e.g. will OSU be referred to as a "Microsoft university");
3. Transform higher education into a revenue commodity;
4. Enable equitable allocation of the university's resources and facilities;
5. Unfairly advantage or disadvantage any segment of the university;
6. Unite the university as a community;
7. Respect the decision-making autonomy of colleges, departments, and other administrative units;
8. Ensure that freedom of choice is preserved for faculty, staff or students who may wish to 'opt-out' of a given licensing agreement;
9. Have minimal impact on other valued university goals and priorities (such as resources for teaching);
10. Provide a coherent process for decision-making, including consent of university,

faculty, and staff decision-making bodies.

In response to Senator Shor, Engineering, questioning whether upgrades would be charged for prior Microsoft donations, Lederman felt that the agreement appears to be worded such that upgrades would now be charged. Shor expressed concern about who would be responsible for the charge.

Senator Coakley, Science, felt that this arrangement would cost large departments huge amounts of money and felt that it should remain an option. She thought that if the university were to mandate the agreement, then the university should be paying for it. She felt this proposal needs more consideration.

Senator Thorsness, Associated pro-tem, noted that Purchasing held forums to educate the university about the agreement and another will be held prior to renewing the contract. The recommendation is that the agreement continue to be optional.

Senator Gardner, Science, felt that this sounds advantageous for Microsoft' and was most concerned about the insidious effect of mandatory compliance.

Senator Langford moved to accept the report; motion seconded. Motion 99-548-13 to accept the Microsoft Task Force report passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Information Services Ad Hoc Committee

Henry Sayre, Information Services Ad Hoc Committee Chair, presented for Senate endorsement the Committee's final report, which was in the agenda. The purpose of the committee was to oversee the implementation of the Information Services Review Task Force recommendations and to coordinate formal input to the policies and procedures of Information Services. Sayre thanked the committee members for their work: Gary Beach, Deborah Healey, ZoeAnn Holmes, Curt Pederson, Robby Robson and Tony Wilcox.

Recommendations 1-10 dealt with deficiencies in the conduct of fiscal management operations and budgetary responsibilities in Information Services (IS) as well as other campus units and are being addressed at a university-wide level. The recommendations will be considered by the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the President's Cabinet and the Deans. The Committee recommended that Vice President Specter report to the Senate in Fall Term 1999 on the status of the University's response to recommendations 1-10.

Recommendations 11-14 all pertain to the library and have been addressed as follows:

#11: Create reporting responsibilities for the University Librarian to both the Associate Provost for Information Services for matters related to integrating information services and to the Provost and Executive Vice President for matters related to the role of the Valley Library in the academic mission of the University.

This recommendation was reviewed by both listed individuals and they concluded there is no need to change the formal reporting relationship of the University Librarian. Instead the following actions were taken:

- 1) The title of the University Librarian was changed to University Librarian/Deputy Associate Provost for Information Services to reflect that this position is now second in the reporting structure within Information Services.
- 2) Quarterly meetings have been established with the Provost, Associate Provost for Information Services, and University Librarian to discuss library issues and concerns associated with the needs of academic programs, curriculum, instruction and research.

While the Committee believes that these two steps will help to foster an improvement in the communication deficiencies, the Committee further recommends the following:

- 1) Utilize the Provost's Council as a forum for discussion of library development;
- 2) Have the University Librarian meet periodically with the Academic Dean's Council to

discuss library issues; and

3) Encourage the University Librarian, academic deans, and senior administrators to collaborate in fulfilling the Valley Library's promise and expectations.

#12: Secure from Central Administration a commitment that the IS deficit reduction must not involve the serials and monograph acquisition budgets.

Recommends that Central Administration show its commitment to the Valley Library by supporting, to the degree possible with available funds, an annual increase in the Library budget such that by 2004–05, the total expenditures equal 4% of the total University budget. Further, the Committee recommends that the level of funding for the Valley Library not be reduced below 3% of the total University budget.

#13: Limit the Valley Library deficit–reduction payback to the level of its overspending in creating the deficit, which was \$751,417.

The original deficit repayment required of the Valley Library was \$1,382,834. The Associate Provost for IS accepted the recommended payback.

#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.

Central Administration transferred \$200,000 from University reserves in FY 1997–98 and the Valley Library used \$100,000 from an endowment account to help restore the monograph collection. Neither Central Administration nor IS agreed to reduce the deficit by \$300,000. IS has agreed to engage in discussions with the Faculty Senate Library Committee, Provost, Deans and other concerned faculty and students to assess how the endowment proceeds can possibly be redirected once the construction of the Valley Library is completed.

#15: Rename the Faculty Senate Instructional Development and Technology Committee (IDTC) and revise its Standing les.

The IDTC and Ad Hoc IS Committee recommends that the IDTC be renamed the Computing Resources Committee. Their new role would be basically two–fold: as the voice of the faculty in dealing with IS, and as a resource and advocate for faculty working with information technology.

#16: Review the rate structure of Telecommunications. The rapidity with which it retired its debt suggests they may be overcharging for their services.

Recommends that the Vice Provost for IS report to the Faculty Senate in Fall 1999 on the findings of a telephony expert report, and that a new Information Technology Advisory Committee be involved in determinations of adjustments of rate structures and ways to utilize the excess revenues.

#17: Articulation of a vision for computing at OSU by IS.

Recommends creation of a university–wide committee, the Information Technology Advisory Committee, to articulate priorities and develop a vision for computing and related technologies at OSU.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, moved to accept the report; motion seconded. Motion 98-548-14 passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

INFORMATION ITEMS

– IFS, AOF, AAUP Joint Meeting – The joint meeting will be held May 8 in the CH2M Hill Alumni Center.

– Annual Reports – Annual reports for all Faculty Senate committees/councils are due July 15.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold reported on the following items:

Budget Process – OSU administration is not prepared to move to the next step in the budget process until funding from the legislature is known.

Administrative Positions –

Forestry – Three Dean of Forestry finalists will visit during May.

Distance and Continuing Education – The Dean search is underway.

Graduate School – A screening committee is reviewing applications for the Interim Graduate School Dean position. At the same time, a review of the Graduate School will occur.

Veterinary Medicine – Dean Wilson's resignation is effective June 30, 1999. A fast-track search for an interim dean will be initiated.

Science – Dean Horne's resignation is effective December 31, 1999. An interim dean will begin in September to provide an overlap period with Dean Horne. The interim dean may be in place for up to two years and the permanent search will, perhaps, begin at the end of the first year.

Promotion and Tenure Reviews – As dossiers are completed, units will be notified of the decisions.

Provost Arnold wondered if there was merit in considering a service center concept for some smaller units participating in the Microsoft Campus Agreement.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Williamson's report included the following items:

Budget – Williamson briefly outlined implications of legislative funding. He summarized that the intent of the new budget model to make universities more competitive was met. However, since enrollments will grow at all institutions and the funding allocated by the legislature is fixed, the money received will be diluted. The other intent of making OUS comparable to peers will probably happen in relation to programs, since more money will be available for programs, but will not be achieved in relation to salaries.

Committees – Those who volunteered for Faculty Senate committees and those who were selected were thanked for their interest.

Difference, Power, and Discrimination Task Force – A task force to develop recommendations for the future structure and function of the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program is in the process of being appointed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award

Laura Connolly, Faculty Recognition and Awards Chair, presented a nominee for the D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award. There was no discussion on the nominee. After reopening the meeting to the public, the nominee was approved via written ballot.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:35 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](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » April 8, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 547

April 8, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on April 8, 1999, at 3:03 PM, in the Valley Football Center by President Kenneth Williamson. There were no corrections to the minutes of March 1999.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Approval of OSBHE Faculty nominees; Proposed Award, and Transit Resolution [Motion 99–547–01 through 03]
- Discussion Item: Education Reform
- Special Reports: University Honors College and Legislative Update
- New Business: None

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Ahern, I. Rajagopal; Brooks, M. Seville; Champeau, L. Beeson; Crateau, T. Henderson; Drexler, J. Down; Gross, E. Gonzales-Berry; Johnson, L. Kristick; McDaniel, L. Goddik; Rodriguez, V. Collins; Sandstrom, D. Denning; Sanford, A. Gillis; and Shor, S. Ellinwood.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Arp, Azarenko, Barth, Bird, Biwan, Bliss, Breen, Burt, Bushnell, Cornell, K. Daniels, S. Daniels, Doescher, Downing, Esbensen, Farber, J. Field, K. Field, Fisk, Frank, Franklin, Gamroth, Green, Gregerson, Hathaway, Henthorne, Huyer, Jepson, Jones, Kerkvliet, Krause, Lajtha, J. Lee, Lomax, Marks, Moore, Morris, Plant, Proteau, Prucha, Righetti, Rosenberger, Rossignol, Sayre, Strik, Tesch, Trehu, White, and Yamada.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; G. Matzke, President-Elect; M. Niess, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, L. Connolly, S. Francis, C. Graham, A. Hashimoto, J. Hieb, D. Johnson, K. McCann, and D. Visiko.

ACTION ITEMS

OSBHE Nominees

Ken Williamson announced that the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate had narrowed to three the list of nominees to be forwarded to the Governor for consideration as a faculty member on the Oregon State Board of Higher Education: Peter Callero (WOU); Gary Tiedeman (OSU); and Craig Wollner (PSU).

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts moved to endorse the slate of nominees; motion seconded. Motion 99-547-01 to endorse the nominees passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Williamson noted that the legislation specifically states that this position be filled by a faculty member. However, there is opposition by the governor's and chancellor's staff who prefer an emeritus faculty member since they feel that an active faculty member would result in a conflict of interest.

OSU Award for Excellence in Service

Laura Connolly, Faculty Recognition and Awards Chair, requested approval of the criteria for a new award and requested permission to open a foundation account to fund the award.

Connolly explained that the award was initially proposed in 1995-96, but wasn't brought forward for approval since funding was not identified. The proposed award is geared toward non-teaching Professional Faculty which is a category that is currently not recognized during University Day. The criteria follow:

OSU AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE

The Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee will consider the following evaluation criteria:

- exceptional job performance
- direct and significant involvement with and impact upon students, faculty, staff, or other university clientele
- innovation or creativity in work
- wide recognition by peers and colleagues of the quality of the nominee's work and service
- professional achievement or activities
- participation in university and community affairs
- evidence of continued professional growth

Since there are groups and individuals who are willing to help fund the award, a foundation account needs to be opened to create an endowment. Connolly has asked each Dean to contribute \$100 toward the award and is planning to work with the Development Office and Alumni Association to identify permanent funding. The exact amount of the award has not been determined. OSUMA has agreed to partially fund the award from member contributions.

Senator Tiedeman suggested adding 'Professional Faculty' to the award title; Connolly accepted on behalf of the committee.

A friendly amendment to drop the word 'wide' in the fourth bullet was accepted.

Senator Sorte, Agricultural Sciences, moved to accept the criteria and open a foundation account; motion seconded. Motion 99-547-02 to approve the award criteria and foundation account passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Transit Resolution

Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, presented the following resolution in support of the Corvallis Transit drivers:

WHEREAS, Oregon State University faculty may ride the bus for free in Corvallis as a benefit of employment;
WHEREAS, Accepting this benefit, even if unused, confers upon faculty a moral responsibility to ensure that city transit workers receive adequate wages and benefits for their service;

WHEREAS, Under the current contract, city transit workers earn considerably less

than the prevailing wage for the region, and are among the lowest paid in the state of Oregon; therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate supports the efforts of City Transit Workers in their campaign for a living wage.

Cornell explained that this resolution applied only to transit workers and not to school bus drivers, although they are both employed by Laidlaw. OSU currently pays \$20,000 to Laidlaw for bus services in addition to between \$50,000 and \$60,000 that is paid by student fees. She felt that failure to take sides in the dispute would be perceived as acquiescence. The starting wage for Corvallis bus drivers is \$6.65 per hour, which is the lowest in the region and well below what is considered a living wage. She also noted that direct negotiation with Laidlaw has failed, and felt that an expression of support for the drivers by the Faculty Senate would help to influence the City to reconsider taking a more active role in the negotiations. Cornell noted that the contract is quite profitable and felt that Laidlaw could finance a pay increase for drivers.

Senator Longerbeam, Student Affairs, felt that the resolution should be more comprehensive since there are also probably OSU employees who only earn the minimum wage. Cornell indicated she would be willing to bring forward another resolution that addresses the larger issue of minimum wages as opposed to living wages, but felt the proposed resolution should be addressed separately because of its immediacy.

George Curtain, union representative for the bus drivers, responded to a question from the floor regarding staffing. He indicated there were 12 full-time and two split-shift employees who drove city buses. Curtain also explained that city and school bus drivers belong to one union, but that the contracts are separate since one is with the City and one is with the school district.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, moved to approve the resolution; motion seconded.

Senator Burton, Science, supports the transit workers but opposes the resolution because he felt it is too political an issue and felt it was inappropriate for the Senate to consider. In response, Senator Cornell felt that faculty should take a stand on issues that directly affect the university community.

Senator Carson, Liberal Arts, felt the resolution was entirely appropriate and spoke in support of it.

Motion 99-547-03 to approve the transit resolution passed by voice vote with many dissenting votes.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Education Reform

Robby Robson, Education Reform Coordinator, provided a status report of the state-mandated transition to a proficiency-based admission standard system.

He noted that 49 of the 50 states are involved in standards-based education reform at the K-12 level which will result in an increase in the complexity and type of information provided by potential students. The information will speak to students' achievements and preparedness in individual areas as opposed to an overall grade point average.

Robson explained that, by 2005, OUS policy requires students to demonstrate proficiency

in six content areas broken up into 33 different proficiencies. The content areas are: English, Mathematics, Science, Social Science, Second Languages and Visual and Performing Arts.

The framework being considered would essentially equate the decision to admit a student to a commitment to provide a student with an appropriate program. The current admission policy is to admit any student who demonstrates evidence that they can succeed in the system. The difference between the current and proposed policy is the kind of evidence on which the decision will be based.

Senator Landau, Science, was impressed with the standards, but wondered if they weren't too rigorous. He felt it was premature to judge until there is an opportunity to see how the exams are structured and how well students do.

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether the SAT and GPA would be phased out. Robson responded that the SAT is required for admission and that the GPA will be phased out for students graduating from Oregon high schools.

SPECIAL REPORTS

University Honors College

Joe Hendricks, University Honors College Dean, updated the Senate on the enrollment and activities in the University Honors College.

He explained that the College opened in 1995 with 225 students and the trend has been to double the applications each year. OSU is one of about 12 institutions in the country that offer a distinctive honors degree. He acknowledged and expressed appreciation for the support and coursework provided by teaching faculty.

Applicants are evaluated on GPA and SAT scores and three essay questions. The average GPA is 3.96 and the average SAT is over 1300. For fall 1999, there were 895 applications for 125 slots in each cohort; admission was offered to 292 with 83 alternates identified.

There were 188 freshman admitted in 1998 with 22% consisting of underrepresented minorities, 54% females and 89% were Oregonians. Current distribution by college is as follows: Engineering - 36%; Science - 27%; Liberal Arts - 13%; Agricultural Sciences - 8%; Business - 5%; UESP - 4%; Pharmacy, Health & Human Performance and Home Economics and Education - 2%; and Forestry 1%. Although not all colleges are currently offering courses, it is anticipated that all colleges will offer courses beginning fall 1999.

Activities of the Honors College include sponsoring keynote speakers, such as Julian Bond and Sally Ride, and having the student newspaper place first in a nation-wide competition of honors college newsletters.

President-Elect Matzke questioned the available budget given the number of students. Hendricks re-ponded that, to serve students, visiting faculty positions have been cannibalized and reduced from four to one; the money that would have gone toward a 1999 keynote speaker will be used (negotiations with Madeleine Albright were unsuccessful); and there is a minor allocation from the Emergency Board.

Legislative Update

Kevin McCann, Community & Government Relations Director, provided an update on higher education funding.

He reminded Senators that they could not endorse measures or candidates during their personal time and wasn't sure how the Senate could justify personal time if these issues came up on the floor.

The higher education funding rally held March 31 was deemed a success and was the biggest rally this session; the crowd was estimated at 2,000. The Republican leadership in both the House and Senate were very pleased with the rally and have moved the higher ed Ways and Means hearings up several weeks. The Governor put \$73 million above continuing service level increases in the higher ed budget, but the Senate Republicans want an additional \$100 million. McCann expects higher education funding to be funded significantly higher than current levels. Final funding decisions hinge on K-12 funding levels.

McCann feels that OSU funding is positioned well for the state-wide public service programs: Agricultural Research, Forest Research and Extension.

Joe Hendricks, University Honors College, questioned the possibility of using tobacco settlement monies for funding higher ed. McCann wasn't sure if that was possible and Senator Lunch indicated that the governor's staff sounds skeptical about that approach.

INFORMATION ITEMS

The joint meeting of IFS, AOF and AAUP will be held May 8 in the CH2M Hill Alumni Center between 8:00 AM and 1:00 PM.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

- Budget information is due to the Provost by April 16.
- Serious concerns are being raised by academic units about their ability to provide available courses and advising for the projected increase of 500-600 freshman students for fall 1999.
- PEBB will continue to offer employee insurance benefits in 2000. It is anticipated that the new, merged PEBB program will offer similar benefits to what OSU faculty presently have with cafeteria-style, pre-tax spending on premiums, cashback and opt out. It is anticipated that opt out, cashback, etc., will eventually be greatly reduced or eliminated. More information is available at: www.ous.edu/hr/benefits/pebb.htm.
- A serious campus discussion is underway concerning the potential renovation of Weatherford Hall. One plan, called the "Weatherford Project," has been developed under the leadership of Jack Van de Water and Tom Scheuermann to convert the present facility into a residential college and a home for international programs. More information is available at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/housing/weatherford>.
- The Executive Committee has appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to explore the use of VoteNet by the Faculty Senate; the Committee is chaired by Len Friedman.
- The Executive Committee will appoint a Task Force to develop recommendations for the future structure and function of the DPD program. If you are interested in serving on this Task Force, contact a member of the Executive Committee.
- The graduate students have collected enough signatures to force a vote for a graduate student union that would include both GTA's and GRA's. The union would likely negotiate for more control in the number of hours worked and for health benefits.

Senator Wrolstad felt that if graduate students had been treated more fairly in the areas of insurance and health benefits, the union vote may not have been forced.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:15 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](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » March 4, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 546

March 4, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on March 4, 1999, at 3:02 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Kenneth Williamson. There were no corrections to the minutes of February 4, 1999.

Meeting Summary

--Special Reports: Intercollegiate Athletics, Mitch Barnhart and Legislative Update, Kevin McCann
--Action Items: Library Resolution [Motion 99-546-01 through 04]

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Bird, K. McCann; Caughey, L. Burns; Cornelius, B. Rettig; Daniels, L. Ott; Frank, C. Anderson; Krause, V. Farber; Morris, T. Roberts; Rossignol, J. McCubbin; Sproul, L. Hampton; Thies, J. Ingle; and Witters, B. Coblentz.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Arp, Azarenko, Biwan, Bloomer, Brodie, Bruce, Champeau, Christensen, Downing, Esbensen, K. Field, Gamroth, Gomez, Gregerson, Hooker, Huyer, Jepson, Jones, Kerkvliet, Klein, Lajtha, P. Lee, Lomax, Longerbeam, Lunch, Mallory-Smith, McDaniel, Mix, Moore, Nelson, Peters, Righetti, Robson, Sanford, Trehu, White, and Wrolstad.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; M. Niess, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, A. Christie, D. Johnson, D. Klein and A. Hashimoto.

ACTION ITEMS

Library Resolution

Henry Sayre, Information Services Ad Hoc Committee Chair, explained that the Ad Hoc Committee was created as a result of the Information Services Task Force and given a charge of overseeing the implementation of the task force's 17 recommendations: of which four related to the Library. Although the library deficit was reduced to reflect the actual amount incurred by the Library, the committee felt that the action was short-term and did nothing to address the long-term needs of the Library. Sayre's charts showed OSU compares poorly to ARL institutions in total library expenditures, percent of total university expenditures, total dollars, net volumes added, and monographs purchased. A table comparing OSU to non-ARL institutions also showed OSU at the bottom of the scale.

He presented the following resolution supporting increased funding for the Valley Library:

Library Resolution

Whereas, Oregon State University's Valley Library has been "underfunded for many years," as President Risser acknowledged in addressing the Faculty Senate in February 1998; and

Whereas, the average level of funding at peer institutions is approximately 3% of total expenditures, while the OSU library is currently funded at 2.14% of total expenditures, and

Whereas, the average real dollars expended by peer institutions is \$17,030,754, while OSU library's expenditures are currently \$6,972,417; and

Whereas, in order to achieve Association of Research Libraries (ARL) status, which is befitting a Carnegie Research I University and is an important component in the University's goal of achieving Tier One status, the library must be adequately funded:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT:

The faculty of Oregon State University supports increasing the funding of the Valley Library and recommends that the University commit to increasing the percent of expenditures dedicated to the library this year to approximately \$7,950,000 (an increase of approximately 0.3%) and then annually at a constant rate each year for the next three biennia, to attain a level of at least 4% of total expenditures by the year 2004-2005.

The Committee was fully cognizant that some departments would get less money if the resolution was approved and implemented. However, if ARL status is to be achieved, a greater Library investment is needed. Sayre noted that, if the Library is condemned to mediocrity, it will slide to lower and lower levels of adequacy.

Senator Gardner, Science, questioned the second part of the resolution and proposed that the Senate give a vote of confidence to the Library. He suggested that a period be placed after "Valley Library" in the resolution and the remainder deleted. Sayre noted that the exact figures were placed there at the request of the Executive Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee felt that the faculty should state the level that needs to be reached.

Senator Plant, Engineering, agreed with Gardner and noted that he was bothered by: the reference to increasing the percent of expenditures with a dollar amount listed; the increase of 0.3% is not clear; and the number of volumes purchased does not guarantee ARL status. Since the budget is not known, he supported ending the resolution where Gardner proposed. Sayre responded that it is important for the Library to reach a base level of between \$13-14 million, which would reasonably sustain the library. Sayre noted that the Library is very far below standards in terms of acquisitions.

Senator Farber, Liberal Arts, stated that the Library budget has not been adequate in the 29 years he has been here. Not only is it an embarrassment, it is also a serious impediment to faculty and student recruitment and retention. He felt this was a modest and reasonable proposal.

Senator Lee, Science, felt that if the arguments in favor of the Library are persuasive now, they would also be persuasive at a later time. Sayre responded that the Committee felt that faculty would like a voice in the budget decisions that are occurring.

Senator Landau, Science, expressed concern about identifying which areas are more important than others given the current underfunded situation of the university.

Senator Shor, Engineering, was concerned about promising money to the library, although additional books and monographs are needed. She didn't feel that money should be taken from hiring faculty to cover basic needs and be put toward the library. Sayre commented that the Committee recognized that units would be unhappy with the proposal, but they did not anticipate the negative reaction being voiced.

Senator Rodriguez, Liberal Arts, and Senator Dailey, Agricultural Sciences both spoke in support of the Library. Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, noted he was almost embarrassed at the faculty reaction since the Library is the heart of the University.

Senator Gardner moved to amend the resolution by inserting a period after 'Valley Library' and deleting the remainder of the paragraph; motion seconded.

Senator Daily felt it was necessary to ask for more than is possible to receive in order to get anything. Senator Tynon, Forestry, felt that the resolution is poorly written and favored the amendment. Senator Sorte, Agricultural Sciences, felt it was effective to set a precise number and suggested tabling the resolution and rewrite it with a more accurate number. Senator Rodriguez felt it was important to include a figure or percent.

Motion 99-546-02 to approve the amendment was defeated with many votes in favor.

Sayre proposed an amendment to add '2.43% of university expenditures' after 'to approximately'; motion seconded. Motion 99-546-03 to approve the second amendment was defeated with many votes in favor.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, moved to amend the resolution to read: The faculty of Oregon State University supports increasing the funding of the Valley Library and recommends that the University commit to increasing the percent of expenditures dedicated to the library to attain a level of at least 4% of total expenditures by the year 2004-2005. Motion was seconded. Motion 99-546-04 to amend the motion passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Motion 99-546-01 to approve the motion, as amended, passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

SPECIAL REPORTS

Intercollegiate Athletics

Mitch Barnhart, Director of Athletics, provided an update of Athletic activities. He explained that every aspect of the department has changed: from academics to game day experience, to fund-raising operations, to concessions, to recruitment and interaction with student athletes. They are trying to change the way they do business and become more involved on campus.

He commended his staff for taking on additional activities after 25 employees were let go last year as a result of budget concerns. He also reported that three new head coaches in volleyball, soccer and football have been hired.

Although OSU already has the lowest budget in the PAC-10, expenditures were reduced by over \$2 million last year.

Barnhart provided an overview of the rankings of each sports program; many are ranked in the top 20 while others are very promising.

He is proud of the 460 student athletes and the enthusiasm they've shown. Barnhart is emphasizing to coaches that they are in charge of the athletic experience and to make

sure they have an academic experience, although they recognize that faculty are in charge of the latter. He encouraged faculty to let him know if there is a problem with student-athletes.

In year two, he is committed to learning more about what goes on in the university community and wants to achieve a sense of partnership. The challenges include increasing competitiveness and revenue. He noted that both fund-raising and season ticket sales are up significantly. Athletics will promote the department via a town hall type format to communicate with the university community about their operation. A new marketing firm has been hired to increase visibility of the program.

Senator Cornell, Liberal Arts, questioned the amount of time available to student athletes to study and whether provisions are made for them to study while on the road. Barnhart responded that athletes are on a tight schedule between practice, meetings and studying and each team trains differently. Depending on academic standing, students can be required to attend study table for up to two hours per night. For football, it usually works out to three hours of field time and two hours of meeting time per day. Exams can be proctored on the road, depending on the professor. It's not unusual for a conference room to be scheduled for study time during an airport lay-over. There is currently a 71% graduation rate for student athletes. As a side note, football practice will be changed to the afternoon.

Landau congratulated Barnhart on the progress made in the last year, but was concerned with the deficit amount. Barnhart stated that it was \$8.2 million at the beginning of last year and should be down to \$6 million at the end of June. Athletics is working diligently to reduce the deficit and balance their budget. The department saved \$100,000 last year by using a volunteer work force at football games. There is no money allotted for convention travel and employees are limited to \$30 per diem when traveling in certain areas. Athletes are doubling and tripling up in rooms when on the road to reduce expenditures.

Landau also expressed concern over hiring practices and noted how rapidly coaches have been hired and how the football coach criteria eliminated persons of color. Barnhart noted that athletic hiring is unique and there was a need to hire rapidly to recruit football athletes given the end of the signing period. He explained that a call was placed to the Black Coaches Association asking for help while the football head coach position was vacant, but the Association did not return the call.

Legislative Update

Kevin McCann, Community and Government Relations Director, provided an update on legislative issues. There were three primary topics he spoke about: K-12 funding; the higher ed funding model and abolishment of faculty tenure in higher ed.

K-12 Funding – The biggest issue in the legislature is funding for K-12. The tax shifts which resulted in the general fund handling more of the K-12 funding has caused dramatic problems and challenges. The Governor proposed \$4.6 billion for K-12 out of a \$10 billion state budget, while the Senate Republicans proposed slightly more.

Higher Ed Funding Model – The funding model was adopted by Republican legislators due to accountability and simplicity factors; most realize that the money goes primarily to undergraduates. The Governor is favorable toward the funding model and proposed \$73 million above continuing service levels. Senator Brady Adams proposed \$80- 85 million for the model and is supportive of the tuition freeze. Either of these proposed figures represents a significant investment. The two things currently being worked on are: 1) encouraging the Senate and House leadership to stay firm on their commitment to higher ed, and 2) working with House freshmen to have them understand that, if the proposed K-12 budget was funded, every other state agency would face an 8% budget cut.

McCann noted that several strong lobby efforts are being led by high tech industry in support of engineering and computer science. Another effort on behalf of agriculture, forestry and extension is being led by natural resource folks.

In response to Senator Rodriguez, McCann noted that faculty salaries and recruitment are included within the new tuition model figure of \$85 million.

McCann suggested that if faculty have constituents from their programs (not OSU employees), they should be encouraged to ask their legislators to support the funding model.

Abolishment of Tenure – A bill to abolish faculty tenure went through the hearing process. The House Education Committee recognized that, if adopted, it would be absolutely disastrous to the higher ed system. The current opinion is that this bill will not be seen again.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- Committee Interest Forms are due back in the Faculty Senate Office April 9.
- The joint meeting of IFS, AOF and AAUP will be held May 8 in the CH2M HILL Alumni Center.
- The Bylaws and Nominations Committee is reviewing the Bylaws and welcomes comments.
- A survey is being conducted by the Baccalaureate Core Committee regarding the Baccalaureate Core and DPD courses.
- OSU Connect will be held September 22 through 26.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold opened the floor to questions.

Senator Dailey questioned what would happen to the Library. Arnold responded that it will be considered through the budget process and benchmark comparisons will be considered in determining the allocation. He anticipates that the resolution passed earlier by the Senate would accompany the Library request.

Senator Tiedeman noted that OSU's comparator institutions are, essentially, land grant while the U of O has non- land grant comparators and PSU has urban institutions. Arnold responded that the cell values were calculated from among all three sets.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Williamson's report included the following items:

- It is fairly certain that the new budget model will result in increased funding for the next biennium. Those responsible for working with legislators should be congratulated.
- He reminded faculty that now is the time to get involved in the budget process. Senator Langford, Liberal Arts, questioned whether there will be faculty input in years to come. Williamson responded that the review process is built in.
- Freshmen enrollment for fall 1999 is estimated to be about 500-600 above this year resulting in more than 15,000 students. Enrollment increases will bring new challenges to adequately provide for their many needs. One way to meet academic needs is to be flexible in relation to class times and schedules.

– Since increased enrollment can mean substantial revenue increases for OSU under the new budget model, special importance must be given to continued support and involvement in recruiting and retention efforts.

– The Executive Committee is looking into whether the electronic voting technology developed by ASOSU could be a valuable tool for the Faculty Senate. It could be used as an opinion polling device and/or for voting. Williamson welcomes opinions on this topic.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 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](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » February 4, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 545

February 4, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on February 4, 1999, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Kenneth Williamson. There were no corrections to the January 1999 minutes.

Meeting Summary

--Action Item: [Motion 99-545-01] OSU Distinguished Service Award

--Discussion Item: Internal Budget Allocation, R. Arnold

--Special Reports: Marketing, J. Schuster and Copyright, D. Shapiro

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

D. Champeau, A. Asbell; J. Cornelius, B. Boggess; D. Gregerson, T. Skubinna; K. Hardin, J. Ridlington; and P. Lee, E. Luttrell.

Members Absent Without Representation:

A. Azarenko, J. Barth, D. Bird, P. Biwan, J. Bliss, P. Breen, G. Bruce, C. Candolfi, J. Crane, L. Daley, S. Daniels, T. Daniels, L. deGeus, T. Downing, S. Esbensen, P. Farber, J. Field, K. Field, B. Frank, A. Gomez, J. Green, D. Hemphill, M. Henthorne, M. Huber, A. Huyer, P. Jepson, J. Jones, N. Kerkvliet, R. Landau, M. Levine, S. Longerbeam, C. Mallory-Smith, M. McDaniel, M. Merickel, M. Mix, K. Moore, M. Powelson, T. Righetti, A. Trehu, J. Tynon, and J. White.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; G. Matzke, President-Elect; M. Niess, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; R. Arnold, Ex-Officio; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

L. Burns, S. Francis, D. Johnson, J. Schuster, and B. Strohmeyer.

Action Item

Proposed Distinguished Service Award Revision

Beth Strohmeyer, Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee (FRAC) member, presented a proposal to change the responsibility for approval of the OSU Distinguished Service Award (DSA) selection from the full Faculty Senate to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This proposal allows the deadline for DSA nominations to coincide with the nomination deadline for other+ awards selected by FRAC.

There was no discussion. Motion 99-545-01 passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.

Discussion Item

Internal Budget Allocation

Provost and Executive Vice President Roy Arnold described the new internal budget process at OSU.

He began by outlining some of the elements in the OUS funding model. The new model calls for tuition and fees to stay with the institution where they are generated versus the current model where all revenues go to the Chancellor's Office and are then redistributed to each institution according to a BAS Model. The state tax funds proposed for the new model will be distributed in two ways: 1) a per student component and 2) a series of lump sum pools for various programs or functions within the system that are not driven by student numbers, such as OSU Statewide, Extension, and the Forest Research Lab.

Allocations driven by student numbers are determined by a matrix that includes discipline categories and student levels, with a separate section for unique programs such as Law, Pharmacy and Veterinary Medicine. Per student costs are based on average costs for similar programs at peer universities.

One half percent of the resources allocated to are linked to performance measures and will be held back at the system level. The funds will be released as institutions reach goals established for particular performance measures, including retention rates and graduation rates.

The new model also contains a research component that recognizes the role of scholarship and creative activities across institutions.

The OSU process was developed by the Budget Work Group involving Paul Farber, Maggie Niess, Brent Dalrymple, Fred Horne, Andy Hashimoto and Rob Specter. Their efforts resulted in the creation of Revenue Generation and Budget Allocation Principles, a Budget Allocation Process, and an OSU Planning and Budgeting Schedule that were distributed at the meeting.

The Principles document presents principles for both revenue generation and budget allocation of the State's general funds and tuition revenues. The principles should be considered as a total set and, with the exception of #1, are not in priority order. Number one speaks to allocations of funds reflecting the overall mission and goals of the University.

The Budget Allocation Process document reflects the principles and is envisioned as a process that provides a model for longer-term management of State general funds and tuition revenues within OSU and would be followed each year.

Senator Tate, Science, questioned Provost Arnold about the peer institutions. He responded that there are peer institutions identified for each institution in the system, but for purposes of calculating program costs, there is a pooled group of institutions. The pooled group for OSU includes Land Grant Research I Universities.

In response to Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, questioning if there was a differentiation between in-state and out-of-state tuition, Provost Arnold stated that all tuition paid would come to the institution and would be part of the total resource. There is a state match only for resident students and non-resident students, essentially, pay the state match.

Senator Cluskey, Home Economics and Education, questioned the status of tuition waivers for graduate students. Arnold noted that, currently, tuition waivers are funded by the Chancellor's Office out of the tuition that comes to them. Under the new model, the tuition comes to the university and the university must fund

the tuition waivers. In response to Senator Sorte, Agricultural Sciences, Arnold stated that the intent was to keep the tuition waivers and remissions at the same level for this year.

Senator Doescher, Agricultural Sciences, questioned if there were checks and balances in place to avoid units increasing credits for courses as a means to gain resources. Arnold responded that it will be necessary to exercise discipline across the university to avoid this scenario and the Curriculum Council will play an important role in monitoring duplication.

Senator Westall, Science, noted that it would be helpful for units to have peer institution data during preparation of budget requests. Arnold indicated that the university is working to obtain that information.

President Williamson asked what the biggest impact would be on faculty with the new internal budget model. Arnold responded that the biggest impact will be the opportunity to have an infusion of resources beyond current budgets. He anticipates improved support levels for educational programs and an additional opportunity being reflected in the research piece with additional dollars for distribution.

Arnold responded to Senator Burton, Science, that it is unknown at this time if access funds will be included.

Special Reports

Marketing

Jill Schuster, Director of Marketing, presented a report on the status of OSU's marketing efforts. She indicated that the marketing plan is directed at prospective students and falls within the mission of University Marketing, which is to positively influence the image of OSU among key constituencies.

Schuster stated that, of 30,000 Oregon high school graduates in 1997, only 6,400 chose to attend a four-year college; Marketing views this as a huge marketing opportunity. An increase of high school graduates attending OSU in the next 10 years is projected at approximately 16%. She noted that, although there are many first-generation college students, legacy students comprise as much as 30% of the student body; these are students whose parents also attended OSU.

Her presentation included clips of OSU television advertisements and recruiting videos aimed at Oregon high schools. She also mentioned billboard ads as well as newspaper ads that go to the top 100 Oregon high schools that students are recruited from. An internet advertising campaign was tested this year on Yahoo! and Excite and received about 3,000 hits during a six-week period.

Schuster shared statistics that indicate high school students are aware of OSU advertising and are more likely to attend OSU than the other two major universities in the state.

Senator Sayre, Liberal Arts, questioned why the ad campaign seems to ignore the Eugene area. Schuster responded that the goal in Portland was to make a difference and that resources are not available to cover all areas.

Senator Sproul, Associated, questioned why there is no reference to international students. Schuster responded that the marketing effort is being built on successful models and they need to know that they can successfully market out of state before they move out of the country. She indicated that the web could be a viable marketing tool.

Kent Daniels noted there has been a substantial decrease in international students and felt that ethnic and racial diversity could be improved by increasing these numbers.

Copyright

Danny Shapiro, Multimedia Copyright Manager, provided information on copyright resources available.

Shapiro noted that recently passed legislation includes the Digital Millennium Copyright Act and the Sonny Bono Copyright Extension Act; both of these are currently under review by the State of Oregon. Within this legislation is the promotion of distance education. At this point, no one knows exactly what any of this means.

He informed Senators that information regarding copyright laws can be obtained at the following website:

<http://www.orst.edu/admin/printing/copyright.htm>

Senators were encouraged to contact him at 737-8172 if they are interested in serving on a committee to draft guidelines for faculty to use when creating multimedia. Questions about copyright law, electronics, licensing, and permissions should be directed to Shapiro.

Information Items

-- The IFS, AOF, AAUP Joint Meeting will be held May 8 in the CH2M HILL Alumni Center.

-- The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee will sponsor a discussion February 25 on the OSU Promotion and Tenure Process. Additional sessions will be scheduled for Spring and Fall Terms.

-- March 5 is the deadline for submitting nominations for awards to be considered by the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee. Nominations are to be submitted to the Faculty Senate Office.

-- Attached to the agenda was a letter that was forwarded to IFS indicating OSU faculty selected as nominees to the State Board and the OSU Faculty Senate approved Nominating Process.

Report from & Dialog with the Faculty Senate President

President Williamson's report included the following items:

-- External and Internal Budget Process: The internal funding process is nearly complete. He commended the Provost and the Budget Work Group for their efforts in developing the internal budget process. He noted that the main input from faculty into the internal funding process for academic programs will be through department chairs or heads. Senators were encouraged to convey the message to faculty to begin dialogue in their departments to support current service levels, improvements, and new initiatives for programs of interest and communicate these points to their unit heads.

-- Graduate Student Unionization: The Coalition of Graduate Employees group has filed to establish unionization of graduate teaching and research assistants at OSU. Specific issues are health insurance, child care, standardized hours/FTE appointment across departments, and training. Williamson stressed that, while faculty can discuss this issue with their graduate students, it is important that faculty do not attempt to influence decisions related to unionization. Jack Higginbotham, Graduate School, stated that questions could be directed to him relating to what conversations and actions are appropriate.

-- Faculty Relations with the Athletics Department: Mitch Barnhart is sincerely interested in improving interaction and relations with the faculty; Williamson is seeking ideas and input on this topic. Barnhart is scheduled to speak at the March Senate meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

| [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](#) » [1999 Minutes](#) » January 7, 1999

Faculty Senate Minutes

1999 No. 544

January 7, 1999

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1999 No. 544

Oregon State University

January 7, 1999

For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on January 7, 1999, at 3:03 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Maggie Niess. The December 1998 minutes were corrected to say that the 'Commonly Asked Questions' associated with the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are on the Web, and not in the Faculty Handbook.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Install Elected Officials; Approve Parliamentarian; Category I Proposals: Distance Delivery of the B.S. Degrees in Environmental Sciences and Natural Resources and The Oregon Master of Software Engineering; OSBHE Faculty Member Resolution and Candidates; and Funding Model Support Resolution [Motion 99–544–01 through 08]
- Discussion Items: Research Initiatives, W. Hayes and Human Resource Information System, B. Dennis
- New Business: No action items

Roll Call

Members Absent With Representation:

Cornelius, F. Obermiller and P. Lee, E. Luttrell.

Members Absent Without Representation:

Azarenko, Biwan, Champeau, T. Daniels, Farber, J. Field, K. Field, Frank, Gamroth, Hathaway, Huyer, Lowrie, Mix, Powelson, Righetti, Sandstrom, Sproul, Strik, and Wrolstad.

Faculty Senate Officers/Staff Present:

K. Williamson, President; G. Matzke, President-Elect; M. Niess, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; R. Arnold, Ex-Officio; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, M. Burke, L. Burns, B. Dennis, P. Evans, S. Francis, A. Hashimoto, W. Hayes, B. Krueger, D. Nicodemus, J. Schuster, K. Steele, T. Wilcox, and S. Woods

ACTION ITEMS

Install Elected Officials

President Niess recapped 1998:

- The year began with nearly one-half of the Senators newly elected; for the first time Faculty Research Assistants and Associates and all Professional Faculty were included.
- The change in Bylaws resulting in a more inclusive Senate also made adjustments to Standing Rules necessary to reflect the Senate membership.
- As a result of postponing approval of two Category I off-site degree proposals last January, the university engaged in important discussions about distance education and the State as our campus.
- Approval in October of the Assessment of Teaching Task Force report resulted in six recommendations that focused on the enhancement of teaching.
- The Information Services Task Force, which examined the Information Services (IS) budget deficit and proposed recommendations, presented their report and received Senate approval in November. Based on the recommendations, an Ad Hoc Information Services Committee was created to coordinate formal input to the policies and procedures of IS. This committee will collaborate with IS, the Library Committee, the Instructional Development and Technology Committee and the Deans 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 input from the OSU campus to the IS long-range planning. Their report is due in May.
- The report from the Task Force on Post Tenure Review received Senate approval in May and the guidelines were approved in December.
- The Senate's lively debates showed the value of respect for differences of opinion. In June, when a motion was made questioning the competency of the Senate and its leadership, Senator's answered responsibly by postponing the motion to allow time to study the issue before voting.
- She has been pleased with the collaboration of faculty and administration and noted respect of faculty governance by administration.
- Stub Stewart was recognized in May at a reception and received a Senate-approved resolution in recognition of his continued support of faculty through funding of the Mr. & Mrs. L.L. Stewart Faculty Development Award.
- The year ended on a sad note with the death of former OSU President Robert MacVicar. It was during Dr. MacVicar's tenure, with his support and encouragement, that a faculty member began serving as Faculty Senate President. The following resolution, proposed by the Executive Committee and approved by the Senate, will be forwarded to the MacVicar family:
The Oregon State University Faculty Senate expresses its deepest sympathies to the MacVicar family upon the death of President Robert MacVicar on December 26, 1998. From 1970 to 1984, "Mac" served Oregon State University as our 11th president. During his 14 year tenure, faculty numbers increased by 35%, the General Education budget tripled, and 23 new buildings were added to campus. His impact, however, extended far beyond these accomplishments. Mac demonstrated exceptional, ongoing support for the faculty at Oregon State University. This support is exemplified by his active role in the establishment of Oregon State University's current faculty governance structure beginning in 1978 with a faculty member as Senate President. At the May 1998 reception in appreciation to Stub Stewart for the funding to establish the Mr. & Mrs. L.L. Stewart Faculty Development Award, Mac penned one of his many "notes" demonstrating his belief in the role of faculty in a university:

Plant seedlings and you can grow trees; plant faculty development and grow a great university.

His devotion to Oregon State University and its faculty will be long remembered.

- One of her happiest moments was to attend graduation and declare that the Faculty Senate had unanimously approved the granting of appropriate degrees--particularly since one of the graduates was her own daughter. Kenneth Williamson was installed as the 22nd Faculty Senate President by Maggie Niess. He thanked Niess for her hard work and dedication during the past year and presented her with a Myrtlewood plaque on behalf of the Senate that read:

MAGGIE NIESS
Oregon State University
Faculty Senate President
1998

Given in appreciation for her thoughtful leadership,
perseverance, compassion, and dedicated service
to the faculty of Oregon State University.

Better a cruel truth than a comfortable delusion.
-- Edward Abbey

Williamson then installed President-Elect Gordon Matzke, Executive Committee (EC) members Robert Burton, Stella Coakley, William Lunch, Bruce Sorte, and Richard Thies; and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) representative Gary Tiedeman. Williamson recognized the retiring EC members: Bruce Coblentz, Irma Delson, Jim Foster, Larry Griggs, and Gordon Matzke; and retiring IFS representative Janet Nishihara. He then asked newly elected Senators to stand and declared them installed and thanked retiring Senators for their work and effort.

Approval of Parliamentarian

Robert Iltis, Speech Communication, was confirmed as the 1999 Parliamentarian. There was no discussion.

Category I Proposals

Robert Burton, Curriculum Council Chair, presented for approval three Category I Proposals.

Burton felt that the first two proposals, Distance Delivery of the B.S. Degree in Environmental Sciences, and Distance Delivery of the B.S. Degree in Natural Resources, are extremely parallel and suggested that discussion should occur simultaneously. These proposals were tabled in January 1998 to allow for additional review and course development, which has occurred during the past year. If approved, a review will be conducted every three years after the program(s) are implemented.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, questioned whether off-site students will receive equivalent preparation to on-campus students in areas such as laboratories. Paul Doescher, representing the Natural Resources degree program, indicated that the curriculum will fully meet the criteria for on-campus students. Sherm Bloomer, representing Environmental Sciences degree program, stated that some courses don't have a lab or field component and some labs may be offered in a computational format while field components will require students to travel.

Senator Thies, Science, moved to approve the Environmental Sciences proposal; motion seconded. Motion 98-544-01 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Senator Doescher moved to approve the Natural Resources proposal; motion

seconded. Motion 98-544-02 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

The third proposal, The Oregon Master of Software Engineering Proposal, is a joint proposal between OSU, the University of Oregon, Portland State University (PSU) and the Oregon Graduate Institute (OGI). The respective institutions realized that this type of degree was needed by industry in Oregon; individually, none of them had the breadth to offer a graduate degree in engineering. Burton noted that the program is funded by the legislature and approved by OGI, PSU and the OUS Academic Council of Provost's. Participation of OSU accounts for about 10% of the budget. If the Faculty Senate does not approve this program, the OSU Computer Science Department will not graduate students with this degree.

The Curriculum Council recommends approval of the proposal, which has also been approved by the College of Engineering, Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee, Graduate Council and Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Curriculum Council is requiring a three-year review of the program, and the Graduate School has agreed to the review.

Senator Drexler, Business, questioned who would be the degree granting institution. Mike Quinn, Computer Science, indicated the Oregon College of Engineering and Computer Science, which is the virtual college name, does not have authority to grant degree; students need to apply to the program and to one of the four institutions which will be the granting institution.

Senator Budd, Engineering, moved to approve the proposal; motion seconded.

Burton noted that a Master of Science or Arts requires some research and scholarship while the Master of Engineering does not have that requirement.

Senator Tate, Science, questioned the funding structure. Burton responded that fees will be tailored to match the services provided, after the new funding model is in place. Quinn stated that the program is expected to be self-supporting in 4-5 years. The cost per credit hour is \$475 and institutions will be compensated with a flat rate for teaching the class plus a set rate per student, resulting in increased compensation for larger classes.

Motion 98-544-03 to approve The Oregon Master of Software Engineering passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

OSBHE Faculty Member Appointment

Tony Wilcox, Bylaws and Nominations Committee Chair, presented a recommended nomination process for identifying candidates for the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (postponed from the December Faculty Senate meeting) and candidates to be forwarded to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS).

The recommended nomination process follows:

1. Engage institution Faculty Senates in identifying the 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 IFS, AOF, and statewide AAUP will select no more than 3 names to submit to the Governor.
3. These names will be shared with each Faculty Senate and other faculty leadership groups (e.g., AOF, AAUP) for endorsement prior to submission to the Governor.
4. The finalists' applications will be sent to the Governor.

Wilcox explained that Senate Bill 871 passed in the last legislative session allows a faculty member to serve a two-year term on the State Board. An aide to Governor Kitzhaber indicated he is inclined to appoint a faculty member.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, moved to endorse the proposed nomination process; motion seconded. Motion 99-544-04 to endorse the nomination process passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Wilcox noted that the Bylaws and Nominations Committee received 22 nominations with ten nominees accepting the invitation to be considered and who completed applications. The nominees were judged on the following criteria: 1) Be enthusiastic about the current direction of the Board; 2) Be able to advocate for the State System beyond OUS; 3) Be appointable and confirmable; and 4) Resumes should show experience beyond the campus. The Committee reviewed the applications and narrowed the slate to five and the Executive Committee pared the nominees to three. Those selected by the Committee to be forwarded to IFS are: Kelvin Koong, Clara Pratt and Gary Tiedeman.

Senator Landau, Science, felt that the candidates were strong, but questioned why an associate dean was selected as a nominee. Wilcox responded that the committee felt that all three met the criteria.

Senator Daley, Agricultural Sciences, noted that the nominees were very qualified, but there are a large number of administrators on the Executive Committee (EC) and he felt they didn't reflect faculty opinion. Wilcox responded that the EC composition considering the nominees consisted of the outgoing, continuing and new members, which was a larger than usual body. Senator Shor took exception that administrators, as a rule, are not teaching faculty.

Motion 98-544-05 to approve the slate of nominees passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

The nominees will be forwarded to IFS for consideration.

Funding Model Support

President Williamson presented the following funding resolution in an attempt to show unity across campus es. It is hoped that all Faculty Senate's in OUS will pass similar resolutions.

Oregon State University Faculty Senate Resolution

January 7, 1999

Whereas, the faculty in the Oregon University System provides value to Oregon in carrying out their teaching, research, and public service responsibilities to the students and citizens of the state; and

Whereas, the rapidly changing nature and complexity of society and the economy require increasingly higher levels of education for Oregonians to productively contribute to the livability of our state; and

Whereas, Oregon's employers have increasingly found it necessary to augment the workforce available in Oregon by recruiting educated workers from outside of our state's boundaries; and

Whereas, the State of Oregon drastically reduced state funding for the public universities, forcing tuition increases of 80% upon resident Oregon students; and

Whereas, debt loads for students of Oregon's public universities have increased dramatically during the 1990s, hampering graduates' ability to pursue graduate studies or start businesses; and

Whereas, the Governor, the Oregon business community, and the Oregon University System have recently approved and implemented important reforms to address the future of higher education in Oregon; and

Whereas, the aforementioned reforms promote stability and ensure quality and access to higher education, basing state funding decisions on student enrollments;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT:

The faculty of Oregon State University is united in supporting full funding of the budget model as proposed by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to:

- 1) Increase access to higher education for Oregon residents;
- 2) Preserve and enhance the quality of the learning experience for university students;
- 3) Expand higher education offerings to meet critical needs of the state; and
- 4) Encourage collaboration and partnerships with Oregon's community colleges and the private sector.

Senator Ede, Liberal Arts, moved to endorse the resolution; motion seconded.

Senator Robson, Science, requested evidence to back up the 'Whereas' clauses. Williamson responded that the background came from people who were putting together lobbying efforts for the legislature and are supported by statistics.

Senator Landau was concerned that salary was not included.

Senator Shor asked about the reference to the proposed budget model. Williamson explained that, as proposed, the budget model will be driven primarily by student credit hours and institutions will receive funding for the services they provide.

Motion 98-544-06 to endorse the funding resolution passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Research Initiatives

Vice Provost for Research Wilson "Toby" Hayes presented an update on OSU's emerging research initiatives.

Hayes talked about research challenges and opportunities: 1) Increasing the research funding base; 2) Improving internal and external communication and creating dialog around allocation of resources; 3) Provide administrative efficiencies; and 4) Focus on undergraduate research.

Hayes noted that a task force has been created to examine the use and allocation of indirect costs, which generates about \$17 million annually. He requested input and involvement on the task force.

Several steps are being taken to improve communication:

- An advisory board has been established, with a broad representation of faculty, that is responsible for providing input.
- Mary Nunn has been elevated to Director of Sponsored Programs. Her responsibilities include providing faculty with the expected 24-hour turnaround for proposals, compliance activities, and serving as an implementation person

for the Centers and Institutes.

- Replacing the Dean of Research with a working title of Director of Research Development makes sense for someone who would focus on the corporate relations program, the federal and state relations program, and focus on initiatives such as undergraduate research.

Senator Shor felt that returning some of the returned overhead to the faculty member to support their research would help bring in more research funding through normal research channels as opposed to foundation channels. Hayes responded that about 26% is returned to the college; how it is returned to the investigator varies widely from college to college.

Senator Rodriguez, Liberal Arts, questioned where the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) fits in. Hayes felt there are ways to involve CLA, such as structuring the undergraduate research program to include scholarship or creative activities. He emphasized that he does not want to imply that 'research' means only scientific, laboratory-based research.

In response to Senator Ahern, Science, questioning how undergraduate research would be funded, Hayes stated that new dollars must be found to support this research. He's considering the possibility of obtaining seed money from large, private sector companies he's been in contact with, and the companies seem to be very interested in being involved. At this point, he has not thought about the balance between instructional and returned overhead.

Human Resource Information System

Brad Dennis, Human Resource Information System (HRIS) Project Manager, reported on the status of the system implemented on January 1, 1999.

Dennis explained that the HRIS Team is responsible for implementing software selected by OUS and being used at all public institutions. The HRIS Team has run three test samples and is experiencing a 99% accuracy rate. The software being implemented is Y2K compliant.

One change that employees may notice in the new tax year is a slight change in the amount of withholding as a result of a new tax withholding table.

Dennis cautioned faculty that their earnings statement will look different and urged them to carefully check their statement.

In response to Senator Coakley, Science, stating that her understanding is that there will no longer be an emergency or second payroll, Dennis indicated that there will be one payroll per month, in accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes. However, there will still be a provision for a draw, or manual check, to correct mistakes or for emergencies.

Senator Daley was concerned about incoming graduate students not being paid the first month they are employed. Dennis responded that, if someone is entitled to payment, there would be a provision for paying them.

Senator deGeus, Associated, is also a member of the HRIS Team and reminded faculty that a number of staff are in a steep learning curve and they would appreciate any support faculty can provide.

INFORMATION ITEMS

– Benefits Survey: The PEBB Benefits Survey was due January 12.

– Faculty Senate Handbook Update: Continuing Senators desiring an update for their Senate Handbook should contact the Faculty Senate Office.

– Martin Luther King Holiday Teach-in: Teach-in materials were available at the January Senate meeting.

– Faculty Senate Website: The URL for the Senate website is:
<http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate>.

– Committee/Council Annual Reports: The following 1997-98 annual reports are available at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/comm.htm>

Academic Advising Council
Academic Regulations Committee
Academic Requirements Committee
Academic Standing Committee
Administrative Appointments Committee
Advancement of Teaching Committee
Baccalaureate Core Committee
Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee
Bylaws and Nominations Committee
Committee on Committees
Faculty Economic Welfare & Retirement Committee
Grievance Committee
Faculty Recognition and Award Committee
Faculty Status Committee
Graduate Admissions Committee
Graduate Council
Instructional Development & Technology Comm.
Promotion & Tenure Committee
Research Council
Student Recognition and Awards Committee
Undergraduate Admissions Committee
University Honors College Council

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Arnold acknowledged the leadership of Maggie Niess and those on Faculty Senate committees and congratulated the newly elected leadership.

Arnold recapped the funding presentation to the Education Sub-committee of the Emergency Board that occurred earlier in the day. Both OSU and OIT were requesting an enrollment adjustment from the State general fund. The total higher education request was \$3.6 million with OSU requesting \$3.27 million. After hearing the presentation, the sub-committee adopted a proposal to recommend to the Emergency Board that OSU receive \$1.872 million and \$284,000 for OIT. Arnold noted that this amount reflects that they are dealing with available funds at the end of this interim period prior to the next session. He also reported that the sub-committee recommendations typically are adopted. Arnold reported that sub-committee members acknowledged that there was considerable discussion in the last session about enrollment concerns, particularly at OSU and OIT, and that there had been an obvious turnaround at both institutions which involved considerable effort. They felt it was important to provide some investment to indicate that recognition. The three areas identified in the OSU package were: 1) additional faculty to support student demand in Spring term; 2) additional advisors to deal with increased enrollment; and 3) investment in classroom technology for equipment associated with laboratory courses.

Provost Arnold distributed a document from the Budget Work Group that contained OSU Budget Allocation Principles, the OSU Budget Allocation Process, and an OSU

Planning and Budgeting Schedule. He indicated that revenue principles will be developed.

In response to discussion with Past President Niess regarding students obtaining classroom evaluations, Provost Arnold conferred with Caroline Kerl, Legal Advisor, who provided the following information. The Oregon Revised Statutes authorizes the State Board to adopt rules governing access and personnel records. The statute requires the Board Rules to restrict access unless an institution president finds that "the public interest in maintaining individual rights and privacy in an adequate educational environment would not suffer by disclosure of such records." The Board adopted rules in response to the statute and, included in those rules, is Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 580-022-0090 which authorizes the release of certain limited faculty records without the faculty members consent, including records tabulated from students' classroom survey evaluations on a finding by the president that privacy rights in an adequate educational environment would not suffer by disclosure. Kerl could not recall any requests in the past from the President for a finding that would allow release of classroom evaluations. Arnold noted that there previously was action at the University of Oregon to release the information. The teaching evaluation instrument used at the U of O includes two questions, along with many others, that are summarized and the information is made accessible to students.

REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Williamson's report included the following items:

- The internal budget allocation process is presently being drafted by the Budget Group under the direction of the Provost. If Senators have input or concerns, he urged them to contact Maggie Niess, Paul Farber or him.
- It is imperative that faculty forward concerns and input regarding health benefits to Steve Davis, Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee Chair.
- He suggested that the Senate charge the Advancement of Teaching Committee to examine the issue of allowing access to course evaluations and publishing a Consumer Guide to Classes containing course specific information that could improve students' decisions about class selection. The Executive Committee felt that the process should be designed to be open, involve both students' and professors' input, and be positive and helpful in nature.

In response to Senator Rodriguez, Liberal Arts, asking if this process would pre-empt students, Williamson stated that it's more than pre-emption. After discussion, the Executive Committee felt that the present evaluation form is not designed for what students are requesting. The guide could have a positive feel to it in relation to both fulfilling the students consumer needs and allowing faculty input.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, moved that this issue be referred to the Advancement of Teaching Committee; motion seconded. Motion 98-544-07 to refer the issue of a Consumer Guide to Classes to the Advancement of Teaching Committee passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

In response to President Williamson calling for questions, Tony Wilcox felt that ex-OSU football coach Mike Riley should be commended by the Faculty Senate for his efforts in recruiting and increasing enrollment.

Wilcox went on to explain that faculty were critical of the search and hiring process that resulted in Riley's employment. Following his hiring, an Accelerated Search process was developed to address concerns. Wilcox felt the Senate would want to bring this process to the attention of the Athletic Director since it appeared that the hiring process was rapidly progressing and Mitch Barnhart was not at OSU when the

policy was developed. Wilcox noted that the process is very explicit in that a search committee be involved in the recruitment, screening and interview phases. Williamson indicated he spoke with Barnhart about the process last week and he and Past President Maggie Niess have both left messages for him explaining the process.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Thies, Science, noted a peculiar need associated with the Martin Luther King Celebration. The Lonnie B. Harris Black Cultural Center sponsors a birthday party and is in need of donated cakes. If anyone would like to donate cakes or money to purchase cakes, contact Dick Thies or the Lonnie B. Harris Black Cultural Center.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:23 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](#).