

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 2000 Minutes

**This file is over 65 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](mailto:faculty.senate@oregonstate.edu) or 541-737-4344 for more information.

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

- [December 7, 2000](#)
- [November 2, 2000](#)
- [October 5, 2000](#)
- [June 1, 2000](#)
- [May 4, 2000](#)
- [April 6, 2000](#)
- [March 2, 2000](#)
- [February 3, 2000](#)
- [January 6, 2000](#)

| [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](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » December 7, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 561

December 7, 2000

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on December 7, 2000, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. There were no corrections to the minutes of November 2000.

---

### Meeting Summary

– Election Report: Process Update

– Action Items: Executive Committee Election; Category I Proposals: Master of Fine Arts Degree in Creative Writing, Merging and Renaming the Oregon Water Resources Research Institute and the Center for the Analysis of Environmental Change, and Rename the Center for Salmon Disease Research to the Center for Fish Disease Research; Standing Rules changes to the Committee on Committees and Diversity Council; and Revisions to Academic Regulations 1 and 2 [Motion 00–561–01 through 11]

– Discussion Item: College of Veterinary Medicine

– Special Report: Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

– New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Avery, J. Anamaet; Beeson, J. Schindler; Butler, T. Deboodt; Lunch, A. Jeydel; Mallory-Smith, O Riera-Lizarazu; and Schwab, D. Loeffler.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Ahern, Braker, Brooks, Bruce, Carson, Christensen, Cloughesy, Collier, Collins, Cromack, Daniels, DeCarolis, deGeus, Downing, Freitag, Gamroth, Green, Gregory, Hamm, Henthorne, Hooker, Horne, Huber, Jepson, Jimmerson, Kerkvliet, Kimerling, Lomax, McDaniel, Murphy, Obermiller, Schori, Stang, Strik, Trehu, Vickers, J. White, Winner, Witters, and Woods.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

G. Matzke, President; H. Sayre, President-Elect; K. Williamson, Immediate Past President; S. Coakley and T. White, Ex-Officios; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

B. Balz, R. Banning, L. Burns, F. Conway, I. Delson, V. Djolcotoe, L. Friedman, R. Schwartz, and T. Daugherty.

## **ELECTION REPORT** **Faculty Senate Election Process Update**

President Matzke explained that, since the College of Liberal Arts did not receive ballots for the President-Elect and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator election, the deadline for returning ballots has been extended to January 17.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **Executive Committee**

Executive Committee candidates were: Dan Arp, Mary Cluskey, Paul Doescher, Kimberly Douglas, Jonathan King, Mary Prucha and Steve Tesch.

Ballots were distributed and counted during the meeting. Those elected to two-year terms were: Dan Arp (Professor of Botany and Plant Pathology and Director, Molecular and Cellular Biology Graduate Program), Paul Doescher (Professor of Rangeland Resources), and Mary Prucha (Professional Faculty, Coordinator of Graduate Services, Graduate School).

The newly elected Executive Committee members will join the continuing members: Vicki Tolar Burton, Stella Coakley and Rubin Landau.

#### **Category I Proposals**

Len Friedman, Curriculum Council Chair, presented three Category I proposals for approval.

*Master of Fine Arts Degree in Creative Writing*

The proposal can be found on the web at:

<http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/cat1s/MFA.htm>

There was no discussion on the proposal. Motion 00-561-01 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

*Merging the Oregon Water Resources Institute (OWRRI) and the Center for the Analysis of Environmental Change (CAEC) and renaming it the Center for Water and Environmental Sustainability (CWEST)*

The proposal can be found on the web at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/cat1s/CWest.htm>

Motion 00-561-02 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

*Rename the Center for Salmon Disease Research to the Center for Fish Disease Research*

The proposal can be found on the web at:

<http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/cat1s/fishrename.htm>

Motion 00-561-03 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

#### **Standing Rules Changes**

Flaxen Conway, Committee on Committees Chair, presented for approval Standing Rules revisions to the Committee on Committees and new Standing Rules for a Diversity Council.

*Committee on Committees*

(Note: Proposed additions are indicated in bold)

The Committee is composed of six Faculty **and the ASOSU Executive Director of Committees.**

The student member was eliminated from the committee several years ago, but is now being added since it was discovered that the ASOSU Bylaws indicate that the proposed member shall be a member of the committee.

Motion 00-561-04 was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### *Diversity Council*

(Note: The following Standing Rules are being proposed in their entirety)

The Diversity Council provides a forum for communications among campus groups participating in OSU's diversity related activities. It promotes, stimulates, and develops strategies for improving community-wide diversity as authorized by the OSU Faculty Senate and endorsed by the OSU Administration. The Diversity Council will proactively help the campus move toward a more diverse university. It considers and evaluates diversity efforts of the university community and recommends the introduction of new programs and special events, or changes to existing ones, to better meet the University's diversity goals. It facilitates faculty and staff development efforts relating to diversity issues. Immediate crisis response is not a function of the Council, but it may evaluate the effectiveness of crisis responses, as it relates to University diversity goals.

The Diversity Council reports directly to the Faculty Senate. It prepares an annual report comparing the University's efforts and impacts with the OSU Mission and Goals and similar efforts of other institutions of higher education.

The Council consists of one voting representative from each group involved or interested in diversity efforts at OSU. Meetings are always open. A majority of the Council members shall constitute a quorum. The Faculty Senate President shall appoint the Council Chairperson. The Council's day to day activities and responsibilities including, yet not limited to, reviewing activities, proposing actions, and drafting reports shall be the responsibility of the Diversity Council Coordinating Committee. The Coordinating Committee shall consist of two members appointed by the Diversity Council and two members appointed by the Faculty Senate President. Those appointees shall appoint two student members and one community member. The Diversity Council shall meet at least quarterly, and the Coordinating Committee shall meet as frequently as required to assure the continuity and responsiveness of the Council.

In response to Leslie Burns, Undergraduate Academic Programs, questioning the composition of the Council, President Matzke explained that the thought was that it would include those groups (about 25) and individuals who feel they are involved in diversity on campus. Matzke noted that this Council was in response to the TEAM Report asking the University to do more in the diversity area.

Immediate Past President Ken Williamson noted that he had initially proposed the notion of the Council and the idea was to model it after the Academic Advising Council whose membership consists of non-designated units that provide academic advising to students. Since the feeling was that the existing diversity groups were not communicating effectively, the Council creation was the Faculty Senate's response to create better communication. President Risser is committed to preparing a diversity progress report every year and this Council would assist in the preparation.

Senator Nishihara, Student Affairs, questioned why the chair would be appointed by the Senate rather than the group, as occurs with the Academic Advising Council. Williamson noted that, since the report will represent the Faculty Senate, it was felt that they should be appointed by that group.

Senator Coblentz, Agricultural Sciences, felt that the groups should be defined.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, questioned the intent of the second sentence of the first paragraph and moved to amend it by ending the sentence after 'community-wide diversity' and deleting the remainder of the sentence. Motion 00-561-06 to truncate the second sentence was seconded and passed by voice vote.

Senator Cornell moved to amend the document by inserting the word 'recognized' in the first sentence of the first paragraph so it would read '...among recognized campus groups...' Motion 00-561-07 was defeated by voice vote with no votes in support.

President-Elect Sayre moved to amend the document to insert the word 'recognized' in the first sentence of the third paragraph so it would read '...from each recognized group involved or interested...' and to add 'as determined by the Diversity Council coordinating committee' at the end of the first sentence of the third paragraph. Motion 00-561-08 was seconded.

Senator Cornell amended the amendment to delete 'as determined by the Diversity Council coordinating committee' and add the word 'campus' in the first sentence of the third paragraph so it would read '...from each recognized campus group involved or interested...' Motion seconded. Motion 00-561-09 to amend the amendment passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 00-561-08 to amend per Sayre passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. The first sentence of the third paragraph now reads, 'The Council consists of one voting representative from each recognized campus group involved or interested in diversity efforts at OSU.'

Motion 00-561-05 to approve the proposed Diversity Council Standing Rules, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Revisions to Academic Regulations 1 and 2**

Peter Nelson, Academic Regulations Committee member, presented proposed revisions to Academic Regulations 1 and 2. Nelson explained that the existing AR1 is obsolete. The reason behind replacing it with another, unrelated, Academic Regulation is to maintain the numerical sequence of the remaining AR's.

(Note: AR1. Regular Standing for Special Students, in its entirety, is proposed to be deleted)

#### *AR 1. Regular Standing For Special Students*

a. A person who qualifies for admission as an undergraduate but who elected status as a special student or was entered as a special student because of being a high school student may obtain regular standing by satisfying all admission regulations and procedures.

b. A person who entered as a special undergraduate student because of a scholastic deficiency may obtain regular standing and clear his or her deficiency by satisfying the following conditions:

1. Completion of no fewer than 36 term credits of residence at OSU with a grade point average of not less than 2.00.

2. Completion of examination or requirements as may be prescribed by the dean of the college concerned.

3. Written endorsement to the Academic Requirements Committee by the office of the dean of the college in which the student wishes to register as a degree candidate.

c. The special student category may be used by those holders of a baccalaureate degree who (1) do not wish to pursue an advanced degree or (2) have not met the requirements for admission to the Graduate School.

Special students may be considered for status as regular graduate students at any time, except for those who have previously applied and failed to meet the requirements for admission to graduate school. A student who has failed to meet the requirements for admission to the Graduate School must complete 24 credits of graduate work with a grade of A or B in each course prior to being reconsidered for admission as a regular graduate student.

A maximum of 15 credits of graduate work earned as a special student may be used to fulfill requirements for an advanced degree if the work meets with the approval of the student's graduate

committee. Credits earned as a special student cannot be used to meet residence requirements.

(Note: The proposal calls for AR1 to be replaced with the following Academic Regulation)

*AR1 Admission for Non-Degree Students*

- a. Non-degree enrollment status for undergraduate students is designed for students who wish to take 8 or fewer credits per term, but do not wish to pursue a degree or a specific post-baccalaureate credential.
- b. Non-degree enrollment status for graduate students is designed for student(s) who wish to take graduate courses, but do not wish to pursue an advanced degree. Non-degree graduate students are not limited as to the number of courses (credits) per term.
- c. Credits earned as a non-degree undergraduate student may be used to satisfy degree requirements upon admission as a degree-seeking student.
- d. Credits earned while enrolled as a non-degree graduate student will not necessarily apply to a graduate program upon admission to degree-seeking status. The student should refer to the admission requirements given in the Graduate Catalog. Communication with the Graduate School and specific academic programs is advised.
- e. Non-degree students seeking admission to a degree program may do so by filing an undergraduate, post- baccalaureate, or graduate application for admission.

Senator Rosenberger, Liberal Arts, questioned the rationale of limiting undergraduate students to eight credits when graduate students are allowed more. Barbara Balz, Registrar, noted that this is an OUS policy.

Motion 00-561-10 to delete the existing AR1 and replace it with the proposed AR1 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

*AR2. Credit from a Two-Year Institution  
(Undergraduate Students)*

(Note: Proposed additions are shown in bold and proposed deletions are indicated in brackets)

- a. College Transfer Credits: Oregon State University accepts for credit toward a baccalaureate degree all college transfer work completed at an Oregon or other accredited community college up to 108 lower- division credits. Transfer credits and grades are not used in calculating the OSU cumulative GPA. **Students who hold OSU-approved direct transfer degrees from Oregon or other accredited community colleges (e.g., the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer degree), [or other transfer degrees], or who have 90 or more credits accepted in transfer will be granted junior standing.**<sup>1</sup> Students who [have received Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer degrees from Oregon community colleges], **hold OSU-approved direct transfer degrees** will be considered to have met the Perspectives and Skills (except WIC) areas of the Baccalaureate Core; see AR25. **In addition**, they must complete the upper division Synthesis **and WIC** areas of the Core. Students transferring from **Oregon or other accredited community colleges** [approved institutions of higher education without Oregon Transfer] **who do not hold approved direct transfer** degrees [ordinarily] will be given Baccalaureate Core credit in the Perspectives and Skills areas on a course-by-course basis for work that is judged to be equivalent in content.

<sup>1</sup> Such standing does not necessarily imply that OSU institutional, college, or division, and departmental requirements, normally satisfied by OSU students prior to their junior year, have been satisfied.

Senator Shaw, Liberal Arts, questioned the effect on WIC and DPD courses. Nelson indicated that, if this AR is approved, then a proposal to change AR25 will be presented and depending on the wording, AR2 may also need to be modified. He noted that AR2 is currently in compliance with the Baccalaureate Core.

Senator Gross, Liberal Arts, noted that not all courses at the community college level have been taught as DPD courses.

Motion 00-561-11 to approve the changes to AR2 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

### **College of Veterinary Medicine**

Dean L.J. Koong provided a brief history of the College of Veterinary Medicine as background for discussing the need for a four-year small animal program. He noted that he was asked by President Risser and, then Provost, Roy Arnold to obtain approval of a four-year program. Koong appointed a committee to prepare the proposal, but was notified in July by Provost White that the Chancellor had decided against including it in his proposal. Koong stated that the College has support from many agricultural and farm entities across the State.

The reason behind a four-year program includes, academic integrity, faculty welfare, and student welfare.

*Academic Integrity* - Veterinary Medicine is the only unit in OUS which must sublet a required program from another institution (Washington State University). This creates problems with academic integrity when WSU decides to change their curriculum and OSU has no voice in the matter.

*Faculty Welfare* - There are 32 tenure-track faculty in two departments with a 24-hour large animal hospital and diagnostic lab available to all veterinarians in the State. These numbers allow no depth when the two anesthesiologists are each on call six months of the year.

*Student Welfare* - The students (average age is 26, with 75% of the class typically female) are required to move twice during their academic career at OSU in order to receive required courses. The national average student debt at graduation is \$50,000 as compared to \$70,000 for Veterinary Medicine students.

Koong noted that the College is isolated and the student body is not integrated into the University, but he is changing that. He asked to speak to the Senate to let faculty on campus know what is happening in the College.

Senator Douglas, Engineering, questioned whether there were retention issues with those students going to WSU. Koong responded that retention is not an issue since acceptance is very competitive and it is very difficult to transfer to another, similar program. The OSU Veterinary Medicine program receives over 100 applications each year and only 36 are accepted, with 28 of those from in-state and 8 from out-of-state WICHE students. Koong noted that it is very difficult to attract out-of-state students because of the move back and forth to WSU.

Senator Thies, Science, questioned what four-year approval would mean and how much is currently being paid to WSU. Koong explained that WSU receives about \$2 million per year (adjusted yearly for inflation) with Veterinary Medicine paying \$1.3 million to WSU to train 72 students per year, and the students paying tuition to WSU on top of that amount. The proposal seeks an additional \$8 million base funding for the biennium allocated to the small animal training component. The first two years would not require program funding and the \$8 million would be used to build a small animal clinic on campus.

Koong ended his presentation by stating that he is sincere about communicating Veterinary Medicine issues and it would be important to him to receive an endorsement from the Faculty Senate for a four-year program.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

## **Interinstitutional Faculty Senate**

Senator Gary Tiedeman recapped his last year as Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) President with a report to the Senate.

Tiedeman noted that each OUS institution has representation on the IFS for a total of 20 Senators which meet every two months at a different institution. He explained the IFS format as a governance vehicle for sharing and comparing campus circumstances and experiences, for discussing issues of common concern and for formulating positions, reactions and initiatives for conveyance to appropriate recipients and audiences. Each meeting they typically hear from the host institution President or Provost, legislators, and OSBHE members.

The IFS President makes monthly reports to the OSBHE regarding topics of concern. The IFS legislative agenda during the past year included: the establishment of a Scholars Network to provide expert advisement to legislators upon request; faculty diversity proposals (not incorporated into the Chancellor's budget proposal); and a modest request for central funding for IFS support services (which was included in the Chancellor's budget proposal). Topics also receiving considerable discussion included: distance education (its promises and perils); a current proposal to revise the Board's role in hearing faculty grievance cases that rise beyond the campus level; pros and cons of a Bend campus; a prospective plan to substitute a fully credit-based student tuition system for the current system that allows in excess of 12 hours at the 12 hour rate (IFS formally opposed this proposal); the new budget model, in particular the call for autonomy and entrepreneurship and the desirability for a continued OUS cohesiveness; combating the view of higher education as fundamentally there to serve 'work force needs' -- attempting to distinguish between education and training; a reduced tuition option for faculty and staff dependents; and the return of semester conversion. IFS will be discussing semester conversion in February and Tiedeman encouraged faculty to contact him or Bruce Sorte with their comments on the issue.

Tiedeman thanked the Senate for the privilege of letting him represent OSU, Provost White and former Provost Arnold for their support in allowing him to take on the IFS Presidency and Vickie Nunnemaker for her assistance.

Senator Landau, Science, questioned whether there were ways in which the OSU Senate could work more closely with IFS to promote faculty goals. Tiedeman responded that PSU has incorporated one of their IFS Senators as a member on their equivalent of our Executive Committee and a suggestion will be made to all campuses to do the same to ensure two-way communication.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **Graduate Admissions Task Force**

John Westall, Graduate Admissions Task Force Chair, explained that the Task Force was created as a result of the Graduate School Review which highlighted some issues with Graduate Admissions. Sally Francis, Graduate School Interim Dean, and Bob Bontrager, Admission and Orientation Director, commissioned the Task Force.

The charge includes increasing the efficiency for everyone concerned with graduate admissions and increasing the effectiveness of the various academic units in meeting their graduate recruiting goals. The objective is to come up with a graduate admissions process that gives OSU an advantage in recruitment of top-tier graduate students.

Open meetings to discuss the issue will occur on January 16 and 17. The report is due on March 1 and tentative implementation is scheduled for fall 2001.

Major issues in the report include:

- 1) From the academic side, departments need:
  - a) to recognize the great diversity of different programs
  - b) a rapid response to the admissions process, and
  - c) a rapid communication of all kinds of appeals.



## 2) On the Administrative side:

- a) an efficient process is needed, and
- b) concurrence with State laws is needed to maintain records and processing paperwork in an efficient manner.

Westall urged everyone in a unit with a graduate program to encourage colleagues interested in graduate admissions to attend the open meetings or e-mail him with concerns.

– Faculty Senate Reception - All Senators are invited to a reception at President and Mrs. Risser's home following the December Senate meeting.

– Faculty Senate Committee/Council Annual Reports, 1999-00 - Annual Reports can be found on the web at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/comm.htm>. Please note that the University Honors College Council Annual Report was incorrectly listed as not received.

– NCAA Certification Public Meetings - In preparation for a February NCAA site visit to certify the Athletics program, a public meeting will be held December 7 to describe the results of the self-study and obtain feedback from the community.

– Martin Luther King, Jr. Teach-in - Copies of the teach-in guide can be obtained from the Office of Multicultural Affairs.

– Central Oregon RFP - The Central Oregon RFP is available in the Valley Library Reserve Section and at <http://www.cosu.orst.edu/>

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Provost Tim White began his report by thanking Gary Tiedeman for his remarkably capable, effective, and uncannily engaging representation of the faculty.

His report also included the following items:

*Central Oregon* - White noted that many individuals have been working on the proposal, but acknowledged four in particular for their efforts in the production and communication side of the endeavor: Sandie Franklin, Tina Chavonec, Dave Stauth and Mark Floyd.

He explained that the OSU proposal is an advanced model for higher education and that there are profound differences between the OSU and U of O proposals, such as: the OSU proposal has a core of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as well as professional degree programs; it calls for residential faculty in Bend; it is an efficiency of intellectual activity; and there is a central core rather than a series of traditional departments. The savings realized from the central core allows OSU to offer 22 degrees as opposed to 3 degrees proposed by the U of O.

White felt that OSU's experience with the Promotion and Tenure system and the fact that OSU already has experience with faculty off-campus gives the proposal added authenticity and credibility. Additionally, OSU has a track record of working with many community colleges in Oregon. OSU also has a long history, since 1911, of profound programs in Central Oregon.

*Administrative Searches* - Dean candidates for Veterinary Medicine and Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences will be on campus in January - White encouraged faculty participation in the open forums.

Sabah Randhawa from the College of Engineering has been appointed Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to replace Andy Hashimoto. White indicated that he was grateful to all who applied.

*Cultural Centers* - After recently visiting the Cultural Centers, White resolved to create a document that provides a commitment to the Cultural Centers as a vital entity of OSU and that, if the need arises to relocate or expand a Center, they will be full participants in those decisions. He recognizes the importance of the Centers to recruitment and retention of students and faculty and recognizes the need to embrace the Centers in much more profound and sustainable ways than in the past.

White indicated that the document, tentatively scheduled for completion by the end of January, will be circulated for public comment and he encouraged faculty to participate.

*Budget* - The Governor's initial budget has been released and doesn't appear to be particularly supportive of higher education. If approved as proposed, it's clear that the cell funding values would be reduced, it doesn't deal with faculty salaries, it greatly reduces money from state-wide programs, it funds Engineering at 50% of what was finally negotiated, and it eliminates a \$2.8 million subsidy for Pharmacy and Veterinary Medicine students. The proposed budget will be shared with the Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee for their review. The administration is working on a thoughtful way to move forward in the budget area.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke's report included the following items:

- Thanks to the outgoing Senators for their service.
- Issue Group on Intellectual Property and Distance Education - This group has begun meeting and is chaired by Dick Schori.
- There has not yet been agreement to appoint a group to study professional faculty issues.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business

Meeting was adjourned at 4:56 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](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » November 2, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 557

November 2, 2000

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on November 2, 2000, at 3:01 p.m., in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. There were no corrections to the minutes of October 2000.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Fitness Course Criteria Revision; AR 1 Revision; Graduate Certificate Program Policy and Guidelines; 2001 Apportionment Table; Faculty Senate Nominees; and Ballot Counting Committee [Motion 00–557–01 through 06]
- Committee Report: Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Baggott, M. Arnold; Brooks, M.A. Seville; Caughey, C. Steggell; Cook, P. TadePELLI; Edge, S. Davis; Jimmerson, S. Ellinwood; Mallory-Smith, Oscar Riera-Lizarazu; and Middleton, L. Kristick.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Anderson, Arp, Bliss, Bruce, Carson, Clinton, Cloughesy, Crust, Daniels, De Carolis, Downing, Folts, Gamroth, Green, Gregory, Hooker, Horne, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Krause, Landau, Lunch, McDaniel, Oye, Plant, Powelson, Sorte, Sproul, Stang, Strik, Trehu, and J. White.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

G. Matzke, President; K. Williamson, Immediate Past President; Ex-Officios: S. Coakley, J. Roach, T. White; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

L. Burns, S. Francis, J. Kerkvliet, T. Littrell, R. Specter, and T. Wilcox.

---

## ACTION ITEMS

### Fitness Course Criteria Revision

John Lee, Baccalaureate Core Committee Chair, presented proposed fitness course changes to the Baccalaureate Core Fitness Course Criteria (HHP 231) and provided a brief background behind the following proposal:

#### *Proposed Baccalaureate Core Fitness Course Criteria Revision*

Fitness courses shall:

1. be lower division and consist of a lecture component of at least 2 credits and an activity-based component of at least 1 credit (these components are graded

independently and can be taken in different terms);

2. emphasize critical thinking in approaches to principles of health and fitness;

3. provide information and experiences in the safe and effective means to initiate and maintain healthful behavior change and a physically active lifestyle;

4. have a fitness lecture component that will:

i. focus on an understanding of the scientific principles of physical fitness and positive health behaviors;

ii. expose students to concepts related to physical fitness and health, such as stress management, nutrition, and risk avoidance behaviors;

iii. provide practice in the development of personal fitness and health programming;

5. have a fitness activity component that will:

i. provide techniques and opportunities to assess, evaluate, and practice physical fitness and associated health behaviors;

ii. lead to the development of an appropriate fitness program based on assessments and in-class experiences in physical activity.

Physical fitness and positive health behaviors are recognized as central to wellness. Students should understand the relationship between diseases and behavior. In order to achieve wellness, students need to assume personal responsibility for a physically active and healthy lifestyle.

Senator Thies, Science, suggested one Nutrition and Food Management (NFM) course and three PAC courses. He also felt that the proposal would require more resources. Anthony Wilcox, Exercise & Sport Science, indicated that NFM was included in the process and was supportive of the proposal. Wilcox felt it would be more a redirection of resources rather than additional resources.

Senator Doescher, Agricultural Sciences, felt there should be more choices than just HHP 231. He also questioned whether consideration was given to dropping this requirement. Lee responded that: 1) eliminating the requirement was discussed; 2) students have three ways of opting out; and 3) when asked, ASOSU did not want to provide input on the issue.

Justin Roach, ASOSU President, questioned why the proposal was being presented and liked the idea of giving students more choices.

Stella Coakley, Ex-Officio, felt that similar requirements at other institutions should have been reviewed and suggested that perhaps this requirement should just go away.

Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, stated that he has not heard anything positive from students about this course and questioned why it existed.

Senator Avery, Information Sciences, noted that only one course currently fits the fitness requirement, but the proposed criteria will allow other courses to be developed and advisors should advise students of options.

Wilcox felt there was a compelling reason to have this requirement in the curriculum. He also provided examples of courses that could be developed to meet student interest in the subject area, upon approval of the proposal. Students would select both a lecture and an activity option:

*Fitness Lecture options (2 credits each)*

Lifetime Fitness for Health

Nutrition and Fitness

Stress Management and Fitness

Sport Performance and Fitness

Health Behaviors and Fitness

*Fitness Activity options (1 credit each)*

Lifetime Fitness

Lifetime Fitness for the OTA Student

Fitness and Weight Management

Aerobic Training and Fitness  
Resistance Training and Fitness  
Swim Training and Fitness  
Yoga and Fitness  
Cross-training and Performance Fitness  
Adapted Physical Activity

Senator Reed, Forestry, supported the committee's work but questioned how distance students would take the course. Wilcox responded that web-based curriculum has not yet been implemented, but can be done.

Motion 00-557-01 to approve the Proposed Baccalaureate Core Fitness Course Criteria Revision passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Approval of the 2001 Apportionment Table**

OSU Faculty FTE in the ranks of Instructor or above, including Professional Faculty, Research Associates, and all Faculty Research Assistants as of October 24, 2000, together with student credit hours apportioned to individual units, resulted in 2,601.47 FTE/Senator and 18,864.94 SCH/Senator. (Apportionment is based on 75% FTE and 25% SCH with a cap of 132 Senators.) Motion 00-557-02 to approve the 2001 Apportionment Table passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Graduate Certificate Program Policy & Guidelines**

Leslie Burns, Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs, presented the following proposal:

#### **Graduate Certificate Programs at Oregon State University**

##### *Proposed Policy Statement:*

The Graduate Certificate Program at Oregon State University is a structured progression of graduate level courses that constitute a coherent body of study with a defined focus within a single discipline or a logical combination of disciplines. It is designed for a post-baccalaureate level participant and reflects the educational mission of the University. All certificate programs require a minimum of twenty-four (24) graduate credits with a cumulative grade point average of 3.00 or greater. Students desiring a graduate certificate must be admitted to the University but are not required to be on track for a specific degree. There is no residency or formal committee requirement for graduate certificates. Certificate students are subject to all general policies governing the courses for the Master's Degree.

##### *Proposed Guidelines for Graduate Certificate Programs at OSU:*

##### *Definition*

A graduate certificate program is a structured progression of graduate level courses that constitute a coherent body of study with a specific defined focus within a single discipline or a logical combination of disciplines. It is designed for a post-baccalaureate participant and reflects the educational mission of the University.

##### *Program Coordination*

A designated graduate certificate program coordinator oversees each individual program. The program coordinator is responsible for all aspects of administration of the program - applicant screening, admissions recommendations, and annual reporting to the graduate school. Annual reports will briefly summarize program status and provide statistics on enrollment and student progress. The Graduate School is responsible for certification of program completion.

##### *Admissions*

Students must minimally be admitted to the University as "non-degree graduate

students", as defined in the Graduate Catalog. This requires that the student hold a 4-year baccalaureate degree from an accredited College or University. Individual certificate programs may specify additional requirements, including minimally acceptable grade point averages. Students may be reclassified as "advanced degree students" by following the procedure listed in the Graduate Catalog. Credit earned at OSU prior to admission to the certificate program may be applied toward a certificate as transfer credit, per current graduate credit transfer policy, as defined in the Graduate Catalog.

#### *Curriculum*

The certificate curriculum is a structured progression or collection of courses approved and offered for graduate degree credit at OSU. The curriculum consists of a minimum of twenty-four (24) quarter credit hours, and may include a final project, portfolio, or report for integration of the sequence of course materials. Up to 8 quarter credit hours may be transferred toward a 24 credit hour graduate certificate.

#### *Transcript*

Courses and certificates completed will be transcribed by the University Registrar as a part of the student's permanent University record. The certificate is awarded when all course material is satisfactorily completed and a cumulative grade point average of 3.00 has been attained for all courses to be used toward the certificate. Award of a separate document suitable for framing will be at the discretion of (and will be the responsibility of) the unit administering the certificate program.

#### *Integration with current degree programs*

Credits earned in fulfillment of a certificate program may be applied to a graduate degree program at OSU, so long as they meet the appropriate standards for use in the degree\* and the criteria for transfer credit as defined in the graduate catalog. Courses completed for a degree program may likewise be applied toward a certificate program. Courses completed no more than 7 years prior to the certificate award date may be used to satisfy certificate requirements.

#### *Approval*

New certificate programs must be proposed by a department, program, or by combinations of departments or programs, be reviewed and approved by the appropriate School or College committee(s), and must meet with the approval of the Graduate Council, the Curriculum Council, and the Graduate School.

\* Includes all current graduate degree programs at OSU (Ph.D., EDD, MF, MBA, MS, MA, Ed.M., MAIS, MAT, MEng, MAgr, MOcE, MPH, MSE).

*Approved by the OSU Graduate Council, 11 May 2000; Approved (as amended) by the OSU Curriculum Council, 18 May 2000*

In response to Senator Witters, Agricultural Sciences, asking how the Graduate Certificate differed from the MAIS, Sally Francis, Graduate School Dean, indicated that the credential is different.

Senator Thies moved to amend the proposal to delete the phrase "residency or" in the last sentence of the Policy Statement; motion was seconded. Motion 00-557-04 to amend the Policy passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 00-557-03 to approve the amended document passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections**

Ken Williamson, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented the slate of nominees for elected positions:

*President-Elect* – Nancy Rosenberger (Associate Professor, Anthropology) and Dick Thies (Professor, College of Science).

*Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Representative* – Sandie Franklin, (Professional Faculty, Printing & Mailing Services) and Jim Lundy (Associate Professor, Civil, Construction and

Environmental Engineering).

*Executive Committee* – Dan Arp (Professor, Botany & Plant Pathology); Mary Cluskey, (Assistant Professor, Nutrition & Food Management); Paul Doescher (Professor, Rangeland Resources); Kimberly Douglas (Associate Professor, Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering); Jonathan King (Associate Professor, College of Business); Mary Prucha (Professional Faculty, Graduate School); and Steve Tesch, (Professor, Forest Engineering).

There were no nominees from the floor and the nominations were declared closed.

### **Ballot Counting Committee**

Senators Lynda Ciuffetti, Karen White and Sylvia Yamada, volunteered to assist in counting President-Elect and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative ballots on December 6; Senators Kevin Ahern and Mark Floyd were designated alternates.

### **Proposed Revision of Academic Regulation 1**

Joe Kerkvliet, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, explained that the proposal is to entirely eliminate the current AR1, since it is obsolete, and replace it with the following. The reason to replace it with a new AR is that total elimination of the AR number would require renumbering every AR and the proposed replacement is current practice, but is not currently referenced in the AR's.

#### *AR1 Admission for Non-Degree Students*

- a. Non-degree enrollment status is designed for students who wish to take courses on a part-time basis (8 or fewer credits per term), but do not wish to pursue a degree or a specific post-baccalaureate credential.
- b. Non-degree students seeking admission to a degree program may do so by filing an undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, or graduate application for admission.
- c. Credits earned as a non-degree undergraduate student may be used to satisfy degree requirements upon admission as a degree-seeking student.
- d. Credits earned while enrolled as a non-degree graduate student may or may not apply to a graduate program upon admission to degree-seeking status. The student should refer to the admission requirements given in the Graduate Catalog. Communication with the Graduate School and specific academic programs is advised.

In response to Senator Shor, Engineering, questioning whether there were certain admission standards for non-degree students, Leslie Burns indicated that there were not.

Senator Thies noted that the International Studies Program didn't fit into the proposed AR. Burns responded that they are treated as an exception in that they can take more than eight credits and are considered as non-degree students.

In response to Senator Prucha, Associated, questioning the eight-credit limit, Kerkvliet indicated that it was an OUS rule driven by fees.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, amended section d. to remove 'may or may not' and replace it with 'will not necessarily'; motion seconded. Motion 00-557-06 to amend section d. passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Kerkvliet noted that summer term students have been known to take over eight credits because there is nothing in Banner to catch those that do.

After additional discussion President Matzke suggested a motion to return the proposed AR to the Committee for further consideration. Motion 00-557-05 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **COMMITTEE REPORT**

### **Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee**

Steve Davis, Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee Chair, explained that the Issue Group on Faculty Compensation issued the following recommendations last spring:

- 1) The OSU Administration make a commitment to put faculty salary increases as a top priority;
- 2) In order to achieve parity with the mean salary levels of peers, the following salary increases must occur annually over the next three biennia: Instructor, 4.95%; Assistant Professor, 5.70%; Associate Professor, 6.60%; and Professor, 7.15%.
- 3) OSU Administration should develop an implementation plan and report it to the Faculty Senate by November, 1, 2000 and the Faculty Senate should develop a plan to monitor progress of implementation.

Davis referred to a letter from Provost White and Finance and Administration Vice President Specter (dated November 1, 2000) responding to the recommendations from the Issue Group. He was pleased that the administration was committed to a 5.25% increase (2.5% for satisfactory service and 2.75% for merit, equity and compression), rather than the original proposal of 2.5%, and that the increase would occur in fall 2000 rather than January 2001. Davis suggested that he would be available to come back in December to present the committee's response to the letter. Specter asked the Senate to recognize that the report to the Senate is an interim work. The [letter](#) will be posted to the Faculty Senate website. President Matzke pledged to continue raising this issue with administration.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Senator Representation Summary for 1999-2000 - A summary of Senator attendance by both apportionment and individual Senator for academic year 1999-2000 can be found at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/attend00.htm>
- President-Elect, Executive Committee and IFS Elections - President-Elect and IFS Senator elections will be conducted between November 13 and December 4; Executive Committee elections will be held December 7 at the Faculty Senate meeting.
- Instructions for Nomination and Election of Faculty Senators - A sample letter sent to the heads of all voting units can be found at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/instruc.htm>.
- Fireside Chat - OSU President Paul G. Risser will hold conversations with members of the OSU community in the MU Lounge on Monday, November 20, 2000, 3:00-4:00 p.m.
- Faculty Forum Paper - Faculty Senate President Gordon Matzke's University Day address has been published as a Faculty Forum paper and can be found on the web at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/ffp.0900.htm>
- University Awards - A cover letter, guidelines for preparing nomination packets, and criteria for selected awards presented at University Day, as well as the OSU Distinguished Service Award, can be found at <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/naward.htm>. All nomination materials for these 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 1, 2001; February 5, 2001 for the OSU Distinguished Service Award. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Christian Stehr at [stehr@proaxis.com](mailto:stehr@proaxis.com) or 737-2147.



### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Provost White's report contained the following items:

Home Economics and Education - White noted that an unusual interim dean structure has been created. Effective November 1, 2000, Clara Pratt will oversee the family and consumer science units. On the Education side, Wayne Haverson will oversee the day-to-day level leadership and George Copa will become the interim dean effective January 1, 2001. To provide additional funding to support the multiple positions format, White is allocating \$180,000 for the fiscal year. White was enthusiastic about the leadership arrangement and encouraged support of the college and its faculty.

Engineering - The OSBHE agreed to recommend additional funding and extension of OSU's program as a top-tier status. In response to Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, inquiring as to whether there are actually potential engineering students, White indicated that the students are there. Ken Williamson, Immediate Past Senate President, noted that there is certainly a demand on the employers' side for graduates and that all indications are that the enrollment requirements will be met.

Central Oregon RFP - The RFP is due December 1, which is when the proposal will be posted on the web ([www.cosu.orst.edu](http://www.cosu.orst.edu)). The proposal will be presented to the OSBHE in December and a decision will be made in January, which will then be dependent upon funding. In response to a concern by Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, regarding the amount of funding, White noted that Central Oregon Community College would be responsible for lower division courses.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke's report included the following items:

- Faculty were encouraged to submit nominees for the awards referred to under 'Information Items'.
- An agreement has been reached with Provost White to appoint an Issue Group on Intellectual Property and Distance Education.
- The agreed upon principles surrounding the Central Oregon proposal have been maintained.

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, questioned when the earlier approved fitness course requirement would be implemented. Leslie Burns responded that the recommendation is for a fall 2001 implementation to allow time for creation or revision of courses to meet the criteria.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:08 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker*

## *Faculty Senate Staff*

| [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](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » October 5, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 559

October 5, 2000

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on October 5, 2000, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. There were no corrections to the minutes of June 2000.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Discussion Items: Central Oregon, H. Sayre & G. Matzke; Legislative Issues, J. Mills & W. Lunch
- Committee Report: Bylaws & Nominations, K. Williamson
- Action Items: None
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Avery, P. Isensee; Hooker, S. Rosenkoetter; Janet Lee, J. Foster; and Mallory-Smith, O. Riera-Lizarazu.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Anderson, Arp, Bliss, Bontrager, Braker, Brooks, Cornelius, Cromack, Daniels, De Carolis, deGeus, Downing, Gamroth, Green, Gregory, Hamm, Hardin, Horne, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Kesler, King, Merickel, Mix, Peters, Powelson, Raja, Rosenberger, Sanford, Stang, Strik, Trehu, and J. White.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

G. Matzke, President; H. Sayre, President-Elect; K. Williamson, Immediate Past President; S. Coakley and T. White, Ex-officios; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

R. Banning, L. Burns, V. Djokotoe; S. Francis, J. Ellingson, B. Warren, and A. Young.

---

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **OSU Central Oregon Campus**

President Matzke explained that the issue of a Central Oregon Branch campus arose during the summer and over 50 faculty have been preparing information for the Request for Proposal (RFP), and felt it was important to discuss the proposal with the Senate. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee discussed the issue and arrived at three principles they felt the faculty would want if OSU were to participate in a Central Oregon campus: 1) faculty, rather than administrators, should decide the curriculum; 2) OSU should be held blameless for the cost - additional revenue should be allocated for Central Oregon; and 3) the quality of programs and faculty at a branch campus should be essentially

equivalent to those on campus.

President-elect Henry Sayre, who is also chairing the curriculum committee for the RFP, explained that the cost of a branch campus would be \$7.2 million per biennium. He noted that \$3.6 million per year is the equivalent of a large department on campus. The budget forces OSU to think creatively about the possibilities for a meaningful branch campus which includes the need for an interdisciplinary campus since no unit could or would be self-sufficient. It is anticipated that there would initially be about 8 FTE the first year with 30-38 FTE in five years with all sharing curriculum and students.

Three core curriculum areas have been identified, with other degree areas dependent on the core:

- 1) Social Sciences
- 2) Humanities
- 3) Biological Sciences

The idea is that the proposed curriculum be as responsive as possible and reflect the needs and interests of the Central Oregon community and Central Oregon Community College (COCC) students. Since the curriculum also tries to play to the many strengths of COCC's existing lower division offerings, there is almost no need for COCC to develop any other lower division courses.

OSU is considering including EOU, OIT and, possibly, OHSU as partners in the RFP. OSU would exercise some quality control over programs with partner institutions, which would be written into the contract with them, and reviews will be performed.

Additionally, Bend would like graduate program offerings on site, however, OSU will continue to offer graduate programs via distance at this time. All 400 level courses will be 400/500 level.

Sayre noted that COCC is constructing a \$7 million plus building that should be completed in 2002-03 to house the upper division campus.

Senator Thies, Science, questioned the U of O's involvement in Bend. Sayre responded that the U of O has two \$400,000 entitlements that will continue for three to five years. He noted that the U of O is preparing a counter-proposal to OSU's RFP.

Senator Lee, Science, asked about the budget and whether OSU has decided to go ahead with the proposal regardless of the cost. Sayre indicated that the budgeted amount must be approved at \$7.2 million. Matzke noted that this is a political gamble since they could add the \$7.2 million to OSU's budget, but reduce other portions of the budget by the same amount.

Senator Woods, Engineering, questioned if \$7.2 million was in addition to tuition and state general funding. Senator Sorte, Agricultural Sciences, responded affirmatively and thought that the ongoing budget figure was about \$5 million.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, made two cautionary notes: 1) the enrollment at Washington State University's tri-cities campus is significantly lower than anticipated; and 2) if Ballot Measures 91 or 8 pass, none of this will be possible.

Sayre responded that faculty whose curriculum is included in the RFP should be discussing the proposal at the college/departmental level.

## **Legislative Issues**

Jock Mills (Legislative Liaison) and William Lunch (Political Science) outlined November ballot measures that may have higher education implications. A hand-out was also distributed that described the ballot measures.

BM 86 - (income tax kicker) less likely to have funding for higher education if the excess income tax kicker funds are rebated

BM 91 - (tax deduction) probably takes kicker away in the first year which results in a

20% reduction in funding to K-12 and higher education

BM 92 - (dues deduction) reduces funding to the labor force

BM 93 - (government fees) retroactive

BM 95 - (teacher pay) not resolved if it would affect higher education

BM 1 - (school funding) focus is on K-12, but unclear what it would do to other state funding

BM 2 - (administrative rules) could make rule-making more difficult for higher education

BM 8 - (state spending limit) since it doesn't have to be State of Oregon derived funds, it would affect grants coming to higher education – this would include private funds raised by the Foundation

Senator Winner, Science, questioned current poll standings. Mills didn't have current standings, but responded that BM 91 was compelling at first but, once voters understood the measure, they were generally opposed. Because BM 8 is complicated, voters are inclined to vote no if it's not understood.

Mills noted that the Committee For Our Oregon has been formed to fight measures 91, 93, and 8 which would have the most impact on higher education. He encouraged faculty to call him after hours if they have questions about specific measures or how to contribute to the above committee.

## **COMMITTEE REPORT**

### **Bylaws & Nominations Committee**

Ken Williamson, Chair, discussed the nomination process for Faculty Senate President-Elect, Executive Committee members and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator. A slate of nominees for each office will be presented at the November Senate meeting. If someone is nominated from the floor at the November meeting, the nominator must have received prior approval from the nominee.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Faculty Senate Fall Elections - Nominees for President-Elect, Executive Committee and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate should be forwarded to Ken Williamson no later than October 6.
- Faculty Senate Calendar - Senate meetings begin at 3:00 PM, normally in the LaSells Stewart Center: November 2, 2000; December 7, 2000; January 11, 2001; February 1, 2001; March 1, 2001; April 5, 2001; May 3, 2001; and June 7, 2001
- Creating and Sustaining a Quality Learning Environment - A forum on this topic was held October 2.
- Curriculum Proposal Workshop - A workshop was held on October 6.
- Central Oregon Faculty Forum - A forum was held October 12.

## **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Provost White began by commenting that he viewed University Day differently this year in his new role, and noted that the event seems to get better each year.

### **Searches** -

White announced that Andy Hashimoto and Leslie Burns will leave their respective positions of Academic Affairs Vice Provost and Academic Affairs Associate Vice

Provost effective January 1, 2001. He noted that no other positions have as much importance to academics and encouraged faculty to apply for these positions.

College of Business Dean - Advertising has commenced and the deadline is around December 1; Ron Adams is chairing the search.

College of Veterinary Medicine Dean - The deadline for applications is this fall and the search is being chaired by Brent Dalrymple.

College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences Dean - The deadline for applications is this fall and the search is being chaired by Tim Cowles.

College of Health & Human Performance Dean - The search committee members have been invited to participate and the process of advertising is beginning. Wayne Kradjan is chairing the committee.

College of Science Dean - A national search will commence this fall.

Graduate School Dean - The Graduate School will continue as a free-standing entity and a national search will commence this fall.

College of Home Economics and Education Dean - The initial move will be to an interim leadership model for probably 18-24 months with a search for permanent leadership in the future.

White noted that he respects the people who have served in the above roles and owes them a gratitude of thanks.

Central Oregon - White noted that it is very much a faculty-driven proposal, as it should be. He acknowledged respect and admiration for President Matzke and President-elect Henry Sayre, as well as Linda Johnson in Bend, and others on campus who have put much time and effort into the proposal.

Budget - White indicated that the budgeting process had been fairly open and included input. He felt that the faculty could share pride in the final product and that the investment in important areas reflects the commitment of all faculty on a daily basis. He noted there will still be serious economic challenges even without the passage of ballot measures that could negatively impact higher education. White noted that a group to provide academic insight and strategic decisions in the area of internal allocations will be appointed.

In response to Senator Thies commenting positively about receiving access money early, White indicated that the plan is also to provide the access money early again next year.

Senator Landau, Science, referred to the November 1 deadline by the Issue Group on Faculty Compensation for the administration come up with a plan for providing salary equality with OSU's peers within six years and for monitoring by the Faculty Senate. White stated that OSU will meet the challenge even though OSU didn't make the first year goal.

Senator Niess, Science, questioned what will happen with the School of Education. White responded that Education is important at OSU and will continue. He noted that the interim leadership model will assist in resolving the issue of the status of education on campus. He is sensing great enthusiasm within the College of Home Economics and Education that the process is moving and focused.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke's report included the following items that occurred during the summer:

The legislative plan for faculty salaries called for a 2%+2% allocation. The Executive Committee was involved in increasing that allocation to 2.5% for satisfactory service and 2.75% for equity, merit and compression. An additional \$1.4 million allowed raises to be implemented this fall rather than at the beginning of the calendar year. Matzke thanked Provost White for his involvement in restructuring the faculty salary increases.

A half-time position to help enhance faculty teaching was approved and will be administered by the current Undergraduate Academic Programs Director.

There is a commitment to centrally fund the Center for Writing and Learning rather

than the funding coming from the College of Liberal Arts.

OSU's enrollment continues to grow and Matzke thanked the marketing efforts of all involved.

An issue group on the status of professional faculty will be jointly appointed by administration and the Faculty Senate.

The EC has discussed and is concerned about ownership of intellectual property in the area of distance and electronic education. Matzke is working with Provost White and Dean McCaughan to appoint a group to study this issue.

In response to many requests for President Matzke's University Day address, it is being formatted for a Faculty Forum Paper and will be available on the web (<http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/ffp.0900.htm>).

Matzke encouraged faculty to contact him with concerns or issues.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:43 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

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

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

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

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

Valid [xhtml](#).

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » June 1, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 558

June 1, 2000

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on June 1, 2000, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. There were no corrections to the minutes of May 2000.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Consideration of Degree Candidates; Standing Rules changes to the Academic Advising Committee, Curriculum Council and Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee; AR 7 Proposed Change; Difference, Power and Discrimination Recommendations; Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee Election [Motion 00-558-01 through 10]
- Special Report: Issue Group on Faculty Compensation, R. Landau and N. Rosenberger
- Committee Report: Computing Resources Committee, J. Schindler
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Anderson, D. Allen; Cardinal, R. Michael; Cornell, R. Wess; Drexler, C. Cogliser; Henthorne, G. Alegado; Jimmerson, P. Montagne; Krause, J. Trujillo; Nishihara, A. Akyeampong; Plant, A. Wallace; Plaza, E. Gonzales-Berry; Sanchez, D. Pehrsson; and K. White, C. Neumann.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Abbott, Arp, Baggott, Barth, Beatty, Bliss, Braker, Breen, Brooks, Bruce, Carson, Cloughesy, Collier, Cook, DeCarolis, deGeus, Esbensen, Green, Gregory, Hamm, Horne, Jepson, Johnson, Kerkvliet, Koenig, Ladd, P. Lee, Lowrie, Mallory-Smith, Merickel, Mix, Nelson, Raja, Reed, Sproul, Stang, Strik, Tesch, Trehu, Tynon, J. White, Winner, and Yim.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

G. Matzke, President; H. Sayre, President-Elect; K. Williamson, Immediate Past President; Ex-officios: S. Coakley and P. Risser; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

B. Balz, G. Beach, L. Burns, L. Friedman, J. Kerkvliet, R. Rathja, and J. Reeb.

---

### **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 3,427 students who were candidates for 3,535 degrees which included: 2,736



Bachelors, 598 Masters, 160 Doctors and 41 Professional Doctor degrees. There were also 104 students who were candidates for two degrees and two students who were candidates for three degrees.

The Class of 2000, OSU's 131st graduating class, had 576 seniors who qualified for Academic Distinction and included 295 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50-3.69), 147 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70-3.84), and 134 'summa cum laude' (gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 00-558-01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### Standing Rules Changes

Jim Reeb, Committee on Committees Chair, presented proposed Standing Rules changes to the Academic Advising Committee, Curriculum Council and Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee.

*Note: Proposed additions are in bold; proposed deletions are in brackets*

#### Academic Advising Council

The Academic Advising Council furnishes support and information to those units on campus that provide academic advising for students and makes policy and procedure recommendations to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

The Council shall be composed of a Head Advisor or designated representative from each academic college, [and] one or more representatives from each service unit involved in advising students, **and a student representative**. Each of the academic colleges and the service units represented shall have one vote on the council.

There was no discussion on motion 00-558-02 which passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

#### Curriculum Council

The Council consists of nine Faculty and two Student members. In addition, the following are to be members: A member of the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee, appointed by its chair, serves as a liaison member, non-voting. The Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs, ex-officio, non-voting, serves as the Council's Executive Secretary. Three Information Services faculty members, non-voting, are appointed annually by the Associate Provost for Information Services; one represents the library, one represents distance education, and one represents instructional technology. The Catalog Coordinator **and Coordinator of Assessment and Academic Programs** shall also serve as [an] ex-officio, non-voting members.

After confirming that the individual currently serving in the position proposed to be added is Gary Beach, motion 00-558-03 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

#### Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee

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

The Committee consists of nine [members] **Faculty**; two or three shall be retired

faculty. In addition, the OSU [Staff] **Employee** Benefits Manager shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Senator Schuster, Associated, proposed an amendment to include at least one professional faculty in the composition; motion 00-558-04 was seconded. The amended version would read "The Committee consists of nine Faculty, including at least one Professional Faculty member..."

Motion 00-558-05, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Academic Regulation 7 Proposed Changes**

Joe Kerkvliet, Academic Regulations Chair, presented the following proposed changes to AR 7 (bolded sections indicate proposed deletions):

#### *AR 7. Maximum and Minimum Registration*

a. The minimum number of credits for which a full-time undergraduate student may register is 12, and the maximum is 19, regardless of the method of grading used for the classes selected. **(In determining the load for students not normally held responsible for physical education, the credits in activity courses in physical education will be disregarded.)** The maximum may be extended:

a.2) Over 24 credits by petition approved by a student's adviser and college dean (or head adviser) **and the Academic Requirements Committee** and filed with the Registrar.

There was no discussion on the proposed changes. Motion 00-558-06 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Difference, Power and Discrimination Recommendations**

Alexis Walker, Difference, Power and Discrimination (DPD) Task Force Chair, presented for approval recommendations and proposed changes to the DPD Criteria and Rationale for the DPD requirement in the Baccalaureate Core. Walker noted that the committee has been meeting almost weekly since August 1999. In addition to Walker, the Task Force membership included: Leslie Burns, Robert Burton, Erlinda Gonzales Berry, John Lee, Janet Nishihara, Dwaine Plaza, Susan Shaw, and Ken Williamson; and students Janet Armentor, John Hollan, and Kezia Willingham.

The DPD report, containing the recommendations, is available on the web at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/DPD.report.htm>

The Task Force expended considerable effort to formulate language that represents the purpose of the DPD academic requirement consistent with its history and the university's mission. The drafts were widely circulated and modified in response to feedback received.

### **Recommendations**

Whereas, The U.S. has become an increasingly multicultural society; and

Whereas, The Difference, Power, and Discrimination Program (DPD) and the DPD academic requirement further the mission, goals, and values of OSU; and

Whereas, The DPD requirement engages students in the intellectual examination of the complexity of the structures, systems, and ideologies that sustain discrimination and the unequal distribution of power and resources in the U.S.; and

Whereas, The uniqueness of the DPD Program and the DPD academic requirement in the baccalaureate core places OSU in a leadership position in addressing issues of diversity; and

Whereas, The DPD program and the DPD academic requirement help OSU to achieve a climate that values diversity; and

Whereas, There is a need for more DPD courses, particularly outside of the College of Liberal Arts; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, that the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University

1. Reaffirm its commitment to both the academic requirement in the OSU Baccalaureate Core and the associated Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD) Program;
2. Approve the revised criteria and rationale for the Baccalaureate Core Academic Requirement; and
3. Establish the DPD Baccalaureate Core academic requirement as a separate category within the Baccalaureate Core, including both lower- and upper-division courses, with approximately half at each level.

### **The DPD Requirement in the Baccalaureate Core**

We recommend that the following revised criteria and rationale be approved.

*Criteria.* Difference, Power, and Discrimination courses shall:

1. be at least three credits;
2. emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. have as their central focus the study of the unequal distribution of power within the framework of particular disciplines and course content;
4. focus primarily on the United States, although global contexts are encouraged;
5. provide illustrations of ways in which structural, institutional, and ideological discrimination arise from socially defined meanings attributed to difference;
6. provide historical and contemporary examples of difference, power, and discrimination across cultural, economic, social, and political institutions in the United States;
7. provide illustrations of ways in which the interactions of social categories, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and age, are related to difference, power, and discrimination in the United States;
8. provide a multidisciplinary perspective on issues of difference, power, and discrimination;
9. incorporate interactive learning activities (e.g., ungraded, in-class writing exercise; classroom discussion; peer-review of written material; web-based discussion group); and
10. be regularly numbered departmental offerings rather than x99 or blanket number courses.

*Rationale.* The unequal distribution of social, economic, and political power in the United States and in other countries is sustained through a variety of individual beliefs and institutional practices. These beliefs and practices have tended to obscure the origins and operations of social discrimination such that this unequal power distribution is often viewed as the natural order. The DPD requirement engages students in the intellectual examination of the complexity of the structures, systems, and ideologies that sustain discrimination and the unequal distribution of power and resources in society. Such examination will enhance meaningful democratic participation in our diverse university community and our increasingly

multicultural U.S. society.

Senator Daniels, Associated, appreciated the work of the Task Force but expressed concern about the wording in Criteria #4, "focus primarily on the United States..." Walker responded that the Task Force felt that the U.S. focus serves the mission of the DPD requirement and the needs of students, and noted that Criterion #6 specifically requires historical examination. She explained that it is probably not possible to teach a DPD course that doesn't consider what occurs in other cultures.

Senator Wood, Health & Human Performance, felt that Criteria #4 was acceptable since it encourages global context, but moved to amend Criteria #6 and #7 to remove "in the United States" in both to clarify the intent for those in the future who did not take part in the discussion. Motion 00-558-07 was seconded. Walker noted that the DPD Director is an ex-officio member of the Baccalaureate Core Committee and would be available to make sure that every element of the Criteria is adhered to in all courses.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, spoke in opposition to the amendment and noted that particularly undergraduate students like to think that this is a problem for people in other countries. The United States references were included to reflect the attitudes of students.

Senators Kesler and Shaw, Liberal Arts, opposed the amendment and echoed Lunch's comments. Kesler emphasized that the Criteria does not eliminate an international or historical focus. He felt that the entire proposal would be circumvented if the amendment is approved. Shaw noted the importance of focusing on the U.S. is to have students realize that this is about them.

Senator Gardner, Science, felt that the intent of the wording was good, but had a problem with the actual wording. He felt it needed to say that it is relative to the students' contemporary life, but not be worded "in the United States."

Senator Landau, Science, supported the amendment and felt that #6 and #7 were overly restrictive.

Senator Thies, Science, felt it was important to distinguish DPD from the Cultural Diversity requirement and keeping "in the United States" does that.

Senator Tolar Burton, Liberal Arts, opposed the amendment because the Criteria are used by faculty designing and evaluating courses.

Motion 00-558-07 to remove "in the United States" in both Criteria #6 and #7 was defeated with 19 in favor following a divided vote.

Senator Landau moved to replace Criteria #4 with "Have clear-cut relevance to and draw attention to activities in the United States." Motion 00-558-08 was seconded.

Senator Thies spoke in opposition of the amendment.

Senator Lee, Liberal Arts, explained that the original wording allows one could teach a course about the Holocaust and tie it into anti-semitism in the U.S.

Senator Gardner expressed concern that a future administrator will say that a course on the Holocaust is not appropriate based on the original wording.

Senator Williamson argued that such a course could be proposed and would not be rejected.

Motion 00-558-08 to replace Criteria #4 with "Have clear-cut relevance to and draw attention to activities in the United States." was defeated with several votes in support.

Senator Burton called for the question, which was seconded. Motion 00-558-09 to end discussion on the main motion passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 00-558-10 to approve the DPD recommendations, Criteria and Rationale passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

### **Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee Election**

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

Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees are elected on even numbered years. Nominees for each new panel were randomly selected and ballots were distributed to Senators at the meeting. Those elected to Panel B were (in the order they would be called to serve): Sonia R. Anderson, James Leklem, Annie Qu, Martin Hellickson, Donald F. Parker, Jennifer L. Kuzepa, William Chadwick, Gary L. Kiemnec, Sandra S. Ridlington, Gopinath Munisamy, Brian L. Arbogast, Patricia E. Aune, Donetta A. Sheffold, Linda N. Cameron, Paul E. Montagne, Rosemary Weidman, George Clough, Marit Legler, Joseph E. Majeski, Ann McLaughlin, and Tudy M. Seistrup.

### **SPECIAL REPORT**

#### **Issue Group on Faculty Compensation**

Rubin Landau and Nancy Rosenberger, committee members, presented the final report and recommendations from the Issue Group on Faculty Compensation. The report can be found on the web at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/issue.final.htm>

The Issue Group on Faculty Compensation requested in their cover letter that:

The OSU Administration make a commitment to put faculty salary increases as a top priority;

A plan for implementation of these suggestions be completed by the OSU Administration and reported to the Faculty by November, 1, 2000;

A plan for monitoring progress of implementation be developed by the Faculty Senate; and

A hard copy of this cover letter and report be jointly distributed to all faculty members by the OSU Administration and Faculty Senate prior to June 15, 2000.

Rosenberger felt that administration has not given priority to faculty salaries. She feels that faculty have not complained in the past because they felt hopeless and powerless. She noted that the following petition was available outside and is being circulated on campus:

*We, teaching and professional faculty at Oregon State University, are tired of OSU permanently being below average in faculty compensation when compared to our peer universities. It is inexcusable, given the biggest budget increase in a decade, that OSU salary increases are below that of inflation, as well as two to seven times below that of other public universities in the state.*

*We enjoin the OSU administration to commit to placing and maintaining faculty salaries in the highest group of budget priorities.*

*In the strongest possible terms, we request that you implement the plan for annual salary increases calculated by the Issue Group on Faculty Compensation. We request that at least the basic principles of implementation be reported to the Faculty Senate by November 2000. To avoid further degradation of the quality of the faculty and, correspondingly, of education at OSU, we need to reach salary parity with our peer institutions within six years. The longer you wait, the more*

*harm is done and the more difficult it becomes to solve this problem in a collegial manner.*

Landau provided comparative faculty salaries from other institutions and noted that faculty should always receive salary increases above the inflation rate. He observed that OSU is the only OUS institution to receive a 2-2.5% increase – all other OUS institutions are reportedly receiving higher increases, even though it was initially reported by the Provost's that all OUS institutions would receive the same increase.

Landau indicated that the report states that sources of funding should be dedicated to faculty salaries through reallocation of: a fraction of both administrative discretionary funds and funds coming to the University as a result of enrollment growth; a portion of increased auxiliary enterprises; savings realized through possible downsizing; foundation money raised for things such as lab equipment and travel; lowering FTE of consenting faculty; returned overhead; and using instructors and teaching assistants in place of regular faculty where no harm would be done.

Senator Wood, Health & Human Performance, felt the issue was problematic when reading that the legislature felt that part of the increased higher education funding was going to faculty salaries, when it actually didn't.

Senator Shor, Engineering, noted that 10 of 25 faculty in her area left in the last two years due to low salaries.

Senator King, Business, indicated an interest in seeing precise figures for salaries and administrative increases.

### **COMMITTEE REPORT**

#### **Computing Resources Committee**

Jay Schindler, Computing Resources Committee member, made preliminary recommendations about allocation of information technology resources at OSU. He noted that funding, as it stands now, is not adequate to meet OSU's current and growing information infrastructure needs.

The complete recommendations can be found on the web at <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/crc.rec.0600.htm> and include:

- 1) Funding information technology at OSU so every faculty member has a base level of support;
- 2) Determining how support can be provided at an institutional level; and
- 3) Lobbying the legislature for infrastructure support.

The CRC is initiating meetings with faculty and staff to look at a variety of issues. They recently hosted a meeting to explore issues related to E-commerce at OSU, including ethical and financial issues.

Senator Samuelson, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, suggested that technical people be involved to determine infrastructure needs.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

– Annual committee/council reports submitted by Faculty Senate chairs are due July 15.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke's report included the following items:

– Apparel and Footwear Industry – Vice President Rob Specter is forming a group to review this issue; Matzke noted that no decision will be made this summer. Senator

Daniels, Associated, questioned whether the group has been formed and what will be the role of the Faculty Senate and students. Matzke responded that the strategy and kinds of people to serve on the group has been discussed, but not by the Faculty Senate. Leslie Burns, Undergraduate Academic Programs, stated that the group has been formed and is chaired by Sandie Franklin.

– Sports Cage Issue – In response to budget-driven issues, a decision was made to discontinue issuing athletic clothing in Langton Hall and the Women's Building sports cages, rather than closing the cages altogether, as some have been led to believe. Matzke noted that towels and lockers will continue to be available in the cages 14 hours per day. He noted that there is a proposal on the Provost's desk requesting support for sports from central administration, but no decision has been made. Matzke noted that it costs about \$80,000 per year to have two union employees staff the cages.

Senator Sorte, Agricultural Sciences, felt that there are alternatives available and there is a need for better communications. An individual from Science felt that there was a lack of communication and no attempt to find a solution.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:47.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Staff*

| [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](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » May 4, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 557

May 4, 2000

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on May 4, 2000, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. There were no corrections to the minutes of April 2000.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Discussion Item: Difference, Power and Discrimination Report, A. Walker
- Special Reports: University Goals - Compelling Learning Experience, K. Schaffer; and Valley Library Journal Cancellations, K. Butcher
- Action Items: None
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Obermiller, B. Rettig; Sproul, M. Legler; and Witters, C. Vasconcelos.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Abbott, Ahern, Arp, Braker, Breen, Brooks, Bruce, Cluskey, Cornell, Cromack, DeCarolis, Downing, Freitag, Gamroth, Green, Gregory, Hardin, Hoogesteger, Horne, Jepson, Jimmerson, Kerkvliet, King, Ladd, Lomax, McDaniel, Merickel, Mix, Murphy, Nelson, Plant, Powelson, Raja, Reed, Rosenberger, Scott, Sorte, Stang, Strik, Tesch, Trehu, Tynon, J. White, Winner, and Yim.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

G. Matzke, President; H. Sayre, President-Elect; K. Williamson, Immediate Past President; Ex-officios: T. White, C. DeKock, and P. Risser; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, R. Brumley, L. Burns, K. Butcher, I. Delson, B. Edwards, C. Jones, C. Ottow, M. Scanlan, K. Schaffer, and K. Willingham.

---

### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

#### **Difference, Power and Discrimination Report**

Alexis Walker, Difference, Power and Discrimination (DPD) Task Force Chair, discussed the recommendations and report related to the DPD Baccalaureate Core requirement. The Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) has endorsed the DPD Task Force recommendations.

Walker noted several concerns the task force wanted discussed. One concern relates to the DPD recommendation that the course have a United States focus. She explained that



this focus was approved by the Senate in May 1992. This focus does not mean the entire course must be exclusively focused on the U.S. and she stated that the course can draw from experiences in other countries. She noted that one of the criteria states that historical issues must be brought to the forefront. Reasons to maintain the U.S. focus include students indicating a need to focus attention on contemporary society and students desiring an emphasis directly related to their everyday life. Some disciplines may have difficulty incorporating into the DPD, but the DPD seminar would help to bring the content to the U.S. experience. She also noted that there are other categories in the Baccalaureate Core that provide non-U.S. experiences.

Walker also mentioned that a new Baccalaureate Core category in which to place DPD is being proposed. She noted that the BCC endorsed the proposed criteria and rationale, but neither endorsed nor disagreed with the separate category. After examining the purpose of DPD and the means for which to achieve the purpose, the group felt that the proposal would not fit very well in the current categories since Perspectives courses are about skills, particular disciplines, and interrelationships among disciplines (DPD is beyond that); and Synthesis courses do not focus on difference and power. In addition, the BCC currently approves Perspectives courses only at the lower division and DPD courses should also be available at the upper division. Walker noted that DPD courses were originally approved as both lower and upper division in 1992, but have been only approved at the lower division with the change in BCC membership. The task force feels that the Senate should decide whether a category should be offered at upper or lower division.

Irma Delson, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, suggested DPD in the U.S. or DPD - An American Perspective as an alternative title since the current title implies something much broader than it actually is. She did not disagree with the content or intent. Walker responded that the title had not been discussed.

Senator Landau, Science, felt that the program could be stronger and made less-self-contradictory if #4 was changed to draw attention to activities in the U.S. He sees #4 "focus primarily on the United States, although global contexts are encouraged", to be contradictory with the aspiration to "free people's minds from ignorance, prejudice, and provincialism and to stimulate a lasting attitude of inquiry." Walker noted that the aspiration comes from an OUS publication and applies to all higher education in the State of Oregon. Landau argued for as broad a view of diversity as possible. He recommended changing the wording in #4.

Jim Foster, Liberal Arts, explained that one of the original goals of Affirming Diversity (prior to the DPD title) was to create a safe space in the classroom for students to 'think outside the cultural box'. He noted that these are transferable skills and not ethnocentric skills targeted strictly to American students. He argued that having a U.S. focus does not mean that it's about the U.S. For example, the U.S. treatment of particular ethnic groups can be combined with a discussion about the Holocaust.

Senator Shaw, Liberal Arts, spoke of DPD providing an opportunity for students to distance themselves from what is familiar. It also encourages mathematicians and scientists to think creatively.

Senator Robson, Science, suggested that there be an explicit requirement that the point of these classes is to confront and educate faculty and students about what is happening and how it relates to today and not to some historical facts.

Senator Tolar Burton, Liberal Arts, supported the proposed wording and argued that the category specialness of DPD is different because it is not presumed that faculty are already experts in this area.

Senator Gardner, Science, was opposed to the U.S. focus.

President-elect Sayre spoke in support of the proposal and encouraged faculty to view 'U.S. focus' broadly and generally.

Senator Wood, Health & Human Performance, supported the wording in #4 and suggested deleting the United States reference in #6 and #7 of the criteria.

Leslie Burns, Undergraduate Academic Programs, noted that there are areas in both Perspectives and Synthesis that focus on international issues.

Senator Lee, Associated, agreed that the issue is one of semantics. She felt there is a need to both include international perspectives and to be inclusive in all disciplines.

Walker emphasized that this course can be part of a university effort to respond to DPD issues, which are global.

The recommendations will be voted on at the June Faculty Senate meeting.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **University Goals - Compelling Learning Experience**

In the third, and final, report related to the University Goals, Dean Kay Schaffer, College of Liberal Arts, gave a progress report on the Compelling Learning Experience. All three task forces related to University Goals were established for "defining, refining, clarifying and communicating the University's three goals."

She explained that the Compelling Learning Task Force was appointed by former Provost Arnold in July 1999. The membership consists of: Andrew Hashimoto and Kay Schaffer (co-chairs), Leslie Burns, Joe Hendricks, Kathleen Moore, Donald Parker, Larry Roper, Kyle Shaver and Ariana Sulton (students), Janine Trempy, and Jack Van de Water. They were charged with "planning an appropriate strategy to enhance campus-wide understanding of the Compelling Learning Experience Goal and its implications for OSU's units, programs, services and activities."

Schaffer then reviewed the task force activities to date, including definitions and dimension, the focus and scope, and the task structure and components.

The focus and scope involves undergraduate and graduate students, as well as international and minority students.

The task structure included reviewing external reports, discussing the OSU culture and experience, and determining recommended actions and institutional commitments required.

The Task Force listed ten ways to change undergraduate education, some of which have already been implemented at OSU: 1) Make research-based learning the standard; 2) Construct an inquiry-based freshman year; 3) Build on the freshman foundation; 4) Remove barriers to interdisciplinary study; 5) Link communication skills and course work; 6) Use information technology creatively; 7) Capstone experience; 8) Educate graduate students as apprentice teachers; 9) Change faculty reward system; and 10) Cultivate a sense of community.

The actions recommended include:

#### 1) Immediate and short-term (next two years) actions

- a) Collaborative programs/workshops for OSU faculty, students, staff and administrators
- b) Engage OSU faculty in process
- c) Engage OSU students in process
- d) Identify OSU's "best practices": build on our strengths/successes

#### 1) Long-Range Plan (five years)

- a) Establish benchmarks for measuring progress and change
- b) Outcomes Assessment (exams, capstone courses, exit interviews, alumni surveys, etc.)

Institutional commitments required include:

1) Shared campus responsibility for student learning is necessary to make significant progress and build on existing strengths

- a) Academic Affairs
- b) Student Affairs
- c) Faculty
- d) Students
- e) Staff

2) Align institutional planning and resource allocations with the learning mission. Use evidence of student learning to guide program improvement, planning and resource allocation.

Schaffer noted that, in terms of progress, OSU is doing very well, but could do better in some areas. She acknowledged that doing things better will mean making some hard decisions, but that students will ultimately benefit.

Senator Cloughesy, Forestry, was disturbed that this appeared to be focused on resident instruction. He argued that Extension, outreach, and continuing education can be just as compelling and, perhaps, more demanding. He encouraged the task force to look beyond resident instruction for examples of compelling learning. Schaffer responded that she did not mean to imply that it was limited to on-campus.

Senator Lee, Liberal Arts, questioned what is meant by a compelling learning experience when there are 150 students in a class. She noted that enrollment needs to be addressed in the report.

Senator Landau felt that the document focused primarily on undergraduates and noted that graduate students are very much a part of research institutions. Schaffer noted that the report will focus on both.

### **Valley Library Journal Cancellations**

Karyle Butcher, University Librarian, discussed the proposed journal cancellations which can be found at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/library/whatsnew.htm#jourcan>.

She explained that it's necessary to cut journals since there is always a yearly 7% gap between budget increases of 3% and journal increases of 10%. In 1999-2000 the cost of the current journal subscriptions increased by \$250,000 (approximately 10%).

Butcher noted that she is often asked why more journals are not available electronically. She explained that most electronic journals require that a paper journal also be kept, which results in no savings. In addition, many journals are not available electronically and some disciplines don't lend themselves to electronic versions.

She explained that when the building is paid off in October, some money from the campaign may be redirected to the library collections. The Valley Library will receive \$200,000 in Technology Resource Fees this year and has requested \$300,000 next year for collections. The current budget is slightly under \$7 million, with about \$4 million going for collections and the remainder goes toward services and supplies (technology) and salaries. The technology component allows the Valley Library to access ORBIS, which is an on-line catalog of most of the Oregon libraries and some in Washington.

Butcher explained that, without making any cuts, assuming that the budget increases 3% per year, journals increase 10%, and books increase 3%, by 2003/04 there will be a deficit of \$959,000 resulting solely from price increases.

The primary reason for the journal cut is because for-profit publishers continue to control more of the journal publishing. Faculty relinquish their copyright when publishing through a for-profit publisher who then sells back to the institution at an inflated rate. When faculty published through associations, which are not-for-profit, the journal prices

remained relatively low. She felt this was an academic problem that faculty need to be aware of and to work on resolving.

She noted that the problem of increasing journal costs is not unique to OSU and that the U of O is cutting \$300,000 this year.

The Valley Library determined what to cut using statistics for journals that had generally low use and high cost. Journals for potential cancellation were selected according to the following criteria:

- Journal subscription costs over \$2,800 per year; and
- Journal was on few or no faculty survey lists in 1998/99 journal review (faculty were asked to submit a personal list of journals important for their teaching and research); and
- Journal was rarely cited by OSU faculty (based on ISI journal citation report covering 1981-1995).

Senator Robson, Science, requested information on the plan to deal with the situation and to increase input and dialogue from faculty. Butcher responded that the dialogue is starting and encouraged faculty on editorial boards to talk about it at the editorial board level and go as far as resigning from the board in protest, as she has done. There is also a need to deal with issues surrounding electronic publishing, web publishing and promotion and tenure. She noted that faculty should not be penalized, in terms of promotion and tenure, for publishing electronically.

Senator Shor, Engineering, requested that a list of overly expensive for-profit publications be distributed; Butcher agreed that it would be.

In response to Senator Lee, Science, Butcher responded that there will be a \$300,000 journal cut this year. They are working with PSU, OHSU and the U of O to share titles, but there are still more titles than available money.

Butcher explained that journal costs are not decreasing as a result of institutions canceling subscriptions since the primary market is pharmaceuticals and hospitals. She suggested that if faculty were to withdraw their product, editors would not have a journal to publish.

Butcher invited faculty to call her at 737-7300 with comments.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Barbara Balz, Registrar, requested assistance from faculty to participate in Commencement. Since Commencement will consist of two ceremonies this year, participation from at least one faculty member from every department is critical.
- A proposed Department of Intercollegiate Athletics Mission Statement may be viewed on the web at <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/athmiss.htm>. Comments should be directed to Henry Sayre, NCAA Compliance Committee Chair for the Athletics Certification effort, at [hsayre@orst.edu](mailto:hsayre@orst.edu) or 737-5018.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Interim Provost White's report included the following items:

The Post-Tenure Review document has been through review at the Chancellor's Office and will be available soon. A plan to engage in the process will be implemented for faculty affected by this document. He acknowledged that there is a defacto backlog which will require flexibility in implementing. He stated that OSU's document is very strong as compared to other OUS campuses.

The President's Cabinet retreat focusing on diversity was postponed to May 30.

## **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke's report included the following items:

Faculty Salaries - Matzke noted that the salary increases at OSU (2% + 2%) were the lowest in OUS. Although the cell values were funded, no money went toward salary increases. The unionized faculty at PSU have noted that they could not figure out who they were negotiating with under the new budget model, whether it was the institution or the system. The lobbyists present at the recent joint AOF, AAUP, IFS meeting felt it would be more productive to negotiate directly with the legislature.

Education Issue - Faculty have informed Matzke that they are concerned about conversations surrounding restructuring of teacher education. There are a variety of plans and documents being discussed in relation to teacher education at OSU. Although Matzke has learned that there are ongoing conversations, President Risser has assured him that there is no plan in place regarding teacher education. Matzke encouraged faculty to contact him with rumors and he will follow-up on them.

PEBB - OUS will be held without harm in 2001 and basically the same package will be continued. OUS still has the option of changing providers and plans in the future.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 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](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » April 6, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 556

April 6, 2000

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on April 6, 2000, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. There were no corrections to the minutes of February and March 2000.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Category I Proposal to Rename Extension Home Economics Department to Extension Family and Community Development Department; Bylaws Changes; and Revisions to AR 3, 23 and 25 [Motion 00–556–01 through 12]
- Discussion Item: Distance & Continuing Education, B. McCaughan
- Committee Report: Faculty Mediation Committee
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Henthorne, G. Alegado; Hoogesteger, C. Graham; Jimmerson, J. Mosley; Johnson, L. Maughan; Mallory-Smith, J. Crane; Vickers, B. Coblentz; and Wood, D. Champeau.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Abbott, Arp, Beatty, Bliss, Braker, Breen, Bruce, Burt, Burton, Carson, Clinton, Cloughesy, Cornelius, Cornell, DeCarolus, deGeus, Douglas, Downing, Esbensen, Folts, Hamm, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Kesler, Ladd, Janet Lee, Lomax, Lunch, McDaniel, Mix, Nishihara, Raja, Sanford, Stang, Strik, Thies, Trehu, Tynon, J. White, and Winner.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

G. Matzke, President; K. Williamson, Immediate Past President; Ex-officios: S. Coakley and T. White; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

L. Burns, L. Friedman, J. Kerkvliet, S. Longerbeam, and B. Moon.

---

## ACTION ITEMS

### Category I Proposal

Len Friedman, Curriculum Council Chair, presented a Category I Proposal to Rename Extension Home Economics Department to Extension Family and Community Development Department. Friedman explained that the rationale behind the change was to more accurately reflect the vision, mission, and work of Extension state-wide; reflect the focus of the discipline not only state-wide but regionally and nationally; it is supported by colleagues, decision-makers, and stakeholders; and the current name does not describe the breadth of the programs. He noted that there was liaison approval and enthusiastic support from the Library, Sociology, and from Agricultural and Resource

## Economics.

There was no discussion on the proposal. Motion 00-556-01 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## Bylaws Changes

Maggie Niess, Bylaws and Nominations Chair, presented the following proposed Bylaws changes (additions are bolded):

### ARTICLE VII: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Sec. 4. Term of Office and Vacancies. Senators elected to open positions on the Executive Committee shall be installed at the first regular Faculty Senate meeting of each Calendar year and shall serve a term of two years or until a successor has been duly installed. Three new members shall be elected each year, with three continuing. An elected member who, at the completion of his/ her term, will have served on the Executive Committee for more than eighteen (18) months, shall be ineligible for re-election for two years.

**The position of an Executive Committee member shall become vacant by: (1) Resignation, on the effective date specified in a letter of resignation to the Senate President; (2) Leave of Absence, on the effective date of a leave from the campus in excess of one academic term, exclusive of Summer Term; (3) Termination or Retirement, on the effective date; (4) Recall or Rescind, according to procedures identified in Article VI , Sec. 4.**

Motion 00-556-02 to approve the proposed changes to Article VII passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### ARTICLE VIII: INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE

**Sec. 5. Vacancies. The position of IFS Senator shall become vacant by: (1) Resignation, on the effective date specified in a letter of resignation to the Senate President; (2) Leave of Absence, on the effective date of a leave from the campus in excess of one academic term, exclusive of Summer term; (3) Termination or retirement on the effective date; (4) Recall or Rescind, according to procedures identified in Article VI , Sec. 4.**

**A vacancy shall be filled by appointment of the Executive Committee with approval from the Senate.**

There was no discussion on this proposal. Motion 00-556-03 to approve proposed changes to Article VIII passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### ARTICLE X: MEETINGS

Sec. 2, Paragraph 4 - It shall be the responsibility of all members to attend all meetings of the Faculty Senate. When circumstances require the absence of a Senator from one or more meetings, it shall be the Senator's responsibility to provide a substitute to attend who is eligible for election to the Faculty Senate (from the Senator's constituency **but is not a current Senator or ex-officio member**). The substitute shall have the powers, privileges, duties, and responsibilities of the absent Senator and shall be eligible to vote upon all motions coming before the Faculty Senate. 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.

There was no discussion on this proposal. Motion 00-556-04 to approve proposed changes to Article X passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## Changes to Academic Regulations 3, 23, 25

Joe Kerkvliet, Academic Regulations Chair, presented proposed changes to Academic Regulations 3, 23, and 25 (proposed additions are bolded and proposed deletions are bracketed):

### AR 3. Credit From An Unaccredited Institution

After three terms of work at Oregon State University satisfactory to the Undergraduate Admissions Committee, a student may request validation of work done in an unaccredited institution of collegiate rank. The committee will consider each petition separately and base its decision on all information available. In some instances, informal examinations by the departments concerned may be required. Credit for transfer of vocational-technical work will be awarded in accordance with paragraphs 2b **and** 2c [and 2d] above.

Motion 00-556-05 to approved proposed changes to AR 3 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### AR 23. Special Examination For Credit

A regularly enrolled student in good standing, either graduate or undergraduate, currently registered at Oregon State University [during fall, winter, or spring quarter] and wishing credit **for an OSU course** for which a grade has not been previously received, may petition for credit examination under the following conditions:

a. The application for such examination shall be presented on an Official Student Petition and shall bear the [recommendations] **approvals** of the dean of the student's college, the dean of the college in which the course is offered, and head of the department in which the course is offered.

[d. No student may take a special examination for credit in the term in which he or she completes requirements for graduation.]

**d. A student may not petition for credit by special examination for a course in any term in which the student is or has been enrolled in that course after the add/drop deadline for that term.**

Motion 00-556-06 and 07 to approve the proposed change to the AR 3 prelude passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. Motion 00-555-08 to approve the proposed change to the AR 3 a. passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. Motion 00-555-09 to approve the proposed deletion of the current AR 3 d. passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote. Motion 00-555-10 to approve the proposed insertion to the current AR 3 d. passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. There was no discussion on any of the proposed changes.

### AR 25 - Institutional Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees

Academic Residence:

**1) A minimum of 45 of the last 75 credits must be completed while the student is in academic residence at OSU.** 'Academic residence' is defined as OSU courses taken as a **degree seeking** [enrolled] student of OSU or **courses** through [an approved off-campus degree program.<sup>3</sup> A minimum of the last 45 credits, or 45 of the last 60 credits as approved by the student's dean, must be completed at OSU.] **one of the following approved special programs: professional degree programs which require that the student enroll in another institution while finishing their bachelor's degree at OSU or an international study program sponsored by the Oregon University System.**

[3. A student must be enrolled at OSU, in regular standing, before undertaking academic work to satisfy this requirement.]

*Note: The current f.3 is eliminated and f.4 becomes f.3 which reads:*

3) Credits earned by special examination for credit (AR 23) are not considered in



## **fulfilling academic residence requirements.**

Senator Kimerling, Science, proposed a friendly amendment, that was approved, to change the word 'their' to 'the' so the sentence reads: *...the student enroll in another institution while finishing the bachelor's degree...*

Motion 00-556-11 to approve the proposed changes to AR 25 f. 1), as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 00-556-12 to approve the proposed changes to AR 25 f. 3) passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

### **Distance and Continuing Education**

Bill McCaughan, Dean of Distance and Continuing Education, discussed the current status of distance education at OSU.

He provided two reasons, from his perspective, to be involved in distance education including:

- 1) The changing student body environment. Total higher education enrollment nationwide includes about 70% in non-traditional programs or students.
- 2) To help control the definition of what distance education is and, in so doing, to keep the institution in control of education. Distance education is being viewed increasingly as a commodity and the institution needs to be involved to provide direction.

McCaughan feels it's necessary to meet the growing needs of a non-traditional population and to define the external student body to better determine what kinds of services can be offered.

He noted that distance education is being viewed as a business, but it isn't necessary to respond as a business. There is a need to streamline processes already initiated, such as curriculum development and production.

What will differentiate OSU from others offering distance education will be what surrounds the technology. The experience of the student must be equivalent in quality to that of a student on campus.

Senator Niess, Science, questioned the results of distance programs. McCaughan noted that numerous studies are available, usually based on student performance as compared to other programs. One challenge he sees is building an environment that allows students to interact with other students.

Senator Landau, Science, mentioned the necessity of personal interaction and elimination of full-time faculty in some distance ed programs. McCaughan noted that the University of Phoenix uses almost entirely adjunct faculty—their ratio is about one to one hundred. The British Open University model employs senior tenured faculty who have research and scholarship as their focus. These senior faculty design the courses and programs and contracted faculty actually teach the courses. He suggested that the latter model could be employed to protect the essence of the institution. On the matter of personal interaction, McCaughan felt that the web offers a tremendous potential for student interaction.

Senator Robson, Science, noted that OSU is a research institution and emphasized the importance of research being integrated into distance education. McCaughan noted that the British University faculty are ranked in the top 10% of research faculty in the U.K. McCaughan couldn't answer where the graduate students are, but indicated he would find an answer to that question.

## **COMMITTEE REPORT**

## **Faculty Mediation Committee**

Susan Longerbeam, Faculty Mediation Committee Chair, and Bill Oye, committee member, explained the mediation process and compared it with the grievance procedures.

Longerbeam emphasized that mediation is an alternative to grievance procedures and compared the two: Mediation is an informal, voluntary, early-intervention, flexible process which is available anytime, where the parties control the outcomes, where relationships can be preserved and enhanced, where documentation is not kept, and the mediator is a neutral third party in a win-win situation. Grievance procedures are a formal, involuntary, lengthy process with late-stage decisions, accessible only as part of an appeal process, with a pre-determined outcome based on rules, where relationships can be damaged, with required documentation, and the Grievance Committee is present and advised by the University in a win-lose situation.

Oye noted that the mediator is one member of the Mediation Committee and acts as a communication facilitator, but does not issue a judgement on a case.

Senator Sorte, Agricultural Sciences, questioned types of issues handled by the Mediation Committee. Longerbeam responded that they range from miscommunication between co-workers or between a supervisor and faculty member, to a dispute over a performance review or conditions of employment.

In response to Senator Landau questioning what skills are necessary to serve on the committee, Longerbeam stated that one person is recommended to have formal training (which Oye has) and to have good facilitation skills.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- The IFS, AOF, AAUP Joint Meeting will be held April 29 in the CH2M HILL Alumni Center from 8:00 AM to 1:00 PM.
- President Risser will hold a Fireside Chat from 3:00-4:00 PM on April 11 in the MU Lounge.
- Committee Interest forms are due back in the Faculty Senate Office on April 7.

## **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Interim Provost White's report included the following:

-Congratulations to the faculty, departments and colleges involved in the recent graduate conference, which he felt was a vital opportunity for campus. He was struck by a lack of attendance at the event and issued a personal plea for faculty to support graduate students and their efforts.

-The first meeting between the bargaining team and the graduate student's exchange of proposals was cordial, with no surprises.

-Search Update: The faculty searches are in the final throes and White expressed appreciation for the amount of time and energy involved in that effort. The dean searches for Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences and Veterinary Medicine are the farthest along with the appointment of search committee members in the final stages. It is hoped that the dean searches for Business and Science will begin this academic year. There were 39 applicants for the Provost position and candidates will be on campus in May and early June.

-The Graduate Tuition Remission Report is on White's desk and will be available to the campus following his review. He noted that the major changes are that 1) the minimum student FTE to be eligible to be appointed in the fall for a graduate tuition remission will be 0.2 (currently 0.15); 2) students receiving graduate tuition remissions must be done through an academic unit. The document has been reviewed by the deans, President's Cabinet, and a group of faculty.

-White is summarizing the Graduate School Review document which will be distributed to the campus for final review.

-Accreditation binders have been distributed to units. He acknowledged that units are being asked to accomplish a lot of work at a busy time of year, but noted that the input is vitally needed for the assembly of the self-study which will occur during the summer. He noted that information for the Mathematics Department will soon be posted on the web to provide a better perspective of what is being requested of units.

-There will be a half-day retreat on April 13 involving the deans and President's Cabinet that will focus on campus multi-cultural activities. As a related item, White encouraged the Faculty Senate to invite representatives from the Association for the Advancement of People of Color, along with Stephanie Sanford and Angelo Gomez, to discuss how to promote racial and ethnic diversity on campus vis-a-vis a hiring process.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke's report included the following items:

-There will be a formal hearing on May 16 regarding the transfer of staff tuition benefits to dependents.

-The Issue Group on Faculty Compensation will begin meeting on April 11.

-The Executive Committee will be discussing a report prepared by the Baccalaureate Core Committee regarding HHP 231, which may be an item on the May Senate agenda.

-ASOSU was requested to respond by May 5 to the possibility of an alternate final exam schedule following discussion in the Senate; no response was received. The issue has been referred to two Senate committees for response.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:33 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](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » March 2, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 555

March 2, 2000

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on March 2, 2000, at 3:01 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. Approval of the February minutes was postponed to April.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Academic Regulations 10 & 23 Proposed Revisions [Motion 00–555–01 through 03]
- Discussion Items: Academic Regulations 17, 18 & 19; Final Exam Schedules; and Difference, Power and Discrimination Task Force Report (Motion 00–555–04)
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Butler, G. Gingrich; Douglas, J. Shea; Gregory, B. Coblenz; Jimmerson, J. Mosley; Johnson, R. Sapon–White; Kimerling, Chuck Rosenfeld; Niess, D. Erickson; Peters, E. Gonzalez–Berry; and Raja, P.H. Hsieh.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Abbott, Ahern, Arp, Barth, Beatty, Bliss, Bontrager, Braker, Breen, Bruce, Clinton, Cloughesy, Collier, Cromack, Daniels, deGeus, Doescher, Downing, Esbensen, Gamroth, Gardner, Green, Henthorne, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Krause, Mallory–Smith, Merickel, Mix, Murphy, Reed, Samelson, Stang, Strik, Trehu, J. White, Witters, and Yim.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex–Officios and Staff Present:

G. Matzke, President; H. Sayre, President–Elect; K. Williamson, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; Ex–officio's: S. Coakley and M. Spraggins; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

B. Balz, I. Delson, S. Francis, C. Jones, J. Kerkvliet, A. Torres, and T. Wilcox.

---

### ACTION ITEMS

#### Academic Regulations Proposed Revisions

Joe Kerkvliet, Academic Regulations Chair, presented proposed changes to Academic Regulations 10 and 23. (*Note: Proposed additions are in bold and proposed deletions are in brackets.*)

#### **AR 10. Eligibility**

[b. For participation in intercollegiate athletics, students must meet all institutional,

Pacific 10 Conference, and NCAA requirements. There are many rules that govern the eligibility of students, including those pertaining to amateurism, financial aid limitations, ethical conduct, participation in "outside" competition, and academics. The main academic rules are:

1) Initial eligibility. A high school graduate must have at the time of graduation presented an accumulative six, seven, or eight semesters' minimum grade point average of 2.00 as certified on the high school transcript. Students using GED tests in lieu of a high school diploma and all transfer students should consult with the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics for determination of eligibility, because eligibility rules are too detailed to be presented here.

2) Satisfactory Progress Toward a Degree. Eligibility for regular season competition after the first year in residence or after the student has used one season of eligibility in any sport shall be determined at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year, based upon: (a) satisfactory completion prior to each fall term of a total number of quarter credits of academic work acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies equivalent to an average of at least 12 quarter credits during each of the previous quarters in academic years in which the student was enrolled, or (b) satisfactory completion of 36 quarter credits acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies, since the beginning of the previous fall term. A student-athlete shall designate a program of studies leading toward a specific baccalaureate degree no later than the beginning of the seventh quarter of enrollment.

3) Enrollment During Season of Competition. At the time of practice or competition, the student must be registered for not less than 12 semester or quarter credits. In the case of sports that begin competition prior to the beginning of classes, a student must have been admitted as a regularly matriculated, degree-seeking student in accordance with the regular, published entrance requirements.

Waivers of some eligibility rules are possible. Students should consult the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on all such matters.]

**b. For participation in intercollegiate athletics, students must meet all institutional, PAC-10 and NCAA requirements. Students should contact the Compliance Office in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on all such matters.**

Kerkvliet explained that the committee learned that the proposed deletions were, in many cases, incomplete or obsolete. He noted that one section under consideration for deletion referring to waivers applied to extra-curricular activities.

Senator Landau, Science, moved to accept the proposed revisions to AR 10; motion seconded. Motion 00-555-01 to approve passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### ***AR 23. Special Examination For Credit***

A regularly enrolled student in good standing, either graduate or undergraduate, currently registered at Oregon State University [during fall, winter, or spring quarter] and wishing credit **for an OSU course** for which a grade has not been previously received, may petition for credit examination under the following conditions:

a. The application for such examination shall be presented on an Official Student Petition and shall bear the [recommendations] **approvals** of the dean of the student's college, the dean of the college in which the course is offered, and head of the department in which the course is offered.

[d. No student may take a special examination for credit in the term in which he or she completes requirements for graduation.]

**d. No examination for credit will be approved for a course in which the student is currently enrolled later than the end of the official add/drop period for the term.**

Someone questioned whether the body should consider limiting the number of credits obtained by examination.

Senator Tynon, Forestry, felt that the proposed wording in Section d. was confusing and proposed an amendment to read: *After the end of the official add/drop period for the term, no examination for credit will be approved for a course in which the student is currently enrolled.* Motion 00-555-02 was seconded.

Following additional discussion regarding proposed wording, Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, moved to recommit to committee AR 23 and clarify the points discussed; motion seconded. Motion 00-555-03 passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Academic Regulations**

Joe Kerkvliet, Academic Regulations Chair, presented proposed revisions to Academic Regulations 17, 18 and 19 for discussion. He noted that, since the Committee was requested to consider adding an A+ grade by both faculty and students, input and guidance from the Senate to determine how to proceed would be appreciated. (*Note: Proposed additions are in bold.*)

#### **AR 17. Grades**

The grading system consists of twelve basic grades, **A+**, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, and F.

#### **AR 18. Alternative Grading Systems**

3) A grade of S (satisfactory) shall be equivalent to grades **A+**, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-.

#### **AR 19. Grade Points**

Grade points are computed on the basis of 4 points for each credit of **A+** or A grade, ...

Kerkvliet confirmed for Senator Obermiller, Agricultural Sciences, that the U of O grants a 4.3 GPA for an A+. When questioned by Senator Woods, Engineering, why a 4.3 should not be given, Kerkvliet related three arguments: 1) GPA's are all relative; 2) It would lower the GPA for students who do not get an A+; and 3) It would create additional numerical calculations which would necessitate changing financial aid and scholarship requirements.

ASOSU Student Advocate Greg Evans presented research regarding GPA inflation and deflation which indicated there was no significant difference when A+ is added.

ASOSU President Melanie Spraggins noted that the request originated with ASOSU to make the grade scales comparable at both the U of O and OSU.

Senator Lee, Liberal Arts, questioned whether OSU's scale is in the minority. ASOSU Advocate Evans reported that there is a trend across the country to add an A+ to the grading scale. He noted that Berkeley, Stanford and the U of O have 4.3 GPA's in the PAC-10.

Senator Brooks, Business, felt that an A+ must be a 4.3 or the GPA is compromised. Senator Shor, Engineering, felt that the highest GPA should remain at 4.0 and an A+ should be for only truly exceptional students.

President-Elect Sayre related problems experienced at the U of O where faculty are pressured by students to receive an A+.

Senator Landau suggested that an admission be made that an A+ is grade inflation and use it to make OSU students more competitive.

## **Final Exam Schedules**

Barbara Balz, Registrar, discussed the issue of adding a half hour between each scheduled final exam. This discussion was the result of a request at the December Senate meeting.

Balz explained that final exams are currently scheduled continuously from 7:30 AM to 9:50 PM Monday through Thursday and from 7:30 to 11:20 AM on Friday. Friday afternoon of Finals Week is left open to schedule special exams and resolve conflicts with other exams. The schedule allows time for 22 regular exams and eight group exams. When compared to the final exam schedule at the U of O, their exams begin at 8:00 AM and end at 10:00 PM Monday through Thursday and from 8:00 AM to 12:15 on Friday. Their schedule allows 22 regular exams and 3 group exams. The U of O exams are 2 hours in length vs. OSU's 1 hour and fifty minutes and the U of O has 15 minutes between exams vs. OSU's 10 minutes. The real difference comes down to the number of group exams scheduled. Balz determined that both institutions offer about 45 group exams, but OSU allots five additional group exam periods to accommodate courses in Engineering, Accounting, and Sciences.

Balz presented two additional exam scenarios:

- 1) A 30 minute passing time Monday through Thursday would require exams to begin at 7:30 AM and end at 11:20 PM; and
- 2) A 20 minute passing time Monday through Thursday would require exams to begin at 7:30 AM and end at 10:40 PM.

Senator Brooks noted that 31 exam sessions would be available if exams ended at 10:00 PM on Friday. His calculations from the schedule represented 37 group exams. He presented an alternate exam schedule consisting of a 30 minute passing time, allowing time for both lunch and dinner, with six sessions each day Monday through Friday beginning at 7:30 AM and ending at 10:00 PM.

Senator Folts, Liberal Arts, felt this would be an enormous grading task for hand-graded exams if the schedule extended into Friday afternoon or evening. IFS Senator Torres suggested determining Friday exams based on whether or not they are essay or multiple choice.

Senator Nishihara, Student Affairs, noted that residence halls close at 5:00 PM on Friday.

Senator King, Business, felt that students should be consulted to determine their stand on the issue.

Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether changing the schedule would benefit the students or faculty and whether the proportion of students having back-to-back finals was known (it wasn't known).

In response to Ex-Officio Coakley's question of whether the same rotational schedule is followed each term, Balz stated that the schedule changes each term.

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, felt that an alternate proposal should be considered, but that it needed evaluation to determine if it is workable. Balz noted that the issue is whether group exams could be reduced or consolidated and if Friday afternoon would be acceptable to schedule exams.

Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, moved to refer the issue to either the Academic Regulations Committee or the Advancement of Teaching Committee; motion seconded. Motion 00-555-04 to refer the issue to committee passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **Difference, Power and Discrimination Task Force**

Alexis Walker, Difference, Power and Discrimination (DPD) Task Force Chair, explained that the group has been meeting weekly since August. The group was told that two major concerns to address were a general lack of clarity about some aspects of the



criteria and that the DPD Program didn't seem to be well integrated across the University. She requested input from the Senate on the two following draft documents.

### **Baccalaureate Core Narrative: Difference, Power, and Discrimination** February 16, 2000

The unequal distribution of social, economic, and political power in the United States is sustained through a variety of individual beliefs and institutional practices. These beliefs and practices have tended to obscure the origins and operations of social discrimination such that this unequal power distribution is often viewed as the natural order. The DPD requirement engages students in the intellectual examination of the complexity of the structures, systems, and ideologies that sustain discrimination, and the unequal distribution of power and resources in society. Such examination will enhance meaningful democratic participation in our diverse university community and our increasingly multi cultural U.S. society.

### **Difference, Power, and Discrimination Criteria** February 16, 2000

Difference, Power, and Discrimination courses shall:

1. be at least three credits;
2. emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. have as their central focus the study of the unequal distribution of power within the framework of particular disciplines and course content;
4. focus primarily on the United States;
5. provide illustrations of ways in which structural, institutional, and ideological discrimination arise from socially defined meanings and attributed to difference;
6. provide historical and contemporary examples of difference, power, and discrimination across cultural, economic, social, and political institutions in the United States;
7. provide illustrations of ways in which the interactions of social categories, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and age, are related to difference, power, and discrimination in the United States;
8. provide a multidisciplinary perspective on issues of difference, power, and discrimination;
9. incorporate interactive learning activities (e.g., ungraded, in-class writing exercise; classroom discussion; peer-review of written material; web-based discussion group); and
10. shall be regularly numbered departmental offerings rather than x99 or blanket number courses.

Sayre questioned how the draft addresses broadening courses across campus. Walker responded that nothing in the statement limits it to one college. Senator Robson, Science, suggested that language could be added that specifically references other disciplines.

Senator Schuster, Associated, requested an explanation of why it is important to offer these courses across campus. Walker responded that, in addition to the group receiving the charge to expand the offerings, the idea of DPD in society would be relevant to every discipline. She noted that, since it is a university-wide program, one way for the University to indicate its institutional commitment is to show that it infuses the campus.

Senator Shor expressed the feeling that she doesn't know how to conduct a DPD conversation in a technical course without sounding irrelevant to the subject material.

Senator Lee, Liberal Arts, questioned if the group has considered having each department create its own DPD course. Walker indicated the group has discussed this suggestion and tried to balance what

they think should be in the DPD Criteria with what they think is possible.

Senator Landau was bothered by the emphasis on United States society. Walker stated that this is not a change from the current criteria. She noted that the group agrees that DPD problems are world wide but felt that recommending the U.S. focus makes people aware that there are problems here. Walker indicated that occurrences in other countries could be used for comparison to the U.S. Senator Gross, Liberal Arts, suggested that the word 'primarily' be kept in mind but it allows one to use examples outside the U.S., such as the Holocaust.

Senator Robson noted the issue of gender discrimination and suggested expanding from the U.S. perspective to include other communities. Several other comments were made in opposition to the proposed U.S. focus.

Senator Lee, Liberal Arts, noted that DPD is a faculty development program and is designed to assist faculty to learn how to integrate courses. Senator Koch, Engineering, also felt there were many opportunities to integrate DPD courses into curriculum.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Faculty Awards Deadline – March 6 is the deadline for submitting nominations for awards selected by the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee
- Fireside Chat – President Risser invites staff and faculty to share ideas, ask questions, and engage in lively conversation about OSU on April 11, from 3:00–4:30 in the MU Lounge.
- Committee Interest Forms – Forms indicating preferences to serve on University and Faculty Senate committees are due in the Faculty Senate Office in early April.
- Joint Meeting – The joint AAUP, AOF, IFS meeting will be held on April 29 on the OSU campus.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Interim Provost White congratulated the College of Liberal Arts, Department of Political Science, and others involved in sponsoring the McCall Lecture held the previous night. He felt that it was a class event which brought in an engaging speaker, Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.

Staff Fee Policy – White requested input on OUS recommendations regarding the proposed Staff Fee Policy, of which the Chancellor is supportive. The President at each institution would determine whether programs on their campus would be participating. The following has been agreed to:

- Employees would be allowed to take courses at \$20 per credit.
- Limited to 10 credits per term.

Criteria under consideration include:

- Allowing employees to transfer their allotted credits to a dependent attending either the employee's place of work or another OUS campus.

White noted that potential risks include:

- Other State agencies might feel that Higher Education employees are receiving an additional benefit.
- This benefit may work against Higher Education in the Legislature in salary

distribution conversations.

Senator Shor wondered why OSU hasn't done this.

Tony Wilcox, Health & Human Performance, felt that OUS should be ambitious and aim for a 12 credit limit if there is an opportunity. He also asked where the IRS stands on taxable benefits. White responded that the Provost's felt that each campus should be able to set the cap on credits but the Chancellor feels that all OUS institutions should be the same. The program will be evaluated after two-years. White was not aware of any IRS problems.

White indicated that the program will be in effect this fall following a public hearing and revisions to the OAR's.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate President Gary Tiedeman reported that IFS is solidly behind the proposal.

OSU and OGI – Conversations are proceeding within OSU and the Oregon Graduate Institute to create a partnership alliance that would greatly increase the capacity of engineering and high technology research. All political and financial issues have not yet been identified or resolved.

In response to Senator Nelson, Engineering, questioning why an alliance with OGI and not PSU, White indicated that the entrepreneurial spirit and the quantity of research at OGI is the highest in the State. White noted that the deans at both OSU and PSU are supportive and that an alliance with OGI will not exclude any OUS campus.

Senator Shor questioned the extent of combining the two programs. White responded that details have not yet been worked out, but felt that instructional aspects would be under OSU and that the research enterprise would be a public-private alliance. He noted that an issue group and task force has been formed to address these issues and that there is certainly no interest in doing anything that will disadvantage either group.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke thanked Joe Kerkvliet and Alexis Walker for the effort their committees have put forth.

A task force has been formed to determine if there are alternatives that could boost the size of salary increases at OSU in the future.

Matzke expressed disappointment that budget figures for next year are still not yet available. This puts departments in the uncertain position of trying to determine whether to make commitments to graduate students and new hires while not knowing whether resources will be available.

Matzke noted that the Sizemore initiative looms on the horizon and encouraged faculty to work to promote the role of higher education in the State in an effort to educate the public.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business

Meeting was adjourned at 4:55 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker*  
*Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

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

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

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

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

Valid [xhtml](#).

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » February 3, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 554

February 3, 2000

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on February 3, 2000, at 3:02 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. There were no corrections to the minutes of January 2000. President Matzke thanked Michael Beachley for serving as Parliamentarian during the meeting.

### Meeting Summary

- Special Report: University Goals, T.Hayes
- Discussion Item: Graduate School Review
- New Business: None

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Cluskey, J. Ridlington; K. Douglas, J. Shea; D. Jimmerson, J. Mosley; Oye, S. Longerbeam; and Sanchez, D. Pehrsson.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Braker, Breen, Burt, R. Burton, Butler, Downing, Folts, Gamroth, Gomez, Green, Gross, Hamm, Henthorne, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Koenig, Krause, Mallory-Smith, Mix, Plaza, Powelson, Reed, Stang, Strik, Tesch, Trehu, Warner, and Witters.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

G. Matzke, President; H. Sayre, President-Elect; K. Williamson, Immediate Past President; Ex-Officios: S. Coakley and T. White; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Administrative Assistant.

#### Guests of the Senate:

S. Bernard, M. Christensen, E. Coddington, I. Delson, J. Dorbolo, D. Erickson, S. Francis, A. Hashimoto, T. Hayes, N. Hoffman, and J. Morandi.

### SPECIAL REPORT University Goals

Toby Hayes, Vice Provost for Research, reported on top tier concerns as they relate to the University Goals. He noted that a task force draft report is available on the web at: <http://osu.orst.edu/research/TopTier.htm>. He noted that public input is welcome.

The charge to the task force contained four elements: 1) what does the goal mean; 2) how do we measure it; 3) what actions do we take to get there, and; 4) what resources will be required.

He reported that the US News and World Report nationally ranks OSU 121st overall,

which is at the very top of Tier III. The following components are used to rank institutions: academic reputation, student selectivity, faculty resources, student retention rates, financial resources, alumni giving, and graduation rate performance. Hayes acknowledged that the rating systems raise many questions but noted that the biggest leverage is to improve OSU's academic reputation.

Strategies to improve OSU's ranking includes: telling our story better, looking at strategic program investments, making the world aware of the faculty and institutional awards and membership, hosting national meetings and symposia, surveying students and graduates, focusing on institutional memberships, improving student retention rates, and improving faculty resources. The short-term strategies include improving communications, publicizing and promoting faculty awards, and promoting OSU for institutional memberships. The long-term strategies include focusing on strategic program investment and faculty compensation structure. Hayes noted that faculty and students are the best ambassadors of OSU's size, scope and excellence as a research university.

On the issue of faculty compensation, the OSU full professor average is \$61,700 compared to the peer average of \$76,500 and the national average of \$78,100; OSU needs about \$7 million to move to the national average.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

### **Graduate School Review**

In an effort to allow faculty to provide input to Provost White regarding criteria to be used for the selection of the next Graduate School Dean, President Matzke lead a discussion concerning the role of the Graduate School in the 21st century and what qualities are necessary for the next dean. The agenda referred Senators to the Graduate School Review Team Report on the web at: <http://arec.orst.edu/gsr/report2.htm>.

Comments regarding the current operation of the Graduate School and the Team Report included: The Graduate School is playing a good role in helping to monitor the quality of graduate education; should assist the University in being more responsible for graduate education; many functions currently handled by the Graduate School may be best addressed at the college level, but also felt that a Graduate Office was necessary to maintain consistency; a dean may not be necessary; and the review of graduate courses by the Graduate School is very valuable and helpful – perhaps undergraduate courses should be reviewed in the same manner. One Senator, referring to the Report, was struck by the lack of need for the Graduate School and wasn't sure why it was needed to assure the quality of graduate degrees since there is no undergraduate school to assure the quality of degrees. The need for the Graduate School to organize a strong fund-raising effort and assist in obtaining grants and fellowships was mentioned. There was also mention of the need to have the Graduate School set and implement standards to make progress toward a degree. The Graduate School should focus on a more cooperative role with colleges and departments. Due to diverse graduate programs, each unit must be extensively directed to graduate education in order to achieve top tier status. Many 'gatekeeping' functions should be moved to departments. It's important to have an organizational structure that serves both as an advocate of and quality control check for advanced degree programs. The Report acknowledges concerns about interdisciplinary degrees, but the Graduate School has never defined what this degree should be. The report sounded threatening to interdisciplinary programs and Senator's were reminded of their importance.

Comments regarding the criteria for a new dean included: feeling that a graduate dean or administrator needs to be available for college deans or administrators who don't understand graduate education and who will serve as an advocate; feeling that the Graduate School acts as a policeman and someone needs to be brought in who will establish a partnership with other departments; and the dean or administrator must be experienced in collaboration, and this person should report directly to the Provost.

President-Elect Sayre questioned how unionization would affect the function of the Graduate School. Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, responded that it depends on what is

negotiated.

Senator Drexler noted that the Graduate School is not the employer and questioned what problems could arise in administering advanced degrees. President Matzke replied that there are two issues: 1) those that must be bargained, such as teaching, and 2) those that can be agreed to during bargaining.

Matzke shared a perspective related to him: Some feel that the graduate program review occurring every ten years should focus on problem programs determined by preset indicators.

Matzke noted that, since neither have their own students, the Graduate School is somewhat parallel to International Programs which has been very proactive in gaining stature and resources. He felt that the Graduate School should also be more proactive in creating opportunities.

Ex-officio Coakley expressed the view that the Graduate School's next phase be as a strong advocate for raising funds and obtaining grants and fellowships.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Faculty Awards Deadline - March 6 is the deadline for submitting nominations for awards selected by the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee.
- Faculty Workshops - Parker Palmer will give two faculty workshops on February 8 and 9.
- Annual Reports - The Graduate Admissions Committee annual report can be found at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/gac.ar9899.htm>
- OSU Connect 2000 - Information on OSU Connect programs can be found at: <http://osu.orst.edu/admissions/rfpletter/>

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Interim Provost White began his first address to the Senate by stating that he feels very supported across campus and provided a brief personal history. He noted that he is not approaching the position tentatively, but has not decided whether he would like to continue past the interim position. His report included four issues:

- 1) Resource Review Meeting – With the cooperation of all, OSU will end the fiscal year on a positive note. There will be precious few new resources during the next fiscal year, although there may be some new money following students. An issue group is being established to re-engineer the budget process. Economic challenges include: graduate unionization, potential passage of the Sizemore initiative, and unpredictable outcomes from OUS and the legislature.
- 2) Communications – The President's Cabinet and Deans' Council will meet jointly every other month to enhance communications. The Faculty Senate President-Elect will become a member of the Provost's Council and will be more involved in university issues during November and December to get up to speed prior to becoming President in January.
- 3) Commencement – The 2000 graduation ceremony will be split with advanced degrees presented during the morning and undergraduate degrees presented during the afternoon. The ceremony will transition to a large, combined 2001 ceremony in Reser Stadium.
- 4) Veterinary Medicine – The issues surrounding the course using live animals has included a social protest, the prerogative of the faculty to set curriculum, and the

responsibility to instruct students. White reported that students spoke of the value of the course and explained that they had learned to do 75-100 procedures during the four-week course. He noted that a remarkable amount of team work to manage the situation has occurred and acknowledged the assistance from Mark Floyd and the Office of News and Communication Services.

Senator Landau, Science, asked White if he sees some way of increasing academics at OSU and how. White responded that there are ways to increase academics, beginning with stop doing some of the things currently in place and focus resources that build intellectual infrastructure and intellectual capital in departments for teaching and research. If this is accomplished, the quality of programs will be raised and students and faculty will be retained. In response to Senator Gardner questioning how to stop doing things, White stated that programs with the lowest ranking must be determined.

### **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke's report included the following items:

- Budget allocations: A decision has been made to allocate some money this year to accommodate students next year.
- Veterinary Medicine: The controversy centers around rights: The Dean feels that the faculty have a right to determine curriculum and protestors are opposed to operating on animals which do not need operations. Matzke felt that this should be used as a teaching event and discuss the important issues raised. He also felt that faculty have to be in control of curriculum.
- Media: *The Oregonian* has suggested that higher education would be better if it were bigger; Matzke didn't feel that was necessarily so. He suggested that if OSU and the U of O merged they would be bigger, but not necessarily better. He felt that investments in faculty are extremely important to be better. Another issue concerns where the institution is located and what is needed to deliver courses to other areas. An additional issue is that of determining how and where resources should be directed to have the most impact.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*





# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [2000 Minutes](#) » January 6, 2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2000 No. 553

January 6, 2000

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on January 6, 2000 at 2:06 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Kenneth Williamson. Corrections to the minutes of December 1999 were made by Senator Brooks related to the discussion of final exams: he replied to the comment that semester schools have the same number of courses as OSU during finals week and therefore that point is not relevant. Brooks also replied to the comment that classrooms might be a constraint is also not relevant as the classes are offered every week during the term and students are in each class for only one-hour and fifty minutes during finals, significantly less than the class time the other nine weeks.

### Meeting Summary

- Special Report: Accreditation, A. Hashimoto
- Action Items: Installation of Elected Officials and Approval of Parliamentarian
- Discussion Item: Telecommunications, C. Pederson
- New Business: Banner Concerns

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Christensen, J. Huddleston; McDaniel, L. Goddik; Rossignol, A.. Wilcox; Stang, L. Daley; and Witters, L. Cole.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Arp, Barth, Braker, Breen, Carson, Cook, deGeus, Drexler, Gardner, Gregory, Gross, Hamm, Henthorne, Jepson, Kerkvliet, Kesler, Krause, Mallory-Smith, Mix, Peters, Powelson, Raja, Samelson, Strik, Trehu, Tynon, and J. White.

#### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-Officios and Staff Present:

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

#### Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, L. Burns, I. Delson, A. Hashimoto, N. Hoffman, and T. White.

### ACTION ITEMS

#### Install Elected Officials

President Williamson began recapping 1999 by thanking the OSU faculty and Faculty Senate for supporting him during the past year and noting that he has truly enjoyed serving as Faculty Senate President. Significant issues brought before the Senate during

his term included: 1) DPD issues and funding, and diversity issues – a DPD task force will come forward this year with recommendations regarding the direction of the program; 2) athletics funding – a task force will also present a report this year; and 3) developing a budget allocation model that would support the legislative funding model.

President Risser's goals for OSU (Compelling Learning Experience, the State is Our Campus, and Top Tier University) are now guiding the budget process and will guide OSU's future. Williamson noted that President Risser's vision for OSU includes: becoming the largest university in the state, becoming the first choice for in-state students, to be recognized as the best funded and top research programs, to be successful in athletics, and to be known as having the widest reaching outreach programs in the State of Oregon – including not only Extension, but also distance education. Williamson felt that the challenge for faculty governance is to determine how to participate in this vision since it will require significant change.

Important future faculty issues include: 1) enrollment; 2) budget allocation; 3) funding levels and selective elimination; and 4) faculty salaries.

On the issue of the best way for faculty concerns to be heard, Williamson called on faculty to 'stop whining'! He acknowledged that there is good reason to whine but, to be heard, faculty need to speak directly and be a participator in the entire educational system.

OSU can be proud of its faculty and Faculty Senate for all that is done, particularly when accomplished under difficult situations. There is general agreement across the state that OSU has the finest Faculty Senate and finest faculty governance anywhere in the State of Oregon. OSU's faculty governance also ranks at the top in the eyes of national organizations.

Williamson thanked the Executive Committee members and Vickie Nunnemaker for their assistance and support during the past year.

Gordon Matzke was installed as the 23rd Faculty Senate President by Kenneth Williamson. Matzke presented Williamson with a Myrtlewood plaque on behalf of the Senate that read:

Kenneth J. Williamson  
Oregon State University  
Faculty Senate President  
1999

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

*"Facts are the basis of policies but they do not create policies... Here is where synthesis comes in to build up the facts to useful knowledge which...gives meaning and direction..." – Harold Dodds*

Matzke then installed President-Elect Henry Sayre; Executive Committee members Vicki Tolar Burton, Stella Coakley and Rubin Landau; and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative Bruce Sorte. Newly elected Senators were asked to stand and were declared installed. These Senators are: *Agriculture* – L. Ciuffetti, S. Gregory, S. Ladd, M. McDaniel, N. Scott, J. Stang, and C. Vickers; *Associated* – R. Bontrager, M. Floyd, C. Klaus, M. McCambridge, and J. Schuster; *Business* – J. King and V.T. Raja; *Engineering* – C. Cook, K. Douglas, and S. Woods; *Extension* – M. Braker, J. Baggott, and P. Hamm; *Forestry* – C. Freitag, M. Cloughesy, S. Tesch; *Health & Human Performance* – L. Beeson, B. Cardinal, and K. White; *Home Economics and Education* – C. Caughey and A. Sanchez; *Information Services* – C. Middleton; *Liberal Arts* – V. Tolar Burton, R. Clinton, J. Cornell, J. Gross, L. Kesler, J. Lee, M. Oriard, K. Peters, D. Plaza, and S. Shaw; *Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences* – M. Abbott, B. Collier, and R. Samelson; *Pharmacy* – T. Collins and T. Filtz; *Science* – J. Beatty, D. Horne, J. Ingle, J. Kimerling, M. Niess, R. Thies, and W. Winner; and *Student Affairs* – B. Oye.

## DISCUSSION ITEM

### Telecommunications

Curt Pederson, Associate Provost for Information Services, provided an update of Internet and Telecommunications charges and activity. In particular, how Telecommunications went from a \$2 million deficit to \$2 million in excess retained earnings over a two-year period.

Pederson explained that the excess earnings were a direct result of improved fiscal management by Shay Dakin, Telecommunication Services Director, and a drop in wholesale long-distance telephone rates. About \$1 million in savings came from the long-distance rates and the remainder was a result of Dakin's aggressive management, which also resulted in increased productivity. As allowed by federal guidelines, the excess money could be reinvested or refunded. The choice was to reinvest in campus-wide telecommunication voice/video/data projects.

Although the long-distance rates dropped, departments continued to be charged the original, higher rate. Information Services felt this was an opportunity to make desperately needed investments to enable them to continue to make available basic telecommunications and Internet service to the campus. Although units are not being charged the lowest rates available, they are being charged 90 percent of AT&T's prime time rate and 80 percent after 6:00 PM.

Pederson explained that both Internet bandwidth demand and central Web server activity has increased 500 percent. The university currently allocates \$150,000 for central Web costs which have risen from \$50,000 to more than \$450,000 per year. The shortfall was requested but funding was not available from the university and is being taken from other areas in Information Services. Due to increased costs, Information Services cannot meet their debt payment or 2 percent hold-back. Since Information Services is a self-funded account, they are required by the university to put money into a depreciation reserve. Pederson noted that the State Emergency Board may offer some relief.

Information Services is currently undergoing a telecommunications rate study to determine appropriate rates. The short term policy is to maintain current rates and invest the excess, but noted that a long-term policy would address equitable funding of all Internet and Network Services expenses. Pederson welcomes input on the long-term policy discussion.

Pederson also requested university input on the following Telecommunications/Network Services joint projects totaling \$1,118,500:

1. Digital Satellite Up-link and Facilities Remodel, \$155,000: November 1999 through YTBD – Includes remodeling of the former Entomology Machine Shop to house digital and analog control equipment.
2. Modem Pool Relocation, Upgrade and Monthly Service Cost, \$165,000: September 1999 through February 2000 (with monthly service cost through June 2000) – Interim solution to relocate, reconfigure, and upgrade modem pool from 28.8 to 56 KB.
3. Core Network Backbone Equipment and Services, \$275,500: July 1999 through June 2000 – Upgrade capacity and capability of campus network backbone; upgrade systems supporting e-mail, news, ftp, listserv, etc.; and provide funding for increased bandwidth.
4. Network Environment and Security Improvements, \$50,000: Nov. 1999 through February 2000 – Improvements to upgrade central network/computer room.
5. Acquire Network Test Equipment, \$25,000: Purchased November 1999 – New test equipment to work with new broadband circuits.
6. Campus Network Inventory, \$72,000: January 2000 through February 2000 – Audit of campus cable infrastructure to determine quality and condition which will assist in establishing a priority list of campus rewiring projects.
7. Residence Hall Rewire, \$259,000: July 1999 through June 2000 – Wire each dorm room with one voice jack, two data jacks, and one cable TV jack; equip each of the

Intermediate Distribution Facilities with new 3rd generation hubs and a switch with 100-Mb fiber uplink to the OSU Network.

8. Implement Inventory Program, \$17,000: December 1999 through March 2000 – Enables Telecommunications and the Residence Hall Computer Network to better track and manage their inventory.

9. Rewire Kerr Administration Building, \$100,000 – Start and Completion TBD – The main distribution cable must be replaced to eliminate required frequent repairs.

In closing, Pederson acknowledged the efforts of Shay Dakin and Jim Corbett.

## **SPECIAL REPORT**

### **OSU Accreditation**

Andy Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, outlined the accreditation effort for the University, which is required every ten years. The accreditation visit by the Commission on Colleges will be April 18-20, 2001. Hashimoto will be providing leadership and oversight of the total process.

The purposes of accreditation are:

- A. To provide an opportunity for self-assessment on a periodic basis.
- B. To assess the extent to which the institution meets established standards.
- C. To foster improvement.
- D. To publicly identify institutions that are achieving their Mission and associated goals.

The steps in the accreditation process include:

1. The institution describes and studies itself in a self-study process.
2. An evaluation committee of peers visits the institution to: a) validate the self-study report; and b) prepare a report to the institution and the Commission on Colleges.
3. The institution responds formally to the evaluation committee report with acceptance or corrections of errors of fact.
4. The Commission reviews the self-study, the committee report, and the recommendation of the committee and decides on appropriate action.

The Standards that OSU will be evaluated on are:

1. Institutional Mission and Goals
2. Educational Programs
3. Students
4. Faculty
5. Library and Information Resources
6. Governance and Administration
7. Finance
8. Physical Resources
9. Institutional Integrity

Self-Study Purposes:

1. Analyze the resources and effectiveness of the institution in fulfilling its mission.
2. Demonstrate that the performance, competence, and the achievements of students who complete programs are commensurate with the certificates, diplomas, and degrees awarded by the institution.
3. Appraise and analyze the relationship of all the institution's activities to its purpose.
4. Indicate clearly the institution's strengths and weaknesses in a candid and forthright manner.
5. Provide a sound basis for institutional planning and improvement.

The accreditation process provides an opportunity to look candidly at the institution and determine whether or not goals are being achieved.

The purpose of the accreditation team visit is to determine if what was articulated in the self-study is actually validated on campus by talking with faculty and students. They will

then prepare a report of their findings that is sent to the institution and the Commission on Colleges. OSU will have an opportunity to respond to the report to correct errors. A final report is then sent to the Commission who then takes one of the following actions:

- A. Reaffirm Accreditation with No Conditions
- B. Request a Progress Report
- C. Request a Focused Interim Evaluation Report and Visit
- D. Issue a Warning
- E. Place on Probation
- F. Declare Show-Cause
- G. Terminate Accreditation

Members of the OSU Accreditation Steering Committee are: Robert Burton (Chair), Ron Adams, Leslie Burns, Karyle Butcher, Irma Delson, Thayne Dutson, Andy Hashimoto, Toby Hayes, Mark McCambridge, Maggie Niess, Mike Quinn, Larry Roper, Henry Sayre, Rob Specter, Meg Swan, Victor Tremblay, and one each ASOSU Representative and Graduate Student. This group will respond to the nine Standards and will begin very soon.

Additional accreditation information is available on the web at:

<http://osu.orst.edu/aa/accreditation/>

There was no discussion.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

– Reception for Provost Arnold – The Faculty Senate is hosting a reception for Provost and Executive Vice President Roy Arnold on January 13 from 3:00-4:30 in the MU Lounge. All faculty are invited.

– Martin Luther King Holiday Teach-in – This year's theme is "Celebrate The Vision" and will take place between January 10 and 21.

– Faculty Senate Handbook Update – Faculty Senate materials have been updated and can be found on the Senate web site at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm>

Since experience has shown that the majority of Senators do not use the updated materials sent to be included in the Faculty Senate Handbook, and since the web site is frequently updated, hard copies of the Handbook are no longer being sent. The web site contains information about Senators, committees, agendas, minutes, etc.

– Senators Discussion Listserv – A motion was approved at the December Faculty Senate meeting to create a Senators discussion listserv to provide a method for Senators to discuss issues between Senate meetings. All Senators have been subscribed to the listserv. The listserv can be accessed by addressing a message to:  
[fsdiscussion@mail.orst.edu](mailto:fsdiscussion@mail.orst.edu)

To unsubscribe yourself, send a message to: [listserv@mail.orst.edu](mailto:listserv@mail.orst.edu) and type the following in the body of the message: *signoff fsdiscussion*

NOTE: You must unsubscribe yourself from your own computer since it will unsubscribe whatever individual is assigned to the e-mail address you are sending the message from. If someone else tries to unsubscribe you, they will either unsubscribe themselves or receive an error message.

– Interinstitutional Faculty Senate – OSU Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator Gary Tiedeman (Sociology) was elected IFS President for the year 2000 at their December meeting.

– John V. Byrne Lecture Series – As part of the John V. Byrne Lecture Series, Governor Kitzhaber spoke at OSU on January 6. His talk was titled, 'From Science to Public Action: The Oregon Approach to Natural Resource Management.'

## **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Dr. Arnold congratulated Associate Provost Hashimoto for appointing an outstanding accreditation team. He also noted that OSU has no choice but to be accredited if OSU students are to remain eligible for federal financial aid.

Arnold also congratulated the newly elected Senators, Executive Committee and IFS Senator, President-Elect, new Senate President, and Gary Tiedeman for his election as the IFS President. He thanked the outgoing Senators, Executive Committee members, IFS Senator, and Ken Williamson whom Arnold felt did an outstanding job in his role as President. He also thanked Senators for their willingness to serve in faculty governance.

Dr. Arnold noted he had served in the position of Provost for eight years, two months and six days and introduced Tim White who will become Interim Provost on January 17.

Arnold noted he has attended 65-70 Faculty Senate meetings, over 200 Executive Committee meetings, and worked with 10 Faculty Senate Presidents. He provided some retrospective comments of events during the past eight years including listing significant changes in Baccalaureate, graduate and professional level academic programs, reorganization and restructuring of programs, and participating in 29 administrative appointments. He was actively involved in the process of granting promotions and tenure and oversaw the selection of 17 new Distinguished Professors. Items that stand out involving the Faculty Senate are: the revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, Post-Tenure Review, the administrative restructuring process, performance indicators, distance education, and ROTC apportionment. He felt that the Senate has made enormous progress in certain areas, including the use of discussion prior to formal action. He also mentioned the changing and dynamic nature of OSU and OUS and groups within those organizations. OSU is well poised to capitalize due to new and innovative programs, increased marketing, and successful student recruiting and retention. He views the budget process as a challenge, and is disappointed that the budget circumstances are not better, and noted a continuing need to communicate better internally.

Dr. Arnold thanked all for the opportunity to have served in the role as Provost and Executive Vice President and felt that it has been a very pleasant experience, most of the time, and it has been a very positive experience.

President Matzke noted that Dr. Arnold has steered the university very well through many challenging transitions, some of which could be considered crises. Matzke appreciated that Arnold reported regularly and forthrightly to the Senate and kept the lines of communication open between faculty and administration. Matzke then presented him with a Myrtlewood plaque on behalf of the Senate which read:

Presented to Provost and Executive Vice President  
Roy G. Arnold  
by the  
Oregon State University Faculty Senate  
January 6, 2000

Whereas, Roy Arnold has served with distinction as Provost and Executive Vice President at Oregon State University for eight years; and  
Whereas, He has shown overwhelming support for the faculty and the faculty governance process;  
*RESOLVED*, That the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University extends its sincere appreciation for his service and wishes him future success as Executive Associate Dean in the College of Agricultural Sciences.

## **REPORT FROM & DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Matzke's report included three issues:

1) Provost Search Committee - He encouraged faculty to provide input on criteria for the new Provost.

2) Faculty Senate Redefinition - He noted that several years ago the Senate redefined who would be included in apportionment. The membership was expanded to include all Professional Faculty and Research Assistants. Matzke was not particularly in favor of this action as an academic, in part, because of curriculum related issues and the fear that the new group would expand the Senate's agenda. He admitted that his fear was misplaced since the committee structure was changed to specify where teaching faculty were needed and that, although the new group did expand the agenda, he now feels that was a positive move. He acknowledged that those in the new group bring a set of skills not available among academic faculty, particularly in the area of fiscal expertise. He felt that it was a very good choice to expand the university's definition of faculty in the Faculty Senate.

3) Y2K Problem - The newest Y2K problem is related to enrollment with projections of 1,000 to 1,500 more students next fall. Matzke asked for Senators to express their concerns about increased enrollment and to share possible solutions.

Senator Shor, Engineering, felt there will be a real strain due to a lack of classrooms.

Senator Thies, Science, was concerned more about straining departmental budgets when additional faculty have to be hired to accommodate the increased enrollment. He noted that there will be more money following the students, but it will be spent to expand sections.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, felt that Baccalaureate Core classes are woefully understaffed.

Senator Tolar Burton, Liberal Arts, noted that courses other than those in the Baccalaureate Core will also be bursting. There is a need to look ahead and not just solve immediate problems for incoming freshmen.

Senator Lee, Liberal Arts, suggested that academic programs may need to be reprioritized and rebudgeted.

Senator Daniels, Associated, felt it was important that we assure that the cost of affordable housing not be impacted by the additional students.

Senator Landau, Science, felt that not enough has been invested in the infrastructure to handle additional students.

Senator Doescher, Agricultural Sciences, thought that a discussion on perceptions and incentives directed toward faculty was needed since it will be the faculty and advisors dealing with new students. There needs to be an esprit de corps put into place to get faculty enthusiastically behind the students.

Senator Westall, Science, felt it was extremely important that the money actually follows the students, as has been promised.

Senator Obermiller, Agricultural Sciences, expressed the feeling that this is a wonderful opportunity to have the university plan for growth rather than for decline and it must be approached positively.

President Matzke stated that the university has made a commitment to take the additional students which provides an opportunity for success. He urged faculty to communicate to the Senate leadership what they feel the Executive Committee could be doing to assist the process.



## **NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Plant, Engineering, noted that scheduling is a nightmare due to being unable to access Banner for two days. He wondered if this was due to recent upgrades and suggested that OSU quit upgrading Banner and live with what works, as the University of Oregon apparently did about three years ago.

Curt Pederson responded that an upgrade consisting of two redundant servers, which resulted in a \$42,000 deficit, will be installed very soon to remedy the situation.

Senator Thies noted that the phone system still works for students who need to make class changes.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:52 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](#).

November 1, 2000

Gordon Matzke, President  
OSU Faculty Senate  
Campus

Dear Gordon;

In May 2000, the Issue Group on Faculty Compensation completed their work by requesting that:(1) the OSU administration commit to making faculty salary increases a top priority; (2) a plan for implementation of these suggestions be completed by the OSU administration and reported to the faculty by November 1, 2000; (3) a plan for monitoring progress of implementation be developed by the Faculty Senate; and (4) the issue group's report be distributed in hard copy to all faculty in mid June, 2000.

Our purpose in writing today is to summarize progress regarding the first two requests. Item 4 (above) was completed in a timely fashion, albeit by electronic means.

Faculty salaries are a top priority of the administration. This commitment has been demonstrated in public statements by the President, Provost, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and the Academic Deans, among others. Evidence of this commitment can also be found in the magnitude, timing, and guidelines of the faculty salary program administered in AY 2000-01. Furthermore, we employ an open process for input on the university budget allocations that allows for direct faculty input on elements of the budget, including salary.

The OSU administration has been consistent and strong in their work with OUS and the State Board of Higher Education to help them appreciate fully the liability of faculty compensation that is significantly below peer median values, and what this liability means to our educational, research, and outreach programs.

While remaining firm in our resolve to work together toward peer parity in faculty compensation, we are not in

agreement with the Issue Group's request to pronounce a specific multi-biennial plan for faculty compensation (salary and benefits). We acknowledge that this may be an unsatisfactory response to some faculty members, but to commit to specific targets that may be unreachable will be problematic if expectations are unmet.

Several external factors come into play here. The most prominent factors known today include the evolving implementation of the OUS Resource Allocation Model, and a request to fully fund the model. Currently, the model is funded at 87.9%. The OUS has placed full funding of the model as its Priority One request for the next biennium. If funds for this priority are appropriated by the Legislature following the political process over the next 7 months, it will provide resources to maintain significant compensation increment programs in the next biennium. The rapidly escalating and mandatory costs of health insurance and energy are an additional major worry. Program priorities of the Governor and Legislature may become a higher priority than those submitted through the Chancellor's Office and the State Board of Higher Education. Potential citizen action at the polls and economic issues in the state also will affect the amount of resources available to the University.

There are also internal factors that will affect resource availability for faculty salary increments. Recruitment, retention, and instruction of students is vital to attract Education and General funds to campus in our funding environment, as is the success of faculty in securing extramural funding. Revenue directly follows increases and decreases in these parameters. Private giving is an increasingly important element of our overall funding, and desirable programs of excellence are attractive to these funds.

As we engage conversation in the University about a re-engineered base budget allocation model, the notion of identifying mechanisms to prioritize faculty compensation increases will be prominent. Meaningful progress will require the combination of central and local administrative actions. Because of the diverse nature of units on campus, one approach will not "fit all". It will be our challenge to identify a range of approaches that are different and yet equitable. Some possibilities include: (a) cost savings that academic and administrative units realize, while maintaining/increasing productivity be directly returned into the unit's salaries, thereby providing incentive for local commitment and action; (b) lower the fractional FTE paid by state funds for a given faculty member,

coupled with an increased salary rate, provides a potential mechanism for an individual who garners extramural resources to generate a higher salary; and (c) unit resource reallocation.

Working together, we fully anticipate that we will make meaningful progress with faculty salaries. It certainly is an important matter.

Sincerely,

Timothy P. White  
Provost & Executive Vice President  
Administration

Robert M. Specter  
Vice President for Finance &

c: President's Cabinet  
Academic Deans