

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 2001 Minutes

**This file is 49 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.**

- [October 4, 2001](#)
- [June 7, 2001](#)
- [May 3, 2001](#)
- [April 5, 2001](#)
- [March 1, 2001](#)
- [February 1, 2001](#)
- [January 11, 2001](#)

| [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](#) » [2001 Minutes](#) » October 4, 2001

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2001 No. 568

October 4, 2001

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Henry Sayre on October 4, 2001, at 3:04 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center. There were no corrections to the minutes of June 2001.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Category I - Nuclear Engineering Rename; Statement of Support regarding September 11 events; and Installation of Faculty Senate President [Motion 01-568-01 through 02]
- Discussion Items: Proposed Bylaws Revisions and Student Evaluation of Teaching Forms
- Committee Reports: Bylaws and Nominations Committee
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Barker, J. McGuire; Bruce, G. Beach; Cardinal, J. Yun; Franklin, M. Douglas; Gomez, P. Miles; Harter, M. Hoffman; Krause, M. Olaya; Murphy, D. Jimmerson; and S. Shaw, S. Henderson.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Ahearn, Ahern, Baggott, Balz, Bliss, Bowman, Braker, Brooks, Burt, Burton, Tolar Burton, Cluskey, Collier, Cornelius, Davis-White Eyes, De Carolis, Deschesne, Douglas, Downing, Esbensen, Flahive, Gonzales-Berry, Gross, Haggart, Hamm, Horne, W. Huber, Jones, King, Mundt, Nelson, Obermiller, Pearson, Pegau, Plant, Reyes, Schuster, Selker, D. Shaw, Smythe, Stang, Trehu, Wallace, Warner, Weber, and Winner.

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

H. Sayre, President; N. Rosenberger, President-Elect; G. Matzke, Immediate Past President; Ex-officio - J. Lundy; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

S. Francis, B. McCaughan, P. McMillen, R. William, and K. Williamson.

---

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **Category 1 Proposal - Nuclear Engineering**

Mike Quinn, Curriculum Council Chair, presented an abbreviated Category I Proposal to rename the Department of Nuclear Engineering to the Department of Nuclear Engineering and Radiation Health Physics.

Quinn offered the following rationale for the name change:

1. Since they offer PH. D., M.S., and B.S. degrees in both Nuclear Engineering and Radiation Health Physics, the rename would more accurately reflect the existing academic and research programs;
2. Since there are only four departments nationwide that offer the same degrees in both disciplines, it will give visibility to the department which, in turn, they hope will assist in recruiting students.

Liaison was accomplished with both Public Health and Physics and neither department had any objections to the proposal.

Motion 01-568-01 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

### **Statement of Support**

President-elect Nancy Rosenberger presented for approval by the Senate the following statement of support in response to events occurring on September 11, 2001:

*We the faculty at OSU grieve at the cruel and senseless loss of innocent lives following the recent terrorist attacks. As we face the aftermath, we reaffirm OSU's commitment to honoring diversity and to respecting all members of our community. We encourage faculty to engage students in open discussion of ideas and points of view on the local, national and global implications of this situation.*

Motion 01-568-02 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **Bylaws Revisions**

Ken Williamson, Bylaws and Nominations Committee Past Chair, presented for discussion proposed Faculty Senate Bylaws revisions (in bold below) to add the senior IFS Senator to the Executive Committee. These revisions are scheduled to be voted on at the November Senate meeting.

#### **ARTICLE VII: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Sec. 1. Membership: The Executive Committee shall consist of the Senate President, the Senate President-elect, the Immediate Past Senate President, and the Provost and Executive Vice President, or that person's designee, as an Ex-Officio member; the senior IFS Senator as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member; and six others elected from the membership of the Faculty Senate. The elected Executive Committee members shall retain their Faculty Senate seats for the remainder of their Senate terms.

#### **ARTICLE VIII: INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE**

Sec. 2. Duties. IFS Senators are the representatives of the OSU Faculty in matters that cross institutional lines. IFS Senators shall be responsible for seeking opinions of the OSU Faculty and the OSU Faculty Senate as a body. The senior IFS Senator shall serve as an Ex-Officio, nonvoting member of the Executive Committee.

Williamson explained that the revision was proposed by IFS Senators who felt it would be beneficial to have greater interaction between the IFS and Executive Committee (EC). Williamson noted that since IFS is beginning to take a much more proactive role in support of faculty during legislative sessions, they need to have a better understanding of specific issues on campus. Williamson also explained that the senior IFS Senator would be a nonvoting EC member, and would be allowed to participate in discussion only.

Senator Coakley, Science, asked for the rationale behind the nonvoting clause. Williamson indicated that the Committee had discussed this issue and determined that the IFS Senator is not elected to represent the Senate, while the EC members are elected to represent the Senate. Matzke noted that the difference between elected EC members and IFS Senators is that EC members must be elected while serving as a Faculty Senator, while IFS Senators are not required to have ever been a Faculty Senator.

Senator Niess felt it was reasonable to have the IFS person a voting member of the EC since they are representing the OSU Faculty Senate outside the University. Parliamentarian Iltis clarified that, under Parliamentary rules, the reason that an ex-officio member can vote is because they are under the authority of the organization.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, felt that the Bylaws do designate elected IFS Senators as members of the Faculty Senate.

The relationship of IFS Senators to the Faculty Senate as whole will be researched prior to the November meeting.

#### **Student Evaluation of Teaching Forms**

Ray William, Advancement of Teaching Committee (AOT) Chair, presented information and recommendations for discussion regarding possible changes in the student evaluation of teaching forms. The Committee's recommendations, are available on

the web at:

<http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/advtch.rec1001.htm>. It is anticipated that these recommendations will be presented to the Senate for approval at a later meeting.

William explained that the AOT was charged to consider adding a question about diversity to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) forms. In the process of researching this charge, the AOT researched the form itself and tried to determine if it was research-based (see criteria below). During the past year the AOT met with numerous departments and provided an opportunity for faculty to respond to a website survey regarding the SET forms. He noted that it is important to quickly make a decision regarding the direction of the evaluation forms since OSU will soon be purchasing the forms for the 2002-2003 academic year. The hope is to revise the SET forms and improve teaching through assessment.

The criteria used by the AOT to review the SET form included:

- improvement of teaching
- research-based (standard deviation with most of the responses fitting within the deviation)
- validity (the question actually answers what was intended for it to answer)
- results are used properly (the summative data are used for comparing faculty across departments, colleges, and universities and would be used for merit, promotion and tenure, and awards; the formative data would be confidential and meant to improve teaching)
- fair, accountable, and actually achieves the purpose

The AOT recommends that OSU contract course and teaching assessment with the Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington. Overall, faculty responses to the survey, as well as faculty comments in departmental meetings, indicated that the UW forms were favorable because:

1. The UW has eleven forms available that match various teaching strategies, class size, pedagogies, etc., which allows faculty to choose a form appropriate to their course.
2. The form is research-based. The UW is very flexible and encouraged adding scannable questions on the second sheet, as well as encouraging additional groups, such as team-taught courses of Extension Service, to develop questions that the UW will place on forms.

Academic Programs Vice Provost Burton requested the AOT to develop a second option which consisted of rewriting the questions on the current form (listed below) using the criteria that these questions would focus on instruction, assuming validation from other universities. AOT advisory suggested writing questions to be useful across classes, Extension Service, and Distance Ed. Since the College of Engineering is required to address outcome-based learning as part of their ABET accreditation, they are working with the Computer Center to add questions to whatever form is used.

William noted that the AOT needs assistance in wordsmithing the following scannable questions contained on the Modified OSU Form that was distributed at the meeting :

1. Instructor clearly communicated objectives.
2. Instruction was directed to objectives.
3. Instruction was clearly organized.
4. Instructor presented information in ways that helped me learn.
5. Teaching aids (visual, hands-on, sensory or technology) helped my learning.
6. Instructor related information to real life situations.
7. [Need a theory question]
8. Instructor encouraged me to think for myself.
9. Instructor was responsive to my learning needs.
10. Instructor treated me with respect.
11. I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher.
12. I rate this class and instruction as excellent.

William felt that the UW may be willing to allow OSU to use the following written questions:

1. Did this instruction stretch my thinking? Did it help me see ways to use it? (Please explain)
2. What aspects of this instruction contributed most to my learning?
3. What aspects detracted from my learning?
4. What suggestions do you have for improving this instruction?

The AOT also recommends selective evaluation which would include all faculty/instructors to encourage written comments from students. If the scannable assessment was selective, the AOT believes it would improve student response, it could be cost or information effective, and it may improve faculty use and/or interpretation.

The formative questions, or those meant to improve teaching, should be encouraged by faculty anytime they wish to improve their teaching. The issue surrounding formative questions is who should receive the responses; should they go to the department head or should they should go to a peer committee. The thinking is that if the responses go to the department head, it is already in the administrative stream. Current research and policy suggests that formative responses should remain confidential between the faculty and, perhaps, another group since they are not meant to be used for promotion and tenure, merit, or awards and are, in fact, invalid for that purpose.

In terms of frequency, the AOT recommends that OSU adopt the following policy regarding summative data, which is used for promotion and tenure and merit:

- New faculty and instructors assess all courses during the promotion and tenure window;
- Associate Professors and Sr. Instructors assess all courses two years prior to intended promotion;
- All faculty and instructors choose representative teaching activities every five years corresponding to post-tenure review; and
- All faculty and instructors be encouraged to assess specific teaching innovations as needed and invite students to provide written evaluation to improve teaching

Regarding the matter of a diversity question, the AOT discovered that it was an extremely complex issue and they could find no American university that included a diversity question on their evaluation forms. They did learn that Nana Lowell, UW Research Director for Educational Assessment, has completed an extensive "campus climate" survey that indicated the need to integrate the community, campus, and classroom functions when assessing this complex issue. Lowell has been invited to present a seminar at OSU to identify the key questions and facilitate a discussion with the Diversity Council, AOT, and others interested in creating appropriate actions or decisions. It is hoped that this seminar will result in an action plan to identify an assessment of diversity.

William then opened the floor to receive faculty comments to be used by the AOT during the next month to assist in formulating final recommendations.

Senator Landau, Science, felt that it was not a bad idea to modify the form, with a strong emphasis on instruction. He would like to see a question asking students if they read the materials and what grade they think they are getting.

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, felt that more emphasis should be placed on how much a student learns from a course.

Senator Coakley, Science, felt that rewording #1 of the new written questions was necessary.

In response to Senator Tynon, Forestry, expressing the feeling that instructors should be able to choose which questions are used, William explained that the University is now paying 3-4 cents per form and individualized forms would increase the cost.

Senator Niess, Science, stated that the AOT felt that there should be four standard questions with an additional handout containing other questions. Senator Cloughesy, Forestry, felt that questions could be customized and still use the same scan sheet.

Senator Jansen, Science, questioned the need for forms and suggested that JavaScript be used instead. William noted that Mark Merickel is currently using that method for Distance Education. Senator Thies, Science, commented that getting students to complete the form online is not easily accomplished.

President Sayre felt that the UW forms are attractive since they have a variety of choices.

Senator Thies felt that question #10 does address diversity.

Senator Doescher, Agricultural Sciences, cost and William explained that OSU currently pays 3-4 cents per form, or about \$12,000 per year, and the Milne Computer Center scans the forms for free. The UW would charge 8-13 cents per form, or about \$40,000 per year; he acknowledged that the money may not be available.

In response to Senator Helle, Liberal Arts, question if the modified form would be available online, William indicated

Senator Cloughesy, Forestry,

William - frequency

Senator Jensen noted the need to evaluate courses consistently.

Senator Brayman Hackel, Liberal Arts, questioned how this compares for promotion and tenure and merit on the summative portion.

Senator Thies felt it was helpful to have courses evaluated every term to determine trends.

Senator Coakley felt that if evaluations became optional or random, the perception will be that we don't care.

Senator Prucha, Associated, echoed Senator Coakley sentiment and noted that, if she were an undergraduate, she may never have the opportunity to evaluate an instructor if the evaluations only occurred every five years.

Senator Lee, Science, suggested a compromise of having four standard questions on every form and have other questions that instructors could choose from to use.

Immediate Past President Matzke felt that it was important for the chair to intervene as problems arise, not after five years.

Senator Oye, Associated, supported Matzke's position and noted that feedback is only useful if it is timely.

President Sayre reminded faculty that former Provost Spanier recognized that data on course evaluations was useless unless he could see consistent data.

Senator Landau felt that if there was an option to customize the form, the student will be more interested.

Senator Sorte, Agricultural Sciences, felt that timing and consistency are important and suggested changing the timing of the evaluation to be about 2/3 of the way through the term rather than at the end.

Senator Helle suggested informing students who reads the evaluations.

Senator Cloughesy felt that the cost should be the least concern.

Senator Brayman Hackel suggested making the bubble form shorter and expanding the written form.

Matzke felt that students should have access to the written forms.

Regarding the question of whom the formative data should go to, either or both the department head/chair or peer committee, Senator Landau felt that the decision should be up to the faculty member.

Matzke felt that there is no reason for anyone other than the faculty member to see the evaluation since the department heads see the numerical values.

Senator Wrolstad felt it was important for department heads to see the evaluations since this is one piece of data they have to use in evaluating the faculty member.

Senator Coakley noted that department heads would get the summative data and under promotion and tenure guidelines, only the numerical data is used.

Senator Dollar, Liberal Arts, felt that the formative data should go only to the faculty member.

Senator Jansen emphasized that the faculty member needs to see the data to use in improving their teaching.

Senator Cook, Engineering, argued that making formative data available may discourage innovation. Conversely, Senator Wrolstad felt that it would encourage innovation.

Senator Thies felt that question #10 may want to be known by the department head.

Senator Wrolstad felt that the department head has the right to know.

President Sayre didn't feel that any of the questions can be public.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Bylaws and Nominations Committee**

Gordon Matzke, Chair, outlined the nomination process for Faculty Senate President-elect and Executive Committee and Interinstitutional Faculty Senators. He encouraged faculty to send him names of potential candidates by October 8.

### **Information Items**

– Building Dedication - Social Science Hall is being renamed in honor of Gordon Gilkey. The dedication will be October 22 from 3:00-5:00 PM.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:35 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](#) » [2001 Minutes](#) » June 7, 2001

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2001 No. 567

June 7, 2001

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on June 7, 2001, at 3:04 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Henry Sayre. There were no corrections to the minutes of May 2001.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Consideration of Degree Candidates; Standing Rules Revisions - Computing Resources Committee; Category I Proposal - Bioengineering; and PEBB Motions [Motion 01-567-01 through 08]
- Special Reports: Budget and Intellectual Property Policy and Distance Education
- Committee Reports: Advancement of Teaching and Computing Resources
- New Business: Library Materials [Motion 01-567-09 through 10]

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Barker, K. Steele; Bird, C. Torset; Collins, R. Rodriguez; Doescher, S. Sharrow; McDaniel, L. Goddick; Murphy, D. McVicker; and Tiedeman, C. Langford.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Abbott, Ahearn, Ahern, Armstrong, Arp, Baggott, Beatty, Bliss, Bogley, Bontrager, Bottomley, Braker, Brooks, Bruce, Burt, Ciuffetti, Coakley, Collier, De- Carolis, Downing, Gregory, Hamm, Horne, Huddleston, Jones, P. Lee, Mundt, Pearson, Pegau, Plant, Reyes, Schuster, Schwab, Selker, Shaw, Smythe, Stang, Strik, Tesch, Thies, Trehu, Tynon, Wallace, and Winner.

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

H. Sayre, President; N. Rosenberger, President-Elect; G. Matzke, Immediate Past President; Ex-officios - T. White, J. Geddes; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff. H. Sayre, President; N. Rosenberger, President-Elect; G. Matzke, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; Ex-Officios - J. Roach and T. White; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, M. Bothwell, F. Conway, H. Egna, S. Francis, K. Krane, H. van der Mars, J. McGuire, R. Michael, J. Mills, C. Pederson, and R. Schwartz.

---

### **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 3,397 students who were candidates for 3,479 degrees which included: 2,676



Bachelors, 598 Masters, 171 Doctors and 34 Professional Doctor degrees. There were also 82 students who were candidates for two degrees.

The Class of 2001, OSU's 132nd graduating class, had 664 seniors who qualified for Academic Distinction and included 329 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50-3.69), 184 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70-3.84), and 151 'summa cum laude' gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 01-567-01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Category I Proposal - Bioengineering**

Robert Burton, Curriculum Council ex-officio, presented the Proposal for the Initiation of New Instructional Programs leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degree in Bioengineering.

Motion 01-567-03 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote.

### **PEBB Motions**

Robert Schwartz, Faculty Economic Welfare Committee member, presented three motions related to PEBB. The first two motions are endorsed by both the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the FEW&RC; the third motion is endorsed by the FEW&RC, but not by the Executive Committee. Schwartz noted that OUS has requested to pull out of PEBB, but will not be allowed to do so since the governor is in opposition; a different administration may allow this to occur in the future.

(1) The OSU Faculty Senate urges OUS to continue exploring the possibility of becoming independent from PEBB in order to obtain the best benefit package for the least cost.

Motion 01-567-04 to approve the first PEBB motion passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

(2) The OSU Faculty Senate urges the OSU administration to continue to seek ways to preserve the incentives created by the cash back options of PEBB insurance plans. Motion 01-567-05.

(3) The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University urges the OSU and OUS administrations to continue the single rate contribution to health care benefits regardless of family status. Motion 01-567-06.

Senator Delson, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, noted that she now contributes toward her health benefits, as do other faculty; cash back is not an option for all. She feels that this is an opportunity to decide what kind of community OSU wants to be in terms of allocating resources; do faculty want to create a more polarized community or take into consideration the needs of others? Schwartz responded that the FEW&RC may not disagree with subsidizing those in need, but going to tiers would create inequities. Senator Landau, Science, felt that was more important to have faculty working than to receive cash back.

Senator Gross, Liberal Arts, questioned the separation of compensation from insurance costs and asked what was meant by preserving the incentives created. Schwartz explained that the \$470 allocated for health benefits is part of the overall compensation. The FEW&RC feels that the legislature knows exactly what faculty are getting paid, and benefits are included. There is no way to think about cash back, insurance, etc., as total compensation. President Sayre noted that cash back encourages faculty to seek lower cost plans and to take better care of themselves so they continue to receive the cash back. If the cash back is not an option, all faculty will opt for the more expensive health plans.

Matzke called for the question on the second motion, which was seconded. Motion 01-567-07 to close debate on the second motion passed by voice vote.

Motion 01-567-05 to approve the second PEBB motion passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Matzke didn't see the rationale behind the third motion because the facts are not known.

Robert Michael, FEW&RC member, recommended passage of the third motion to give OSU and OUS time to study the issue. He felt that if PEBB is allowed to force OUS to accept tiers, there will be subsidies.

Senator Oye, Associated, felt it was unwise to vote for or against the motion in the absence of necessary information. He felt it should be tabled since it could have wide-reaching consequences.

Matzke called for the question on the third motion, which was seconded. Motion 01-567-08 to close debate on the second motion passed by voice vote.

Motion 01-567-08 to approve the third PEBB motion failed by hand vote with 31 in favor and 35 opposed.

Sayre felt that there may opportunities in the future to make additional recommendations.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, urged the Executive Committee to carefully convey the debate surrounding the third motion.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **Budget**

Jock Mills, Director of Government Relations, presented a prognosis as the 2001 Legislative Session comes to an end.

It appears that the legislature is in agreement to raise tuition 4% per year with an additional \$25 million in tuition revenues going into higher education funding. It also appears that an additional \$20 million above what the governor proposed may be going back to general education expenditures for higher education.

The policy option packages are shaping up as follows: Engineering, \$20 million; OSU-Cascades Campus, \$7.2 million; enrollment growth, \$17 million; small school support, \$8 million; and statewide public service programs, \$7.5 million. Mills noted that legislators want an additional \$12.5 million for the statewide program. Republicans are looking at \$19.3 million more for targeted programs: \$2.8 for Veterinary Medicine and Pharmacy; \$10 million for research; and \$6 million for campus public services. The governor is also looking for an additional \$23 million for the resource allocation model.

Mills explained that the following items are still in play - Engineering initiatives; a student proposal to use \$9 million in general funds to reduce tuition to 2.5% plus 2.5% per year, which would mean less for educational support - this would be a no win proposal; a proposal to shift \$12 million in tuition and fee waivers to the Oregon Student Assistance Commission, which would then go to private institutions; Veterinary Medicine is still vying for \$6-8 million; OUS energy costs; PEBB costs; and salary funding.

Other possible funding sources include - \$100 million from the tobacco trust fund; federal tax realignment; \$20 million in general funds resulting from President Bush's tax

cut; and a \$40 million ending fund balance.

The bad news regarding lost funding includes: \$12.7 million in salary increases from the last legislative session - legislators think that faculty are over paid; \$5.3 million eliminated from OUS central services; and \$5.4 million for inflation.

OSU capital budget priorities (bonding requirements) include: 1) Engineering, \$35 million (\$20 million already raised); 2) Snell, \$5.6 million; and 3) Linus Pauling Institute, \$1 million.

Mills felt that OSU is doing well in the legislature compared to other universities in the state, but not in the nation; however, we're not doing well compared to the successes of two years ago. He indicated that no agency, other than K-12, is benefitting from this legislative session.

Senator Landau, Science, questioned the projected total of the current service levels. Mills felt that the co-chairs budget is between \$825-835 million, while the governor is budgeting about \$813 million.

Mills estimated that the legislative session will conclude around July 4th.

## **Intellectual Property Policy and Distance Education**

President Sayre explained that this agenda item is very complex and interesting, but will not be discussed in June since many members of the committee feel that the report does not support their views. Those dissatisfied with the report have been asked to prepare a document representing their point of view and both reports will be presented in the fall.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Advancement of Teaching Committee**

Hans van der Mars, Advancement of Teaching Committee Chair, reported on ongoing efforts aimed at changing the Student Assessment of Teaching instrument. Preliminary information used in preparing the recommendations can be found on the web at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/aot.evaldraft.htm>. This website is linked to a University of Washington website that offers access to the proposed assessment forms.

van der Mars explained that the Committee was asked last spring to create a diversity question to add to the instrument and Past President Matzke also asked them to explore the possibility of creating a new evaluation instrument. A web survey regarding the usefulness of the current instrument generated lukewarm to poor responses indicating that the current form does not fulfill the need. Faculty have indicated that the questions on the instrument are not terribly useful nor does it give feedback on how to possibly improve teaching.

The goal of the Committee is to make the assessment of teaching instrument more purposeful from the institutional perspective for the purpose of tenure, promotion, and related issues, as well as to help instructors become better at teaching.

Specific objectives of the committee for this year and next include: 1) design or select a new assessment of teaching instrument and make a specific recommendation to the Executive Committee; 2) improve consistency across the campus in regard to how results of assessment of teaching are used; and 3) improve the process by which assessment is administered.

Their review of the process so far has determined that departments are using the formal bubble sheet. van der Mars commended Forestry and the University Honors College for

creating additional forms to assist in the assessment process. The current investment to print the bubble sheets is \$12,000 per year.

Activities of the Committee have included reviewing assessment instruments from various institutions around the country; discussing their findings with the Dean's Council and President's Cabinet; and meeting with about 16 departments across campus.

The University of Washington was found to have a fairly sophisticated program in place and is quite attractive since it offers several options: 1) 11 different forms for different types of classes for instructors to select from; 2) they are willing to print different forms for other campuses and currently contracts with over 30 institutions; 3) the output from the form can be separated in terms of what information goes to the department for institutional purposes and what is dedicated to professional development; and 4) the instruments have been validated and found to be fairly consistent across the board. UW is currently creating a distance learning assessment instrument as well as developing an instrument that looks at diversity beyond the classroom. van der Mars noted that the Committee could not find any instrument that addresses the question of diversity in regard to classroom assessment.

During meetings across campus, the Committee found several issues to be addressed by both the Committee and OSU administration: 1) is it necessary for every course to be assessed each time it is taught?; 2) the UW form length raised concerns since there are between 25-30 questions compared to OSU's current 12 questions; 3) who has access to the written comments? - currently OUS policy allows only written comments signed by students to be accessed by administrators, but there seems to be discrepancies among departments as to how the information is being used; will the same form be used for all units?; 4) student access to assessment results; and 5) look at options of contracting with UW for the print and scan forms, taking into account the cost analysis and realizing there would be an additional investment. van der Mars spoke with Sabah Randhawa, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, who felt that the initial estimates indicate that the increase would be well worth the effort.

The Committee hopes to make a more formal recommendation during the coming academic year to move to the flexible UW model since it is more effective and viable in dealing with assessment of teaching.

In response to Senator Langford, Liberal Arts, questioning the additional cost, van der Mars indicated the total would be about \$46,000 to evaluate every course each quarter.

### **Computing Resources Committee**

Bill Uzgalis, Computing Resources Committee Chair, presented five committee recommendations resulting, in part, from the feeling that administration made the decision to purchase Blackboard without sufficient consultation with the intended users:

- 1) Recommended development of a university impact plan to determine what purchases are needed and if the proposed purchase will meet specific needs. The Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse the plan and urge central administration and Information Services to develop such a plan. The Committee currently has an outline for a plan and hopes to further develop the plan in the coming year.
- 2) Urged the Faculty Senate to endorse the work of the Provost's Portal Implementation Committee which is intended to increase faculty participation in the Blackboard implementation.
- 3) Requested that the Faculty Senate urge Information Services to complete the mandated five-year plan and that the Computing Resources Committee monitor the plan.
- 4) Requested that their membership be increased by three teaching faculty.

5) Requested that the Faculty Senate establish a Distance and Continuing Education Committee whose charge is to discuss faculty issues related to distance and continuing education. Faculty issues include: the role and number of adjuncts; the way in which classes are integrated into regular faculty workloads; who will decide limits and by whom courses will be taught; faculty intellectual property rights, etc. Uzgalis urged faculty to become involved in these discussions.

President Sayre noted that the recommendations will be discussed by the Executive Committee and action will likely be taken in the fall. Sayre commended the Computing Resources Committee for their efforts on behalf of the faculty.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

– Annual Reports – Annual committee/council reports submitted by Faculty Senate chairs are due July 15 to allow committees/councils to fully report their activities through June 30. Annual reports will be published on the Faculty Senate web site at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/comm.htm>

– Vacancies – Please notify the Faculty Senate Office if a sabbatic or leave will prevent you from completing your term as either a Senator or Faculty Senate committee/council member. If you are gone more than one term, exclusive of summer term, a replacement is required. This information will assist the Faculty Senate in identifying a replacement

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

Provost White's report included the following items:

He expressed appreciation to the faculty for their continuing efforts at the end of the academic year. He encouraged faculty to stop to reflect on the achievements of students and all that faculty do to assist the students in achieving their goals.

College of Science – A plan was recently released to create a better future for the College of Science which includes a combination of restructuring the debt; commendation of what faculty are doing; an investment from the Provost's Office; and an opportunity to create a partnership with individuals outside the University.

Search update:

- College of Science Dean – A refined list is being developed for campus interviews in June and July; Roy Arnold is chairing the search.
- College of Health and Human Performance and Family and Consumer Science Dean – A refined search list has been developed with interviews probably in June and July; Wayne Kradjan is chairing the search.
- College of Business Dean – There are two candidates on campus the week of June 4; there will likely be an interim dean prior to the hire.
- School of Education – Leadership will be sought this summer with Wayne Haverson staying in place as chair. Kay Schaffer will chair the search committee.
- Graduate School Dean – The position will be advertised in the national press; Thayne Dutson is chairing the search.
- Vice Provost for Research – There will be an interim appointment; the search committee members have been identified; Hal Salwasser is chairing the search.

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

President Sayre spoke about the budget situation and noted that OSU actually has more money than before when tuition and the Engineering initiative are added in. However, costs have risen approximately \$14 million above the allocation. A 2.5% increase in faculty salaries, which equals about \$2.5 million, would add to this shortfall. He urged all faculty to think about the self-cannibalization situation to fund faculty salaries. An additional expense is the PEBB issue, which is about \$1.8 million. The PEBB cost does not take into account the \$4 million loss of cash-back on the OSU campus which equals about a 4% decrease in compensation. He urged faculty to think about these issues and let him or Executive Committee members know their thoughts.

On a brighter note, Sayre noted that, thanks to efforts of the Faculty Economic Welfare & Retirement Committee over the past two years, when faculty were promoted and tenured this year they received a 10% salary increase. Sayre particularly thanked Steve Davis, Faculty Economic Welfare & Retirement Committee Chair, for his leadership in helping to secure faculty salary increases.

Senator Lee, Science, questioned the reality of a financial firewall between the OSU-Cascades Campus and the main campus. Sayre indicated he was dedicated to having the \$7.2 million dedicated for the Cascades Campus stay in Bend, except for searches and the cost of evaluating faculty. He noted that the cost of searches for OSU-Cascades Campus should be borne by that campus and felt there should be no other budgetary relationship between the two campuses. He anticipated that Cascades Campus would be self-supporting with RAM and tuition.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Wrolstad, Agricultural Sciences, moved that the Faculty Senate recommend that the Valley Library implement a system requiring individuals checking out materials to indicate whether they either give or withhold permission to disclose their name and a contact to another authorized person who urgently needs to access the resource material. Motion 01-567-09 was seconded.

Heidi Brayman Hackel, Liberal Arts, suggested that the motion be referred to the Library Committee so it can be discussed with Library staff to determine if there are issues that need to be taken into consideration.

Senator Niess, Science, moved that this issue be held over until the next session; motion seconded. Motion 01-567-10 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:15 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](#) » [2001 Minutes](#) » May 3, 2001

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2001 No. 566

May 3, 2001

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on May 3, 2001, at 3:02 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Henry Sayre. There were no corrections to the minutes of April 2001.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Two Category I Proposals: Establish a new study abroad program in Tunisia and the Initiation of a New Instructional Program leading to the Degree of Bachelor of Science, Arts in Computational Physics; OSU/U of O Joint Athletic Motion; Endorsement of the Athletics Minority/Gender Equity Plans; PAC-10 Joint Athletic Recommendations; and a PEBB Resolution [Motion 01–566–01 through 13]
- Special Report: The OSU National Newspaper Study
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Caughy, N. Bryant; Deschesne, A. Midgley; McDaniel, L. Goddik; Shaw, M. Carson; and Sorte, J. Parker.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Abbott, Ahearn, Ahern, Baggott, Beatty, Bliss, Bontrager, Bowman, Braker, Brooks, Bruce, Burt, Ciuffetti, Collier, Cornelius, De Carolis, Douglas, Downing, Gregory, Hamm, Heidel, Horne, M. Huber, Jones, King, John Lee, Li, Merickel, Mundt, Sanderson, Schwab, Selker, Stang, Strik, Tesch, Trehu, Tynon, and Weber.

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

H. Sayre, President; N. Rosenberger, President-Elect; G. Matzke, Immediate Past President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; Ex-Officios - J. Roach and T. White; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

P. Broadus, S. Francis, L. Friedman, J. Lundy, R. Michael, S. Randhawa, L. Rice, R. Specter, M. Vydra, and T. White.

---

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **Category I Proposals**

Len Friedman, Curriculum Council Chair, presented two Category I proposals for approval:

- 1) Initiation of a New Instructional Program leading to the Degree of Bachelor of Science, Arts in Computational Physics

Friedman noted that this proposal had been unanimously approved by the Curriculum Council. There was no discussion. Motion 01-566-01 to approve the Computational Physics proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes

## 2) Establish a new study abroad program in Tunisia

Friedman noted that this proposal had also been unanimously approved by the Curriculum Council.

In response to a concern expressed by Senator Thies, Science, regarding student safety, Senator Krause, Liberal Arts, indicated that the State Department asserts it is a safe country to visit and Laura Rice stated there have been no challenges to either foreign students or foreign faculty.

Motion 01-566-02 to approve the Tunisia proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## OSU/U of O Joint Athletic Motion

President Sayre presented the following Joint Athletic Motion from the OSU and U of O Faculty Senates. This joint motion is aimed at emphasizing that academics come first. He noted that the following motion was passed unanimously by the University of Oregon Faculty Senate on April 14.

*The growth of intercollegiate athletics has made the scheduling of athletic events more complex, and conflicts with the academic calendar have increased. A recent scheduling decision causes special concern: the Civil War game for 2001 has been scheduled for the Saturday before Fall final exams. We should not lose sight of the principle that the academic needs of our athletes and other students are always our top priority.*

*The combined University Senates of UO and OSU therefore make the following recommendation to our Presidents and Provosts: In the future, the academic calendar should be of paramount consideration in the scheduling of athletic events. In particular we suggest that major events should not interfere with dead week and final exams; in general we urge a heightened sensitivity to the academic calendar by the Athletic Departments of our two universities.*

Senator Landau, Science, felt that the language should be strengthened and proposed amendments to the second paragraph, which were seconded, to delete "a heightened sensitivity to the academic calendar by the Athletic Departments of our two universities" and replace it with "that the Athletics Advisory Board be involved in any change to the athletic calendar that significantly impacts the academic calendar." Motion 01-566-04 to approve the above amendment passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

After the point was made that the amendment rendered this an OSU motion rather than a joint motion with the UO, the following amendments were proposed to the second paragraph by Senator Coakley, Science, and seconded: delete "combined University Senates"; replace with "OSU Faculty Senate" ; delete "of UO and"; change "make" to "makes", "Presidents" to "President" and "Provosts" to "Provost". Motion 01-566-05 to approve the above amendments passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

The second paragraph, as amended reads, "The OSU Faculty Senate therefore makes the following recommendation to our President and Provost: In the future, the academic calendar should be of paramount consideration in the scheduling of athletic events. In particular we suggest that major events should not interfere with dead week and final exams; in general we urge that the Athletics Advisory Board be involved in any change to the athletic calendar that significantly impacts the academic calendar."



Motion 01-566-03 to approve the motion, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Endorsement of the Athletics Minority/Gender Equity Plans**

President Henry Sayre presented the following endorsement regarding the Athletics Minority/Gender Equity Plans that were distributed at the April Faculty Senate meeting and sent to those not present. The plans are included in the recommendations from the recent NCAA Certification visit.

*Having reviewed the recommendations of the NCAA Certification Evaluation Team, the Oregon State University Faculty Senate endorses the proposed Athletics Minority and Gender Equity Plans.*

Motion 01-566-06 to approve the above endorsement passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

### **PAC-10 Joint Athletic Recommendations**

President Sayre introduced this item by explaining that the PAC-10 Faculty/University Senate Presidents felt that institution presidents needed the support from their faculty to slow the rapid expansion and commercialization of athletics at NCAA Division I universities. He noted that PAC-10 participation in this issue includes passage by the Arizona State Faculty Senate who met in special session earlier in the week; UO will vote in mid-May; USC has gone forward with it; the University of Arizona Senate Executive Committee endorsed it and forwarded it to their president; and other institutions are considering it. Sayre presented the following recommendations for approval:

#### *PAC-10 ATHLETICS RECOMMENDATIONS*

*Athletics at NCAA Division I universities are undergoing rapid expansion and commercialization, resulting in an "arms race" universities find increasingly difficult to control. These concerns have been summarized by Myles Brand, president of Indiana University, in an article in the NCAA News of March 12, portions of which are appended below. It is a common proposition in the national dialogue on this issue that meaningful reform of intercollegiate athletics must begin with the university presidents of individual athletic conferences.*

*Therefore, the faculty and university senates of the ten universities in the PAC-10 Conference join together to make the following recommendations:*

- 1. We urge the presidents of our ten universities to begin serious discussions aimed at moderating the exponential growth of athletic programs and budgets in the PAC-10. We urge them to put this topic on the agenda of their June meeting.*
- 2. Further, we urge the presidents to address recommendations made in the appended essay, "Presidents Have Cause, Means to Reduce Arms," as the basis for their discussions.*

Sayre noted he had discussed the issue with Athletic Director Mitch Barnhart who indicated it was easy for those at the top, i.e. Indiana University, to call for these reforms which makes it more difficult for those near the bottom to catch up with other institutions.

Motion 01-566-07 to approve the above recommendations passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

### **PEBB Resolution**

In introducing this item, President Sayre noted that Vice President Rob Specter had

met with Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee members and the Executive Committee and indicated that administration has been working very hard on behalf of the faculty.

Robert Michael, Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee member, outlined three PEBB issues that are of concern to the committee and presented a related motion.

Michael introduced the PEBB tiered compensation model that most of the committee opposes because they feel this plan is unfair and results in unequal amounts of benefits. Michael provided hypothetical monthly information for benefits under a tier model: an employee only would receive \$470; employee and children - \$478.19; employee and spouse/partner - \$560.69; and employee and family - \$573.49. He felt that individual benefits should not be reallocated to subsidize the benefits of others, since that would result in a pay cut to some unclassified employees.

The second concern is that of losing the current cashback which allows employees to receive the balance of their health care allocation as pay. The committee felt this was an important issue since 2,145 unclassified employees received \$986,000 in cashback during the January-March 2001 period, and the tiered system will affect the amount of cashback. Michael noted that a reduction in cashback will affect salary and, ultimately, retirement benefits.

Michael noted that VP Specter warned that benefits costs will rise significantly (possibly 24-25%) for the next benefit period.

The third issue is to encourage cessation of subsidies to HMOs. He noted that this may be a moot point since he is hearing that HMO coverage may not be an option in the next benefit period.

Michael noted that VP Specter reiterated the day prior that OUS has requested that Governor Kitzhaber allow them to withdraw from PEBB, to which Kitzhaber responded negatively. There have been discussions that OUS employees, as a whole, are a healthier group and costs could be lowered. Another discussion is that OUS unclassified employees may not be a large enough group alone to qualify for lower cost coverage, but may be large enough with the addition of students and others.

Michael presented the following motion which was created and endorsed by the Executive Committee upon recommendation of the Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee:

Whereas, PEBB's proposed tiered system of insurance coverage and elimination of cashback result in unequal benefit support for different employees based upon such personal factors as marital/partner status and family size; and

Whereas, Benefits are a form of compensation, and their decrease amounts to a decrease in compensation; and

Whereas, No unclassified employee should suffer a reduction in compensation as a result of the restructuring of benefits; and

Whereas, We would like to encourage PEBB in its efforts to de-emphasize high-cost HMOs by eliminating all subsidies previously used to provide incentives for enrollment in these HMOs; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University urges that OSU and OUS administrators continue to resist efforts to move to a tiered system;

2. That they continue to resist efforts to eliminate the cashback option;
3. That they continue to encourage cessation of subsidies to HMOs; and
4. That they continue to explore possibilities of pulling out of the PEBB system entirely.

Senator Schuster, Associated, questioned the benefit of OUS negotiating separately. VP Specter responded that, currently, OUS does not have a large voice in PEBB (one of eight PEBB Board members represents OUS). It is not clear that OUS could negotiate a better deal than PEBB currently provides due to unpredictable cost trends. There may be a possibility of creating an umbrella within PEBB for just OUS employees since OUS has a healthier population than other state agencies.

Senator Gross, Liberal Arts, questioned the advantages of the tiered system. Specter responded that, with a flat structure, the costs are higher for faculty with dependents. The benefit of tiering is to assist those at the lower end of the economic spectrum who have the highest insurance costs.

Senator Oye, Associated, asked for additional information on the HMO issue. Specter responded that PEBB has received feedback concerning widespread dissatisfaction with HMO quality of service and, since it appears that HMOs are failing, it is unclear that they can be considered stable.

Senator Bogley, Science, questioned the financial impact of the tiered system. Specter responded that the amount of money provided by the State is a zero-sum game. It depends on how the money is allocated internally which is strongly influenced by PEBB.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, noted that OHSU pulled out of PEBB and is faring better than OUS; OHSU IFS Senators recommend that OUS follow suit.

Senator Krause, Liberal Arts, questioned the position of OPEU on the tiered initiative. Specter indicated that the union position was in favor of assisting those at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder.

Senator Obermiller, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether the committee discussed the discrepancies of employees under federal appointment (i.e., Extension faculty). Michael responded that the committee did not consider that aspect.

Senator Oye expressed the sentiment that, if these proposals advantage some faculty and disadvantage others, it may make it more difficult to attract and retain faculty. He also felt that there is not enough information available to make an informed decision since it is not known what the actual differential would be or how faculty on federal appointments would be affected.

Senator Brayman Hackel, Liberal Arts, moved to divide the resolution. Motion 01-566-09 to divide the resolution was seconded and passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes.

Senator Brayman Hackel moved to accept the second and third 'Whereas' and the second and fourth 'Resolved' and asked for additional information on the remaining portions of the resolution prior to voting on them; motion 01-566-10 was seconded.

The divided motion is as follows:

Whereas, Benefits are a form of compensation, and their decrease amounts to a decrease in compensation; and

Whereas, No unclassified employee should suffer a reduction in compensation as a result of the restructuring of benefits; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University urges that OSU and OUS administrators continue to resist efforts to eliminate the cashback option; and  
2. That they continue to explore possibilities of pulling out of the PEBB system entirely.

Senator Landau spoke against the new second 'Whereas' since he didn't feel it made much sense because restructuring benefits would harm someone.

Michael noted that it was the committee's hope that the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate would take up this issue after it was passed at OSU, so it would gain institution-wide support.

Senator Delson, Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, expressed the need to look at the community in the broadest sense and help those less fortunate. Michael's response was that the FEW&RC has requested that central administration review the whole picture of faculty compensation. Michael would like to see compensation increased and a good benefit package for all. Past President Matzke stated that the faculty he needs to look out for are the ones who would be disadvantaged by a tiered plan.

Senator Oye, Associated, moved to amend the new second 'Whereas' to include the word 'significant' prior to 'reduction'; motion seconded. There was no discussion. Motion 01-566-11 to include the word 'significant' passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Robert Ittis, Liberal Arts, was troubled by the divided first 'Whereas' and made the point that if the faculty refers to cashback as a form of compensation, the legislature will look at this as a reason to not increase faculty salaries because faculty view benefits as compensation.

Senator Obermiller moved to table the divided motion for additional consideration; motion seconded. Motion 01-566-12 to table the divided motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Obermiller moved to table the remainder of the main motion; motion seconded. Motion 01-566-13 to table passed by voice vote.

### **SPECIAL REPORT**

#### **The OSU National Newspaper Study**

Mark Floyd and Robert Hood, News and Communication Services, presented the results of The OSU National Newspaper Study. Between mid-December 1999 and April 2000 they studied national news stories related to higher education in the Los Angeles Times, New York Times, USA Today, and the Oregonian. This was undertaken as an assessment tool for their department to determine how OSU is reported on the national scene. Sports stories were not included in the study.

The results showed that, of 2,472 articles related to higher education, 45% were research related; 22% came directly from national journals; 24% related to medical/health news; 16% were from expert sources; 2% were generated from new university programs; 2% related to gifts/grants/funding; 1% related to educational administration; and <1% related to honors and awards.

The breakdown on the origin of research studies was as follows: 48% were articles published in national journals; 27% were generated by reporters; 10% were lectures at major national academic conferences; 8% were university announcements; and 5% were book releases.

The ten institutions mentioned most often, and number of articles, in the national news were: UCLA, 119; Harvard, 118; UC-Berkeley, 111; USC, 104; Stanford, 84; **OSU, 83**; Columbia, 67; UO, 64; University of Pennsylvania, 57; and University of Michigan, 57. Over half of the stories from both Harvard and UC-Berkeley were research related.

The New York Times, Los Angeles Times and USA Today were analyzed when determining how OSU compared to comparable institutions. OSU ranked fourth with seven articles behind UC-Davis (20), UO (11), and North Carolina State (8). Five of the seven OSU articles came directly from research studies; two came from national journals; and two came from articles that used OSU experts. In all cases, OSU received national coverage only when associated with research studies. Hood noted that 7 of the 11 UO articles were related to Nike.

Floyd noted that, in addition to research, there are two other ways faculty can receive national publicity. He noted that, when publishing, it helps to be controversial, topical and to publish with good publishers - basically, publish what is interesting to the public. Also, he encouraged faculty to become involved in activities at the national level.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

– Fireside Chat – Dr. Risser will hold a Fireside Chat on May 23 from 3:00-4:00 in the MU Lounge.

– Undergraduate Admissions Issue Group – The Undergraduate Admissions Issue Group will present *A Symposium on Changing the Criteria for Undergraduate Admissions* on May 24 from 1:30-3:00 PM in MU 206.

– Promotion and Tenure Brownbag – The Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee is sponsoring a Promotion and Tenure Brownbag on May 9 from noon-1:00 p.m. in MU 206.

– Commencement 2001 – Commencement 2001 is scheduled for June 17th. Since this will be the first year that the undergraduate Commencement will be an afternoon event in Reser Stadium and the morning graduate Commencement will take place in the LaSells Stewart Center, there are many unknown situations and ushers are needed. To volunteer as an usher, please contact Joan Sandeno (737-4520 or Joan.Sandeno@orst.edu) and indicate your campus e-mail and/or telephone number, as well as whether you are available for the morning or afternoon ceremony, both, or as needed.

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

Provost White commended Susan Shaw and the Difference, Power and Discrimination program for bringing Morris Dees to OSU for a spectacular speaking engagement. Other comments included:

Budget – The state's budget forecast will be released on May 14. Between mid-May and mid-June there will be an opportunity for the campus to engage in budget conversations. White noted that all OUS institutions have been authorized to adjust tuition between 2% and 5%.

Promotion and Tenure – Provost White is concerned about inconsistent policies and criteria within and among units on campus and will look to the Faculty Senate to engage in earnest conversations about this issue. He will bring details to the Executive Committee. There were 82 cases considered during the week of April 23 and he hopes to be able to announce the decisions by the third week in May.

The practice has been to wait until all promotion and tenure cases in a college have been decided prior to notification of anyone in that college. Provost White's questions to the Senate were, how important this practice was to faculty and to the university and should decisions be released individually as they are known. He requested that responses be sent to him electronically.

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

President Sayre had no report.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business

Meeting was adjourned at 5:06 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](#) » [2001 Minutes](#) » April 5, 2001

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2001 No. 565

April 5, 2001

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on April 5, 2001, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Henry Sayre. There were no corrections to the minutes of February or March 2001.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Category I Proposals - Establish a new study abroad program at the University of Cantabria in Santander, Spain and eliminate the M.S. degree in Home Economics; and proposed Standing Rules changes to: Baccalaureate Core, Faculty Status, and Undergraduate Admissions Committees and Research Council [Motion 01-565-01 through 06]
- Discussion Item: Undergraduate Admissions Issue Group - V. Tolar Burton
- Special Report: Athletics - M. Barnhart, B. Frank, H. Sayre, and M. Vydra
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Delson, L. Jodice; Doescher, S. Sharrow; Gonzales-Berry, B. Frank; Johnson, L. Kristick; McDaniel, L. Goddick; Middleton, B. Avery; Murphy, D. Jimmerson; Sanchez, D. Pherrson; and Shaw, R. Thompson.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Ahern, Balz, Barker, Beatty, Bliss, Braker, Bruce, Cloughesy, Collier, DeCarolus, Downing, Erickson, Gomez, Gross, Hamm, Horne, Huddleston, Jones, King, Merickel, Mosley, Mundt, Nelson, Niess, Nishihara, Pearson, Pegau, Reyes, Sanderson, Schuster, Schwab, Selker, Shaw, Smythe, Stang, Strik, Tesch, Trehu, Tynon, Wallace, Weber, and Winner.

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

H. Sayre, President; G. Matzke, Immediate Past President; M. Beachley, Parliamentarian Pro-tem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, M. Barnhart, F. Conway, B. Frank, L. Friedman, J. Lundy, D. Trump, and M. Vydra.

---

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **Category I Proposals**

Leonard Friedman, Curriculum Council Chair, presented two Category I Proposals:

*Establish a new study abroad program at the University of Cantabria in Santander, Spain*  
- There was no discussion. Motion 01-565-01 passed by voice vote with no dissenting

votes.

*Eliminate the M.S. degree in Home Economics* - There was no discussion. Motion 01-565-02 passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

### Standing Rules Changes

Flaxen Conway, Committee on Committees Chair, presented the following proposed Standing Rules changes. All changes have been approved by both the individual committees and the Committee on Committees.

*The proposed insertions are bolded and capitalized and the proposed deletions are bracketed.*

### **Baccalaureate Core Committee**

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of seven faculty and two students. Two of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, two from the College of Science, and three from faculty in other colleges. **THE WRITING INTENSIVE CURRICULUM PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND THE DIFFERENCE, POWER, AND DISCRIMINATION PROGRAM DIRECTOR SHALL BE EX-OFFICIO, NON-VOTING MEMBERS.**

#### A. Course Selection

*(There were no changes in #1-3.)*

4. All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which [consists of the English Department's Composition and Professional Writing Coordinators, the Director of the Communication Skills Center, and the Writing Lab Coordinator, and this Board] will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals.

[5. All submissions that deal with perspectives and synthesis categories must be distributed to all college curriculum committees for possible consideration and comment before submission to the BCC.]

Motion 01-565-03 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Faculty Status Committee**

The Faculty Status Committee examines **EXISTING** policies **AND MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FACULTY SENATE FOR NEW POLICIES** regarding academic freedom, [and] tenure, appointment, **PROMOTION**, [and] termination, **AND** procedures for review and appeals, and [promotion, and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate, Executive Office, Provost's Council, and Deans and Department Heads]. [It] **THE COMMITTEE** maintains [liaison] **CONTACT** with other faculty affairs committees. **GENERALLY**, the full Committee [typically] meets quarterly; subcommittees may meet more frequently depending on the nature of issues under consideration. The Committee is composed of nine Faculty members representing [all segments of the University] **THE BROAD SPECTRUM OF FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AS IDENTIFIED IN THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS.**

Motion 01-565-04 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Research Council**

The Research Council establishes policies for matters pertaining to sponsored research activities. It promotes, stimulates, and facilitates research activity, disseminating information about availability of grant funds and procedures for applying. It assigns priorities for distribution of various internal funding programs and for external solicitations that require limited submissions from the institution. The Council consists of nine Faculty members **AND FIVE ALTERNATE FACULTY MEMBERS** who



are selected from throughout the University. The Administrator of the Research Office, or designee, shall be a non-voting, ex-officio[, non-voting,] member of the Council. The Chair shall be a Faculty member with immediate prior experience on the Council, appointed annually by the Executive Committee. **IN THE EVENT THAT A COUNCIL MEMBER IS A PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR OR CO-INVESTIGATOR OF A PROPOSAL TO BE REVIEWED BY THE COUNCIL, THE CHAIR SHALL REPLACE THE COUNCIL MEMBER WITH AN ALTERNATE AND THE ALTERNATE WILL THEN PARTICIPATE IN THE REVIEW OF ALL THE PROPOSALS BEING CONSIDERED FOR THE PARTICULAR FUNDING OPPORTUNITY.**

Motion 01-565-05 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Undergraduate Admissions Committee**

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

Motion 01-565-06 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

#### **Undergraduate Admissions Issue Group**

Vicki Tolar Burton, Undergraduate Admissions Issue Group Chair, explained the purpose and activities of the issue group.

The issue group was created in the summer of 2000 by then Vice Provost Andy Hashimoto and spent fall and winter terms becoming educated on the research literature on admissions and understanding the current process of admissions at OSU.

The Issue Group charges were:

- To review the research literature on admissions criteria;
- To review the experiences of other universities re. admissions criteria;
- To conduct research to determine if revised admission criteria will allow OSU to admit students more likely to contribute to OSU's mission, goals, and core values;
- To conduct a campus-wide review/discussion of undergraduate admissions criteria; and
- To develop policies that can be incorporated into a new model for admissions to OSU.

As a way to engage the university community in a discussion of the possibilities for changing admission criteria, the group is sponsoring *A Symposium on Changing the Criteria for Undergraduate Admissions* on May 24 from 1:30-3:00 p.m. in MU 206. Speakers have been invited from institutions that have recently instituted changes in the way they admit students. They will be discussing how their admissions criteria changed and why, what context prompted the change, what process they used, what outcomes were realized and what they learned in the process. The focus questions will include:

- Given OSU's potential for growth in enrollment, shifts in how we think about academic success, and our commitment to University goals, how should OSU change undergraduate admission criteria?
- What can we learn from the experiences of other universities that have recently changed their criteria?

The OSU community is invited to join in this symposium, learn from the speakers, and engage in the discussion of how OSU's admissions criteria might change.

Senator Esbensen, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, questioned what motivated the search for a change in criteria. Tolar Burton responded that motivation included issues of diversity as well as looking at the university goals and mission.

In response to Senator Landau, Science, questioning whether the group addressed the issue of whether OSU should be growing, Tolar Burton indicated that issue was not one of their charges.

Senator Thies, Science, thought that the group would consider PASS standards. Tolar Burton responded that they did discuss PASS, but it was unclear that all schools in Oregon will participate in PASS. They did consider tracking a group of students admitted under the PASS system.

### **SPECIAL REPORT** **Athletics**

Henry Sayre, NCAA Committee member, reported on the NCAA on-site visit. Mitch Barnhart, Athletic Director, Bob Frank, OSU Institutional Athletic Representative, and Marianne Vydra, Senior Woman Administrator, provided an Athletic Department status update.

Sayre explained that the NCAA certification team was on campus from February 19-22 to interview individuals from campus and the community and to review the self-study document prepared by the University.

The following four areas were included in the self-study and all but Equity, Welfare and Sportsmanship were found to be in substantial conformity, meaning that there were no problems which would prevent certification. Recommendations by the review team are listed below:

1) *Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance* - Recommendations:

- Put NCAA compliance in all letters of appointment for personnel
- Formalize responsibilities of Faculty Athletic Representative

2) *Academic Integrity* - Recommendation:

- Athletics' academic services should be reviewed by the Academic Advising Council

3) *Fiscal Integrity* - Recommendation:

- Include all funding sources including construction and OSU Foundation in review by Vice Provost for Finance and Administration (*NOTE: this has already been implemented*)

4) *Equity, Welfare and Sportsmanship* - Recommendations:

- Complete plans to renovate the women's crew locker room
- Institute a roster management program
- Complete a review of the student-athlete exit interview form
- Provide greater emotional and intellectual development opportunities for student-athletes
- Reorganize gender-equity plan and obtain institutional adoption
- Obtain institutional adoption of minority plan

The previously referenced Minority and Gender Equity Plans were distributed at the April Senate

meeting and will be on the May Senate agenda for endorsement.

Immediate Past President Matzke questioned if it was just a matter of money that is preventing gender equity compliance. Barnhart responded that other components include roster management, managing walk-ons, participation, and scholarships.

Sayre introduced Bob Frank as the Institutional Athletic Representative and noted that he oversees academic integrity.

Frank's report on issues related to the NCAA graduation rates included:

- The 43% graduation rate includes all students who enroll, including those who transfer prior to graduation.
- The OSU graduation rate of student-athletes who have exhausted their eligibility is about 90%. He noted that changes in coaching staffs can significantly affect graduation rates.
- The academic performance summary for student-athletes was an overall 2.89 gpa for winter 2001 which is the highest average since 1992.
- In the area of football, two-thirds who have exhausted their eligibility are on track to graduate.

Frank reported on several NCAA issues being discussed:

- The Knight report has created an impetus for increased involvement by presidents and chancellors.
- The graduation rate of mens basketball has become a focus of attention. Players will now take 6-9 credits during the summer to determine if this approach will make a difference in graduation rates.
- All sports, except basketball, would allow high school students to receive financial aid.

Frank also reported that the conference is divided as to whether student-athletes (with the exception of basketball) should be allowed to play professional sports and then participate in college sports. It is proposed that each year played as a professional would count as a year of college eligibility.

While introducing Mitch Barnhart, President Sayre indicated that the certification process was as successful as it was due to the integrity of Barnhart.

Barnhart observed that it has been an interesting year and he is proud of the accomplishments. He noted that OSU has the smallest staff in the PAC-10 and manages 505 student-athletes, including walk-ons, in 15 sports.

Barnhart mentioned these areas in particular:

1) The exemplary way in which the athletes represent OSU - Out of 29 student-athlete seniors in the sport of football, 28 are on scholarship and 23 are on track to graduate. He recounted the letter received from the Scottsdale Plaza (where the Fiesta Bowl players were lodged) stated that OSU players were the best behaved in their 13 years of hosting bowl game teams.

2) Finances:

- Football season ticket sales are up from 4,200 to 19,000.
- Beaver Athletic Scholarship Fund (BASF) - Expected to receive \$800-900,000 in unrestricted funds for a total of over \$3 million this year. The donor base has grown from 3,000 to over 7,000 members.
- Barnhart explained the financial break-down of the Fiesta Bowl. Since OSU is a member of a conference, out of the \$13 million, \$6.5 million comes to the conference and is divided among the 10 institutions in the conference. This resulted in about \$350-500,000 coming to OSU. He noted that if two teams from the same conference are in bowl games, the conference only receives one-half of the revenue.

– Significant progress is being made toward working down the facility debt. There is also the possibility of some additional sponsorships in the near future.

Barnhart mentioned the two new sports facilities currently under construction:

– The new softball complex is nearly complete.  
– The indoor practice facility will benefit seven teams which will allow quality workouts during the rainy season and result in healthier student-athletes. He noted that 15 private donors contributed \$13 million for the two facilities.

Competitiveness allows the program to move forward and be successful. Out of 15 teams last year, 8 advanced to NCAA post-season play and there is a possibility of 10-11 advancing to post-season play this year. Barnhart explained that most student-athletes compete for the love of the sport since only 220 of 505 are on full or partial scholarship.

Vydra expressed her appreciation of faculty who take the time to assist student-athletes. A task force has been formed to review and assist the Athletic Department in implementing both the Gender Equity and Minority Plans. Faculty are encouraged to contact Lynda Wolfenbarger in Athletics if they are interested in serving on the task force.

She noted that every faculty member is capable of mentoring students of color and invited faculty to do so. Students of color look to faculty for answers, caring, and understanding and Vydra challenged faculty to form a partnership with those students.

Senator Plaza, Liberal Arts, questioned how partnerships can be formed between faculty and coaches. Vydra responded that coaches have expressed concern about this issue and they are exploring ways for faculty to meet one-on-one with coaches or in an organized setting. Barnhart stated that faculty are welcome to attend the monthly head coaches meeting.

Immediate Past President Matzke expressed concern about frequent absences of softball team members, in particular. Vydra explained that the NCAA requires a minimum number of contests. She also mentioned that there is a trade-off when teams are successful, which requires additional travel. She stated that an academic person is often sent with the teams to assist with their course work. Barnhart noted that, unfortunately, with our rainy weather, it means that teams must travel quite a bit. Frank reported that there is a growing national discussion of limiting the required number of contests.

Matzke questioned the OSU Foundation, Inc. priorities that include athletics and engineering and asked what those priorities mean to the Athletic Department. Barnhart noted that the priorities were set by the Development Council and didn't know how the priorities were affecting overall fundraising. Senator Landau, Science, noted that, in better times, money from academics has helped student-athletes in the past, but he isn't aware of any fundraising money being returned to academics and questioned if it was time for that to happen. Barnhart responded that fundraising by the OSU Foundation has been very successful, but he doesn't know how the money is appropriated. He mentioned that Athletics and the Foundation have created a partnership where the Foundation will have use of the entire Valley Football Center to be used for fundraising activities during home football games beginning fall 2001. He explained that a great deal of effort is required on the part of the Athletic Department fundraising team to be successful in their fundraising efforts. He felt that donors want to see the departmental/college leadership making the contacts and it takes the head person being on the road, as he was recently for three weeks, to be successful at fundraising. Barnhart noted that there is a large, untapped donor pool out there if people are willing to take the time and effort to find them.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

– IFS, AOF, AAUP Joint Meeting - The joint meeting will be held Saturday, April 7 in the CH2M HILL Alumni Center. The meeting is scheduled between 8:00 AM and noon.

– Committee Interest Forms - The forms for University and Faculty Senate committees have been distributed and are due back in the Faculty Senate Office April 13.

- University Accreditation Recommendations - A summary of recommendations from the on-site evaluation committee conducting the University accreditation effort will be presented from 11:30- noon on April 20 in the Valley Library Rotunda, fourth floor; the meeting is open to all faculty, staff and students.
- Undergraduate Admissions Issue Group - The Issue Group will present *A Symposium on Changing the Criteria for Undergraduate Admissions* on May 24 from 1:30-3:00 PM in MU 206.
- On April 12 there will be a legislative panel in the MU Lounge beginning at 6:30 PM.

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

President Sayre reported that, due to television network accommodations, the OSU/UO Civil War football game had been changed to the Saturday prior to finals week during fall 2001. This change was reviewed by several administrators prior to finalization but no one realized that finals week would be a full week earlier than normal (the first week of December). Sayre noted that he has been in contact with the UO Faculty Senate President Jim Earl and a joint resolution will be presented to the Senate in May asking both athletic departments to pay more attention to the academic calendar.

He also reported that Earl is contacting all PAC-10 Faculty Senates with the idea of de-emphasizing college sports. Sayre suggested that it is time that faculty supported having all PAC-10 Faculty Senates recommend to their respective institutional presidents that they discuss slowing the growth of athletics. This would be a symbolic gesture on behalf of faculties. Sayre encouraged faculty to read the article by Myles Brand found on the web at: [http://www.indiana.edu/president/speeches/press\\_club.html](http://www.indiana.edu/president/speeches/press_club.html).

Senator Flahive, Science, questioned if there is any back-up plan for OUS to contribute funds to the branch campus; and if the answer is no, does OSU have a postponement or exit clause. Sayre responded that OSU money is not being spent in Bend. If the Legislature does not fund the branch campus at \$7.2 million, the branch campus cannot go forward. In response to the second question, Sayre indicated that the Chancellor understands that OSU is spending money now and he feels that OUS is liable too. The biggest issue is the lease on the building which is \$600,000 per year. There is a commitment to not damaging OSU in order to move forward in Bend.

On a budget note, Senator Sorte (Agricultural Sciences) encouraged faculty to talk with legislators regarding the budget. Sayre noted that legislators appear to respond more positively if they feel that a student issue is being discussed versus a faculty issue.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:52 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Staff*

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](#) » [2001 Minutes](#) » March 1, 2001

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2001 No. 564

March 1, 2001

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on March 1, 2001, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Henry Sayre. Approval of the February minutes was postponed until April.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Category I Proposals: establish a Ph.D. in Materials Science, rename the Department of Bioresource Engineering to Department of Bioengineering, and rename the B.S. in Biological Engineering to B.S. in Bioengineering [Motions 01–564–01 through 03]
- Special Report: Central Oregon Branch Campus, L. Johnson, and Trademark and Licensing, S. Franklin
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Bird, C. Torset; Ellinwood, D. McVicker; Krause, M. Olaya; Lee, T. Dick; Li, B. Coblentz; Pearson, J. Greenwood; Plaza, R. Thompson; Prucha, B. Rettig; and Vickers, G. Giannico.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Abbott, Ahearn, Ahern, Arp, Bliss, Bontrager, Bottomley, Braker, Burton, Cloughesy, Coakley, Collier, DeCarolis, Delson, Douglas, Downing, Gregory, Brayman Hackel, Hamm, Helle, Horne, M. Huber, Jones, Kesler, McDaniel, Mundt, Niess, Plant, Reyes, Sanchez, Schwab, Scott, Selker, Smythe, Sproul, Stang, Strik, Tesch, Trehu, and Winner.

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

H. Sayre, President; N. Rosenberger, President-Elect; Ex-Officio's: J. Roach and T. White; T. Goodnow, Parliamentarian Pro-Tem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

M. Bothwell, M. Fahrenbruch, L. Friedman, C. Hayes, L. Johnson, M. Kassner, J. McGuire, K. Peters, and R. Thiesen.

---

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **Category I Proposals**

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

*Establishment of a Ph.D. in Materials Science* – This proposal received approval from the

Curriculum Council on November 16, 2000. Motion 01-564-01 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

*Rename the Department of Bioresource Engineering to Department of Bioengineering* – This proposal received approval from the Curriculum Council on January 8, 2001. Motion 01-564-02 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

*Rename the B.S. in Biological Engineering to B.S. in Bioengineering* – This proposal received approval from the Curriculum Council on January 8, 2001. Motion 01-564-03 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **Central Oregon Branch Campus**

Linda Johnson, Director, Oregon State University - Central Oregon, reported on the status of the branch campus. Johnson noted that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education voted 10-1 on February 16 in favor of OSU sponsoring the branch campus. OSU will partner with OUS institutions to offer courses in Bend.

Several outstanding issues that need to be resolved include: a statement of collaboration with the U of O; an official name for the branch campus; the titles of the top three administrators for the branch campus; and development of an implementation plan which is due April 1.

Ground-breaking for a new OSU building on the COCC campus is expected to occur the beginning of April with occupancy scheduled for September 2002. The building will be funded through a combination of a federal grant and bonding. OSU will occupy interim facilities at COCC for the first year with the lease beginning in April 2001.

A OSU/COCC dual admission policy is being developed to ensure a smooth transition from COCC to OSU, and a recruiting brochure is being created for the branch campus. A unified tuition structure is being created for the branch campus since the State Board indicated a desire to have one tuition rate regardless of the institution offering the course.

OSU curriculum for the first biennium tentatively includes: Majors - Biological Sciences (BS); Child, Youth & Family Services (BS); Computer Science (BA/BS); Environmental Sciences (BS); General Agriculture (BS); Human Development and Family Sciences (BS); Humanities (BA/BS); Liberal Studies (BA/BS); Natural Resources (BS); and Social Science (BA/BS). Minors - Communications, Computer Science, Environmental Sciences, and Natural Resources. Graduate Programs - Nutrition and Food Management (MS); Political Science (graduate certificate); and Public Health (MPH). Many of these will require Category I approval. Partner institutions will continue offering existing degrees currently offered in Bend: U of O - Accounting, English and Discourse Studies, General Science, and Social Science; Linfield - Information Systems, International Business and Management; OIT - Information Technology; EOU - elementary and secondary education, MTE; OHSU - Nursing; and PSU - MSW in MPA and MBA.

The Governor's budget includes \$7.2 million for the branch campus, it is the number one priority in the Ways and Means Committee, and there is strong legislative support from the Central Oregon delegation.

In response to Senator Tynon, Forestry, questioning when COCC would cease to exist, Johnson indicated that it would never cease to exist. COCC will continue to offer vocational and lower division transfer courses. The branch campus will offer upper division courses, although there may be situations when OSU will offer lower division courses to support the upper division when COCC does not offer those courses.

Senator Brooks, Business, questioned if existing courses offered by partner institutions will eventually be phased out. Sayre responded that the programs currently in place will continue until the end of the cohort and then will be renegotiated between OSU and the partner institution.



Senator Tynon questioned the issue of promotion and tenure. Sayre responded that the teaching load will be six courses per year, and it is anticipated that job descriptions will need to be rewritten.

### **Trademark and Licensing Task Force**

Sandie Franklin, Trademark and Licensing Task Force Chair, and Ron Thiesen, task force member, provided a brief background on the work of the task force.

Consistent with OSU's responsibility to participate in social, economic, political and scientific issues of importance to society, OSU's Trademark Licensing Task Force was charged with examining the relationship between the University's trademark licensing policy and companies (and their contractors) that produce goods that may bear the University's logo. The goal was to provide balanced and objective recommendations to assist University administrators in advancing the University. The intent was to work expeditiously toward practical and workable solutions that are of the proper moral and ethical standard, and consequently protect the integrity and good name of the University.

The specific charges to the Task force were to examine the complex set of issues objectively and broadly and consider/include the following:

1. Characterize the current and the desired relationship between OSU trademark licensing policies and licensed-goods producers;
2. Identify all reasonable options for the University, and compare their relative advantages and disadvantages;
3. Recommend future directions that might be taken or ought be avoided by the University;
4. Recommend principles that could be incorporated into licensing agreements and/or into policies; and
5. Identify specific and workable business practices that OSU should reasonably expect from producers of university trademarked goods.

Franklin noted that the group was formed last June and spent most of the summer in fact-finding tasks. Campus involvement was encouraged through brown bags last fall and four three-hour open forums in February. Part of the fact-finding included distributing a survey which resulted in the following responses:

- 1) I have purchased merchandise that bears the OSU name or logo within the past year - 76% had
- 2) I care about how the products bearing the OSU logo or name are produced - 75% strongly agreed
- 3) I actively seek out and purchase only those products that bear the OSU name and/or logo that are made by companies that I believe to be more socially responsible - 74% disagreed
- 4) Would you be willing to pay more if you believe the items were made in a socially responsible factory - 58% responded negatively
- 5) I believe that it is the responsibility of OSU to monitor how products bearing its name are manufactured - 81% agreed
- 6) Regarding the socially responsible treatment of domestic international workers, I believe that I am... - 76% felt they were well or moderately well informed

Based on the information gathered, the Task Force offered several recommendations, with the primary recommendations following. However, Minority Reports were respectfully submitted for Recommendations 1 and 2. A third Minority Report was submitted to reflect the position of Labor on

multiple aspects of this report.

- 1) The Task Force recommends OSU adopt a Code of Conduct.
- 2) The Task Force does not recommend that OSU join a labor monitoring/verification organization at this time.
- 3) The Task Force recommends the establishment of a permanent Trademark Licensing Committee.
- 4) The Task Force recommends that the University develop a vigorous ongoing education program to educate its staff/faculty/students and constituents about the social and economic issues revolving around the manufacture of trademarked products.

Senator Brooks questioned whether University Purchasing follows the same guidelines for monitoring manufacturers. Franklin responded negatively. Vice President Specter noted that their charge was to review trademark and licensing items, although the question raises an interesting dilemma. Specter wasn't sure how a program would be managed to monitor whether all ethical norms will be met through purchasing. Sayre felt that the real task is to inform ourselves and commended the task force for helping to better inform the university community.

Senator Weber, Agricultural Sciences, questioned the next step in the process. Franklin explained that the recommendations will be forwarded to Vice President Specter. Specter indicated he and the President's Cabinet will review and discuss the recommendations and make final recommendations to President Risser.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Higher Education Rally - Justin Roach, ACES President, communicated a plea from students for faculty to attend the March 6 rally at the State Capitol and to educate their colleagues about the importance of the rally. He emphasized that, if the Governor's budget passes, higher education will lose.
- Fireside Chat - President Risser will meet with the university community on March 7 in the MU Lounge.
- Diversity Council - The organizational meeting of the recently approved Diversity Council will be March 5.
- University Accreditation - A team of evaluators will visit the campus April 18-20 as part of the 10-year accreditation. The self study draft is available on the web at: <http://osu.orst.edu/accreditation/>.

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

Provost White referenced the recent Lines Paling Centenary Celebration and, on behalf of the University, commended all those involved in the planning.

*College Transitions* - White reported that George Copa has submitted a proposal to create an identifiable, separate unit for the School of Education, rather than integrated with an existing unit. The College of Home Economics and Education Family and Consumer Science proposal is currently under deliberation. The proposal is being discussed principally, but not exclusively with the College of Health and Human Performance to determine if an intellectual basis exists for the two units to become one. White noted that the speed and carefulness exhibited in the creation of the proposals has been important and impressive and felt that all faculty should feel good about their colleagues participation in this endeavor.

*Dean Searches* - Howard Gelberg has accepted the position of Dean of Veterinary

Medicine effective July 1, 2001. Five applicants visited campus to interview for the College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences Dean position. Three applicants were identified to be interviewed for the College of Business Dean position. However, only one will actually be interviewed because one withdrew and one accepted another position.

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

In recognition of the Peace Corps' creation by President John F. Kennedy on this day in 1961, Sayre noted that OSU has 1,119 current and former Peace Corps volunteers. There are currently 51 OSU students serving in the Peace Corps. Sayre used this opportunity to remind the Senate of the importance of international education. He reported that he has asked Provost White to create a task force to consider OSU's role in international education and research and to consider how OSU might best position itself in the international arena in the new century.

Sayre emphasized that the rally on March 6 is critical and felt that faculty have been not supportive of efforts such as this. He urged faculty to join him in Salem and felt it would mean a great deal to students and OPEU if they were present.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business

Meeting was adjourned at 4:17 PM.

*Respectfully submitted:*

*Vickie Nunnemaker  
Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant*

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

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

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

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

Valid [xhtml](#).

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [2001 Minutes](#) » February 1, 2001

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2001 No. 563

February 1, 2001

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on February 1, 2001, at 3:03 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by Immediate Past President Gordon Matzke since neither the President nor President-Elect were in town. There were no corrections to the minutes of January 2001.

### Meeting Summary

– Action Items: Gilkey Resolution; Category I Proposal - Master of Public Policy; and Approval of

Parliamentarian [Motion 01–563–01 through 03]

– Special Report: Election Results - K. Williamson, Legislative Issues - J. Mills, Higher Education

Budget - M. Nelson, and OSU Accreditation - R. Burton

– Discussion Item: Research Compliance Issues

– New Business: None

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Tolar Burton, M. Dempsey; Clinton, B. Steel; Cluskey, J. Ridlington; Hardin, Z. Holmes; King, J. Down; Mosley, D. Jimmerson; and Plaza, R. Thompson.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Abbott, Arp, Beatty, Bliss, Bontrager, Braker, Bruce, Busse, Christensen, Ciuffetti, Coakley, Daniels, De Carolis, Downing, Esbensen, Freitag, Gregory, Gross, Brayman Hackel, Horne, W. Huber, Jones, Kesler, Merickel, Plant, Prucha, Sanchez, Schwab, Stang, Strik, Trehu, Westall, Winner, and Witters.

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

G. Matzke, Immediate Past President; J. Roach and T. White, Ex-Officios; T. Goodnow, Parliamentarian pro-tem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

B. Becker, M. Edwards, J. Folts, S. Francis, L. Friedman, W. Hayes, P. Lowery, K. Schaffer, K. Steele, T. Wilcox, B. Wilkins, and K. Williamson.

### ACTION ITEMS

#### Gilkey Resolution

Jim Folts provided a brief background on Gordon Gilkey and presented the following resolution to rename Social Science Hall in honor of Gilkey:

Whereas, Gordon Gilkey served for 14 years as the first Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and, subsequently, as the first Dean of the College of Liberal Arts; and

Whereas, The offices of the Faculty Senate are today located in the same Social Science Hall where Dr. Gilkey worked for so many years; and

Whereas, No other single person is so identified with and responsible for the emergence of strong programs in the arts, humanities, and social sciences at Oregon State University, resulting in OSU becoming a truly comprehensive university; and

Whereas, We wish to recognize and honor his many contributions to OSU, the State of Oregon, and the people of the world during a distinguished career as an artist, art collector, educator, military officer, administrator, and philanthropist; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University enthusiastically joins the College of Liberal Arts and OSU Central Administration in the decision to rename Social Science Hall in honor of Gordon Gilkey, so that it may subsequently be known as Gilkey Hall.

Motion 01-563-01 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Category I - Master of Public Policy**

Leonard Friedman, Curriculum Council Chair, presented a Category I proposal for the initiation of a new instructional program leading to the Master of Public Policy and noted that the Curriculum Council recommended approval. This program would involve the departments of Economics, Political Science and Sociology. Motion 01-563-02 to approve the Category I passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Approval of Parliamentarian**

Motion 01-563-03 to approve Robert Iltis as Faculty Senate Parliamentarian passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

#### **Research Compliance Issues**

Toby Hayes, Peggy Lowery and Anthony Wilcox of the Research Compliance Executive Committee discussed research compliance issues.

Hayes began by noting that the University had grown lethargic in areas of safety and compliance several years ago. Positive changes began occurring under the leadership of Mary Nunn and continued with the arrival of Peggy Lowery who constituted an oversight committee of various safety groups to review compliance efforts.

There is a federal mandate that training programs on instruction in the responsible conduct of research be in place and implemented by October 2003 for every person participating in a Public Health Service (PHS) funded project. A group has spent the last six months putting together a summary for training. The effort is now at the point of engaging faculty to accomplish the required training. Hayes has recently spoken with the Deans about this effort.

Wilcox presented a summary of PHS policies which states that all research staff working on PHS-supported projects '...shall complete a basic program of instruction in the responsible conduct of research...' The policy consists of eleven core instructional areas and an OSU committee will determine what training will be

received by whom. The action steps include forming sub-committees to determine necessary training and those receiving the training in each of the eleven identified areas: data acquisition, management, sharing and ownership; mentor/ trainee responsibilities; publication practices and responsible authorship; peer review; collaborative science; human subjects; research involving animals; research misconduct; conflict of interest and commitment; environmental health and safety; and fiscal responsibility. The institution must have developed written documentation of the program of instruction and implemented the program by October 2001.

Hayes explained that the goal is to have the sub-committees formed by February 15 and begin work in early March. Faculty interested in serving on the sub-committees should contact Hayes.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **Higher Education Budget**

Mark Nelson, Association of Oregon Faculties Lobbyist, discussed contents of the document 'Highlights of 2001-2003 Governor's Budget Recommendations for the Oregon University System'.

The OUS general fund amount budgeted for the current biennium is \$754 million and OUS proposed the current service level budget for the coming biennium at \$805 million. However, Governor Kitzhaber reduced the budget to \$709 million, which is a 12% reduction from the proposed current service level budget. The reductions include no roll-up funding for OUS salary increases, as well as those directly affecting OSU including \$14.3 million in Statewide Public Services.

Higher Education items included in the Governor's \$53.5 million add backs for selected policy packages include: \$20 million for engineering enhancements, \$17 million for anticipated enrollment growth and \$7.2 million to initiate the branch campus in Bend.

Students initially agreed with the State Board to a 2%+2% per annum tuition increase, but the Governor recommends a 4%+4% per annum increase. Under the Governor's proposed increase, students will pay an additional \$25.2 million in tuition that will go to support other state agencies - not higher education. Students appear willing to pay higher tuition (between 2% and 4% per annum), but they want the money to remain in the state system.

Nelson noted that OUS created the new budget model at the Governor's request and told him that it would cost additional money, which is not being budgeted.

Nelson believes that the following resources are available to restore the \$96 million reduction: \$1.4 billion in new general fund money this biennium; \$350 million in tobacco settlement dollars not yet allocated; and \$80 million in additional fees to supplant general fund dollars.

The Ways and Means Co-chairs Budget recently restored \$29 million of the \$96 million, with a promise that additional funding will be restored.

Nelson felt that OSU has taken a disproportionate cut in the model when the Statewides and Veterinary Medicine are factored in.

Nelson reported that he is meeting on every OUS campus with members of the higher education network and noted that never has a higher ed coalition worked together as well as this one. A higher education rally will be held on March 6 at the Capitol and he requested help from faculty to energize the campuses and create a presence.

In response to Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, questioning if the budget will pit higher ed against K-12, Nelson hoped not. Nelson noted that there is a question of whether

the K-12 budget is inflated, but felt that it will pass as proposed.

Nelson believes that there is support for higher education in the Legislature and encouraged faculty to contact him with questions.

### **Faculty Senate Election Results**

Ken Williamson, Ballot Counting Chair, reported that Nancy Rosenberger had been elected President-Elect and Jim Lundy had been elected Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator.

### **Legislative Issues**

Jock Mills, OSU Director of Government Relations, reported on legislative issues related to higher education.

Mills receives a summary of every bill introduced to the legislature. In particular, he tracks bills, which:

- 1) have a direct impact on OSU;
- 2) have an impact on students or constituents; or
- 3) have an impact on people who might have an impact on higher education.

Many of these bills may be accessed from his Website at <http://osu.orst.edu/government/measure.html>. Mills sends out a weekly report to deans and cabinet members and is relying on those receiving the report to disseminate it to faculty members who may be affected.

He noted that faculty representation at the March 6 capitol rally would be helpful. OSU's goal is to have 1,400 staff, faculty and students present.

The State Board meets at OSU on February 15 and 16 for the monthly Board meeting. The full Board will render a decision on the Central Oregon campus and discuss the governor's budget on February 16.

Mills suggested that there is a lot of money in the proposed K-12 budget and noted that the Legislature has mentioned a possible overstatement in that budget.

He noted that there are five legislative priorities:

- 1) Return to the \$96 million funding level from the last biennium;
- 2) ensure that the governor's proposed \$20 million for engineering stays at that level, or increases, to achieve the intent of doubling the number of engineering graduates and creating a top tier institution;
- 3) recover \$12.8-\$17 million cut to Statewide services;
- 4) that OSU receives the majority of the \$10 million in state funds going into research; and
- 5) retain the proposed \$7.2 million for Central Oregon.

The proposed budget contains three specific OSU hits:

- 1) Statewides, 2) research, and 3) Veterinary Medicine and Pharmacy which consists of a \$2.8 million reduction in funding.

Nelson doesn't see the Central Oregon branch campus funding package becoming a legislative issue, other than making sure it stays in the budget.

In a partisan matter related to OSU, although disputed, it appears to Republicans that the student vote was responsible for losing a Republican election and the perception is having an affect on Republican relationships.

### **OSU Accreditation**

Robert Burton, Accreditation Steering Committee Chair, spoke about the accreditation process. The on-site evaluation will occur April 18-20 and he advised faculty that the team members could drop in on faculty or stop anyone at random and ask if they are familiar with the process.

Factors that are dependent upon accreditation include: student aid, which is important to recruitment and retention; transfer of credits; federal grant support; and protection of OSU's reputation.

A draft report of the self study can be viewed on-line at <http://osu.orst.edu//accreditation>. He noted that all academic departments are mentioned in Standard 2, Educational Programs and Effectiveness. Since accreditation requires that everyone is informed of the process and has a chance for input, both on and off campus, Burton urged Senators to check the Website to determine if the material for their unit is accurate.

Senator Tiedeman, Liberal Arts, questioned if accreditation could be withheld based on funding. Burton didn't feel that funding would be an issue.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Faculty Awards Deadline - February 5 is the nomination deadline for the OSU Distinguished Service Award; March 1 is the nomination deadline for other awards determined by the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee. Award criteria is available at: <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/indiv.awards.htm>.
- Joint Meeting - The joint AAUP, AOF, IFS meeting will be held April 7 from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the CH2M HILL Alumni Center.

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

Provost White noted that there is a possibility that the February State Board meeting could be compressed to just February 16.

Budget - There is a great deal of behind-the-scenes work being done to improve the higher education budget, but he noted that expectations must be realistic.

OSU Distinguished Professor Award - Since the award criteria and selection process is currently under review, the call for nominations has been delayed. There is strong support for a revised, less onerous nomination process. White noted that emerging patterns show a disproportionality in recipients and disciplines which resulted in questioning whether there was a systemic flaw in the nomination and/or selection process. He cautioned faculty to not interpret the current review to mean that prior recipients have not been deserving. Matzke noted there was a concern that recipients were from only a very few colleges.

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

Past President Matzke again reminded Provost White of the need for an Issue Group on Professional Faculty.

The organizational meeting of the Diversity Council will occur on March 5 from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in the MU LaRaza Room. He noted that this is the next step in the promotion of diversity.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.



Meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

*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](#) » [2001 Minutes](#) » January 11, 2001

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2001 No. 562

January 11, 2001

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on January 11, 2001, at 3:00 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Gordon Matzke. There were no corrections to the minutes of December 2000.

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Install Elected Officials
- Discussion Item: OSU Focus Areas for Research and Scholarship and Graduate Admissions Task Force
- Committee Report: Administrative Appointments Committee – Sense of the Senate: Semester Conversion
- New Business: None

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Plaza, R. Thompson.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Ahearn, Bliss, Braker, Bruce, Burt, Burton, Cloughesy, Coakley, Collier, Cook, Daniels, De Carolis, Downing, Esbensen, Gomez, Gregory, Hamm, Helle, Horne, M. Huber, W. Huber, Jones, King, John Lee, Merickel, Mosley, Mundt, Oye, Plant, Reyes, Rielly, Sanchez, Schwab, Stang, Strik, Trehu, and Witters.

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

H. Sayre, President; G. Matzke, Immediate Past President; T. White, Ex-Officio; T. Goodnow, Parliamentarian Pro-Tem; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

T. Hayes, B. Lunch, N. Rosenberger, M. Sandlin, and K. Williamson.

### **ACTION ITEM**

#### **Install Elected Officials**

In his final address as Faculty Senate President, Gordon Matzke remarked that there are many issues that Senators should be raising to the attention of administration. As an example, after serving for two years on the Athletics Advisory Board, he feels that Athletics is now a well-run program, but reminded Senators that this is not always the case and they should be vigilant in this and other areas. He is concerned about a de-emphasis on international activities and encouraged Senators to ensure that this continues to be an important component of the university in the future, or OSU will not be top tier. He then turned to Provost White, and presented him with 'money' circulated during the last election which was imprinted with 'This note represents insufficient funds

in my family budget' as a way of encouraging the university to be watchful regarding salary issues. To President-Elect Sayre, he presented a notebook he had recently emptied that had contained semester conversion materials because he felt that he would never need that information again. Since the semester conversion issue is again being discussed, he cautioned Sayre to never get so far in front of the faculty on issues that they can't support your stand. He also reminded the Provost of the ongoing need to appoint a Professional Faculty Issue Group and address their concerns.

President Matzke then declared Henry Sayre installed as the Faculty Senate President. Sayre presented Matzke with a Myrtlewood plaque on behalf of the Senate that contained a quote summarizing his time in office:

Gordon Matzke  
Oregon State University  
Faculty Senate President  
2000  
Given in appreciation for his leadership  
and dedicated service to the faculty of  
Oregon State University.  
*"Hurry up, please, it's time!"* – T.S. Eliot

Sayre then installed Executive Committee members Dan Arp, Paul Doescher and Mary Prucha. Newly elected Senators were asked to stand and were declared installed: *Agricultural Sciences* – Peter Bottomley, Laurel Busse, Neil Christensen, Herb Huddleston, Judith Li, Christopher Mundt, John Selker, Bruce Sorte, and Bruce Weber; *Associated* – Barbara Balz, Beth Barker, Gigi Bruce, Sandie Franklin, David Shaw and Carol Spinney; *Business* – Ray Brooks; *Engineering* – Susan Ellinwood, Wayne Huber, Jan Mosley, Pete Nelson, Jose Reyes, and Alan Wallace; *Extension* – ; *Forestry* – Debbie Bird and Greg Filip; *Health & Human Performance* – Charley Fisher and Rod Harter; *Home Economics and Education* – Sally Bowman and Karin Hardin; *Information Services* – Loretta Rielly; *Liberal Arts* – Kerry Ahearn, Natalie Dollar, Erlinda Gonzales-Berry, Heidi Brayman Hackel, Anita Helle, Juan Trujillo and Gregg Walker; *Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences* – Irma Delson and Scott Pegau; *Science* – Don Armstrong, Bill Bogley, Robert Burton, Stella Coakley, Dianne Erickson, Mary Flahive, Henri Jansen, Julia Jones, George Pearson and Bob Smythe; *Student Affairs* – Allison Davis-White Eyes, Kristie Deschesne and Rebecca Sanderson; and *Veterinary Medicine* – Michael Huber. The President-Elect and IFS Senator were not installed since the balloting for that election has not yet been concluded.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Graduate Admissions Task Force**

John Westall, Graduate Admissions Task Force Chair, discussed the re-engineering of graduate admissions at OSU. He noted that the task force resulted from the 1999 review of the Graduate School and was commissioned jointly by the Graduate School and the Office of Admissions.

The charge is to analyze graduate admissions practices with respect to efficiency and effectiveness in making academic units meet their recruitment goals; identify campus concerns; and provide specific recommendations regarding re-engineering the graduate admissions process at OSU with the goals of increasing efficiency for applicants, academic units and university administration and increasing the effectiveness of academic units in meeting their recruitment goals. He noted that the charge does not include reviewing the goals that units set for themselves nor marketing strategies. The real goal is to provide a graduate admissions procedure that gives OSU an advantage of attracting top-tier graduate students.

Members of the task force include: Chris Bell, Irma Delson, Maggie Niess, Bruce Rettig, Valerie Rosenberg, Michele Sandlin, and Andy Young.

The task force expects to present their recommendations on March 1, 2001 with a tentative implementation date of October 2001.

The following have been identified as the most significant problems in the current

process:

- 1) Diversity of departments dictates that individual units should have separate admission procedures, but efficiency and central processing dictates that one standard process be used.
- 2) Delays in processing applications during the peak season (January-March).
- 3) Delays in the appeal process.
- 4) Materials lost, misplaced or marooned between the Admissions Office, Graduate School, and departments.
- 5) Candidates receive incomplete or conflicting information and must deal with more than one entity.
- 6) Applications received without a fee - in particular, international applications.

The task force has developed both guidelines to be used during the review of the process and questions for departments and students. This information was outlined in a handout distributed at the Senate meeting.

Senator Landau, Science, questioned if the task force has considered whether the application fee should go to the department. Westall responded that they feel that an increase or decrease in workload centrally should have a corresponding funding increase or decrease. He speculated that the possibility of additional funding for central services might be greater than for departments.

Senator Doescher, Agricultural Sciences, referred to the gpa standard and noted that some students don't have gpa's. Maggie Niess, Graduate Admissions Committee Chair, responded that the committee doesn't feel it is their responsibility to read the transcripts and suggested that perhaps it should be the responsibility of the departments.

In response to Senator Thies, Science, mentioning provisional admits, Niess stated that if departments would apply a provisional admit and monitor the student, the committee could avoid a conditional admit.

In closing, Westall noted that some questions yet to be answered include how much authority should be moved to the departments and how much responsibility do the departments want to assume.

### **OSU Focus Areas for Research and Scholarship**

Toby Hayes, Vice Provost of Research, discussed the five major fund-raising areas and how they were arrived at. He noted that fund-raising initiatives are generally determined by the University Development Council and passed to the OSU Foundation.

The following five areas have been identified (although the Faculty Senate Executive Committee informed him that this is not how most faculty perceive the campus priorities): high tech and engineering; natural resources and the environment; health; education and training; and arts, humanities and science. He felt that the identified areas covered most of the university. He noted that, although untrue, the health priority has been deemed by some to mean that there is some sort of favoritism being exerted by Provost White and Hayes since their background is in health related areas. While in the process of transitioning to the new model to identify target areas, departments were asked for ideas regarding fund-raising.

Hayes felt that real progress has been made in the area of communication between central administration and deans, although more work in the area of communication is needed with the faculty-at-large.

It has been announced that Hayes will soon be leaving his position and he expressed thanks at the enormous amount he has learned in his current position.

In response to Senator Landau questioning who sits on the University Development Council, Hayes indicated that the group includes Vice President for University Advancement Orcilia Zuniga-Forbes, Deans Kay Schaffer and Ron Adams, Provost White, OSU Foundation President Becky Cole, Vice President for Finance and Administration Rob Specter, President Risser, Athletic Director Mitch Barnhart. and Hayes. Landau expressed

the need for more faculty input in the decision process.

Immediate Past Senate President Matzke questioned whether the group considered the use of particular words or phrases being used, such as tier-one initiative, which is not respective of particular colleges. Hayes responded that the process was not thoughtful or inclusive, it was simply a matter of organizing a peer review process.

Senator Pegau, Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, expressed concern that some colleges have been shut out of general fund-raising issues and asked Hayes to identify how the colleges were represented. Hayes responded that representation occurs 1) in the fund-raising proposals submitted - the vision and funding opportunities presented, and 2) through increased communication between the deans and President's Cabinet during monthly joint meetings.

Senator Tolar Burton, Liberal Arts, felt there was a profound sense of loss in certain fund-raising areas due to restrictions affecting what individual departments can do in the fund-raising area and how the departments can interact with potential donors in the community. She suggested that the University Development Council determine what the cost has been to departments in the transition to the new fund-raising model. Hayes felt this was a good suggestion.

In response to Senator Westall questioning whether the identified areas could be applied to several colleges, Hayes responded that the five areas were not college specific. The titles were meant to span across colleges and be more broadly focused.

Senator Shaw, Liberal Arts, noted the inability to be responsive to items that did not make the identified short list and expressed the need for ways to address opportunities as they arise. Hayes agreed that the process should be more responsive, but recognized the need for a balance between entrepreneurial activities and organization. He admitted that some of the entrepreneurial engagement has been lost in the process, and a way needs to be identified to regain that ability while still being efficient to the university.

Ken Williamson, Engineering, felt that the process was extremely hierarchical and no one has trust in that type of system. Hayes addressed an additional difficulty involving timing of requests since the priorities are determined in November and there needs to be a way to respond to opportunities mid-cycle.

Senator Tesch, Forestry, felt there were also problems with the RFP process that need to be addressed. Hayes responded that they are trying to do the very best and create new parameters, but acknowledged that the process could be streamlined so that faculty aren't required to participate in useless activity.

Senator Landau commented that the council perhaps has an impossible job determining which areas are marketable that may be quite different from areas which actually have the potential for raising funds. Hayes acknowledged that direct input from faculty is missing. He also mentioned that priorities are determined, in part, by units that have a plan and are ready for implementation.

## **COMMITTEE REPORT**

### **Administrative Appointments Committee**

Fred Obermiller, Administrative Appointments Committee chair, reported on the purpose of the committee and which searches are in progress.

He explained that the primary purpose of the committee is to represent faculty interests on selected administrative searches, which has resulted in the committee being very active this year.

Searches are currently progressing for the following positions: Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; the Deans of Business, Health and Human Performance, Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, Science, Veterinary Medicine and the Graduate School; and the Vice Provost for Research.

Obermiller reported that more responsibility is being given to Gigi Bruce in Academic Affairs to administer searches.

Obermiller suggested that, if OSU continues to have numerous high level searches, the committee composition should be increased to at least 12 and select only those who actually have the time to serve since it is an extremely time-consuming process.

## **SENSE OF THE SENATE**

### **Semester Conversion**

President Sayre explained that semester conversion is being discussed within OUS and will be discussed during the February Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting. This was an opportunity for OSU faculty to send a message to IFS.

From the ensuing discussion, it appeared as though most faculty who had participated in the process in the late 1980's were adamantly opposed to going through the extremely labor intensive process again. Many who had come from semester institutions were in favor of the semester system. One faculty member expressed a preference for the semester system, but was opposed to repeating the process to get there.

Following are some of the comments and concerns raised during the discussion:

The previous proposal did not even consider beginning class at the end of September and having exams after the winter break. Instead, the legislature was in favor of beginning in late August and allowing students to begin attending class 3-4 weeks late following the end of the forest fire and crop seasons.

The semester system can be advantageous to students competing for job openings in May.

Faculty can cover more material, and in more depth, in a semester class. Some aspects of teaching may be enhanced.

Although opposed to semester conversion, it is hoped that a body of knowledge exists from a decade ago that will facilitate the process if it becomes necessary to participate in the exercise.

For faculty in units having significant research and teaching obligations (i.e., Forestry), the opportunity to take off one quarter for research is very popular, but it's very difficult to take off an entire semester.

Since most academic institutions are on the semester system, OSU should be able to learn from those who went through a conversion process.

Noting that those who went through the failed process would likely have very little energy to repeat the exercise, it would be imperative to identify very substantial reasons for the conversion.

President Sayre summarized the termination of the previous process by noting that, due to strongly voiced agricultural concerns, the legislature felt that agricultural interests needed students as a labor force.

Advanced graduate courses benefit from a semester system with a greater assortment of courses and allows for more in-depth teaching.

One Senator polled his department and found that most faculty preferred the quarter system because courses could be covered with a real intensity and that students could select from a much broader array of courses. Faculty felt that the semester system locked students into courses and they tend to lose energy for the subject when courses are longer in length.

In response to the question of what is driving the semester conversion discussion, Sayre

felt that money was the driving force. He believed that faculty would have to be convinced that significant savings would be realized before semester conversion could occur.

Conversion is awful and the best system is the one that OSU currently uses. The change is very expensive. If faculty want more in-depth courses, there are other quarter system institutions that have five credit courses.

One expressed support for the conversion, but doesn't agree with the savings rationale as it applies to paper and printing.

Another expressed the feeling that it was offensive to ask faculty to participate in a lengthy conversion process given the state of the university (decreasing budgets, increasing enrollment), the number of dean vacancies, as well as low faculty salaries.

President Sayre invited Senators to follow-up this discussion with e-mails to IFS Senators Bruce Sorte and Gary Tiedeman.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

Faculty Senate Calendar – Faculty Senate meetings are scheduled as follows in 2001: February 1, March 1, April 5, May 3, June 7, October 4, November 1 and December 6.

Faculty Senate Elections – Ballots for Faculty Senate President-Elect and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator are due in the Faculty Senate Office no later than 5:00 p.m. January 17.

Graduate Admissions Task Force Open Meetings – Open meetings for all faculty and graduate students will be held January 16 and 17.

OSU CONNECT 2001 – OSU CONNECT request for proposals and program draft are available from Jennifer Kuzepa at 737-0582.

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

Provost White's report included the following items:

*Accolades* - Since Provost White was unable to participate in the New Senator Orientation immediately preceding the Senate meeting, he noted how important it was to have faculty who were willing to take on an added Senate responsibility and thanked them for their willingness. He acknowledged the importance of the relationship between the Senate and himself and mentioned the value of hearing conversations such as the one related to semester conversion. He encouraged new Senators to become active in the Senate and in Senate committees.

White thanked Immediate Past President Matzke for his contributions to the university, among them, an unbounded clarity of thinking to the core values and to the core principles, as well as clarity of expressions. Matzke has unbounded enthusiasm about everything that is right at OSU and university life and incredible insights about diversity.

White recently attended an event in honor of Gordon Gilkey and commended the College of Liberal Arts and, in particular, Doug Russell for their efforts to provide an insight of this individual.

*Budget* - In response to the serious budget issues facing OSU, 38 university leaders recently met and tried to determine a common understanding of what we're facing and an effective way to move forward. The governor's draft budget calls for a \$40 million cut for higher education during the next biennium which translates to 14% of the current general fund. Of the \$40 million, \$23 million is from the main campus budgets and \$17

million is from statewide services. Add-backs include 3% for growth (about \$10 million) and \$7.3 for engineering initiatives. On the tuition side, institutions are authorized by the governor to consider tuition increases. Provost White felt that maintaining quality and access is very important.

OSU was asked by the Chancellor to prepare a report to outline how the proposed budget cut would be dealt with. White reported that OSU chose not to comply because it was felt that a response now was very premature and would be very irresponsible given that it's likely that the final budget will be altered from the proposal. In addition, since we're in the midst of recruiting students, it would not benefit the institution to have a premature document indicating that specific programs may be eliminated. The document submitted was generic in nature and deals with general implications for OSU. It also suggests that due to successes in research, because of the unique statewide programs, and because of recent growth, OSU is being disproportionately affected by the governor's proposal. Additionally, OSU has two professional schools that are being targeted for base budget adjustments.

He noted that administration and faculty will continue to work through the budget crisis. He felt that it's necessary to fundamentally rethink about how the university is operated, particularly in terms of economic savings or intellectual efficiencies, to determine if there are ways to be successful without being so reliant on the state or public, and to explore possible alternate funding sources.

*Central Oregon* - The Chancellor's Office is in the merit analysis stage. They are preparing a side-by-side comparison of the two proposals. The Chancellor's recommendation will probably be made by the end of January, but no later than early February.

Senator Ciuffetti, Agricultural Sciences, commented that, given the desperate situation with the higher education budget, it's difficult to hear about the money being allocated for Central Oregon. White responded that the money will be allocated for a campus and OSU has decided that it wants to administer that campus and reap the benefits. The reality is that political power and the governor want the Central Oregon initiative to happen.

Senator Selker, Agricultural Sciences, felt that Oregonians have a misconception of what is happening at OSU and higher education in general. In regard to White's suggestion of weaning higher education from state support, Selker felt that this would result in much higher tuition and much lower enrollment. White felt that Selker's comments were valid and explained that they are trying to create a response and mechanism on campus that will be as successful as possible during the legislative session. Rather than complaining about the budget, it is important to be thoughtful in determining how the situation is communicated to the public.

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

President Sayre's report included the following items:

He explained that Robert Iltis has a class conflict during winter term and thanked Trischa Goodnow for serving as Parliamentarian Pro-Tem.

Sayre noted that, due to the favorable relationship with administration, faculty are involved in the budget discussions from the very beginning. He noted that the situation is particularly critical in the state-wide units and urged faculty to be cognizant of the crisis situation that colleagues in those units are facing. He felt that the rhetoric heard on the 6th floor is very different than in the past. Rather than taking the do more with less stance, they are talking about getting more to do more.

Areas that need to be scrutinized to find ways to wean the institution from state funding include: reexamining the allocation of the base budget; recruiting out-of-state students to achieve growth; developing a capital campaign that directly impacts the campus



rather than swelling the Foundation's coffers; expanding graduate education, particularly in Liberal Arts; maximizing classroom assets by expanding class offerings outside of the 10:00 a.m to 3:00 p.m. brackets; expanding into the summer; considering the possibility that the Baccalaureate Core may not be taught as efficiently as could be done; and thinking about privatization in the way that OHSU has become a semi-private institution. Since none of this will occur quickly, the way to begin is by working on the base budget allocation - which may mean cutting programs and reallocating dollars. Senator Williamson reminded Senators that the program cuts following Measure 5 created an incredibly negative impact on the university and its reputation and resulted in plummeting enrollment.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

*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](#).