

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 2002 Minutes

## 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.

- [October 3, 2002](#)
- [January 10, 2002](#)

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

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

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

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

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

Valid [xhtml](#).

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [2002 Minutes](#) » October 3, 2002

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2002 No. 579

October 3, 2002

---

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on October 3 in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Nancy Rosenberger.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Item: Faculty Panels for Hearing Election [Motion 02-579-01 through 03]
- Special Reports: Chancellor Richard Jarvis and PERS
- Committee Report: Faculty Senate Elections
- New Business: None

---

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Barker, J. McGuire; Boggess, K. Carpenter; Collier, F. PrahI; Dollar, T. Goodnow; Gomez, P. Miles; Pegau, B. Hales; and S. Shaw, L. Cramer.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Baggott, Beatty, Bontrager, Boyce, Braker, Breen, Caughey, Coakley, Davis-White Eyes, De Carolis, Deschesne, Douglas, Filip, Gross, Hackel, Hamm, Howell, Jennings, Jones, Li, Lomax, Majeski, McDaniel, Mundt, Piasias, Sanderson, Scott, D. Shaw, Stang, Trujillo, Winner, and Yim.

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

N. Rosenberger, Senate President; B. Sorte, Senate President-Elect; H. Sayre, Immediate Past Senate President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; Ex-officios: B. Burns, D. Edge, J. Lundy, J. Nishihara, and M. Prucha; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

G. Beach, B. Becker, P. Broadus, S. Francis, B. Lunch, M. Merickel, B. Osborne, S. Randhawa, G. Tiedeman; K. Williamson, and D. Zottola.

---

### ***ACTION ITEM***

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

Prior to voting, President Rosenberger clarified that Professional Faculty are eligible to be elected and to appeal to the Faculty Panels for Hearing. The results of balloting (motion 02-579-01) during the Senate meeting are as follows:

*Primary Members:* Sally Bowman, Eda Davis-Butts, Bart Eleveld, Rod Harter, Maureen Healy, Yuji Hiratsuka, Douglas E. Johnson, Jay Noller, Ed Scott, and John Simonsen

*Alternate Members:* Mohammad Azizian, Andrew Bluhm, John Caputo, Javier Cervantes, Sara Eklund, Viki Freeman, Janet Morandi, Jodi Nelson, Lisa Parker, and Charles Sears

## **COMMITTEE REPORT**

### **Faculty Senate Elections**

Henry Sayre, Bylaws and Nominations Committee Chair, outlined the nomination process for President-Elect, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator and Executive Committee and announced that he is accepting nominations for these positions until October 8.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **Report from the Chancellor**

Chancellor Richard Jarvis addressed the Faculty Senate and provided a snapshot of his activities and observations since he began in the position. He noted there is a great need to re-engage the state and its stakeholders.

He sees the following as challenges in the system:

1. Resources - OUS Budget cuts in the '01-'03 biennium so far equal \$50 million, or 6% of the base appropriation, which translates to 3,000 students being denied access. An additional cut of \$2 million has been made with another \$25 million on the table if the income tax surcharge is defeated in January. Potentially the total cuts could reach 10% or \$78 million. The primary objective is to retain the \$25 million to the system.
2. Determine Demand - Jarvis anticipates that the student demand will top 100,000 by 2010 in a high growth situation.
3. Pressures - There are also pressures on quality and competitiveness: all campuses are over-enrolled, many students are enrolled beyond the state funding level (7,000 across the system) that results in increasing class sizes, reductions in course sections, and longer time to graduation.

To keep up with the student demand, OUS would need to add one campus the size of OSU during the next six years. At the same time that enrollment is increasing, OUS is falling behind in state support, i.e., from 88% of the national average index in 1999 to less than 74%.

4. Ratings - The State of Oregon's affordability rating has dropped from a 'D' to an 'F' in terms of need-based support against family income.
5. Gaps to Close - Faculty salaries, unfunded enrollment, deferred maintenance, and a weak-performing economy.
6. Links to Economic Development - There is a need for OUS to link economic development opportunities.

Pieces to the solution include:

1. Engaging all partners fully; increasing state tax support; either increase student tuition or cut programs deeply; and increase institutional efficiency.
2. Improving quality with more student-centered teaching and services through a research-based enterprise and strengthening the public mission of service to society and economy.
3. Opening up barriers and pathways by creating a seamless K-20 experience for the student with multiple institutions and flexible modes of delivery, both on-campus and on-line.
4. Persuading the State to empower the State Board with the flexibility to allow campuses to independently buy, hold, and sell property; purchase insurance; and retain interest earnings on all funds.

Chancellor Jarvis also feels needs the need to recalibrate the OUS vision to commit to progressing toward an enrollment capacity of 100,000 students.

To implement the above, over the next three biennia the state support must be increased to least 80-90% of the model to be close to peer institutions and student tuition must be affordable and predictable (currently tuition is high and aid is low). To accomplish this, there needs to be greater institutional efficiency, increased entrepreneurial efforts, and stake holders must be involved. There also needs to be a long-term commitment and a fair relationship with students, as well as being nationally competitive.

Jarvis asked faculty for their help in shaping his message to the legislature and to suggest to him what needs to be included to be successful.

Senator Obermiller, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether interactive websites have been considered as a means of exchanging ideas. Jarvis indicated that suggestion will be implemented.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, asked what will happen when the income tax surcharge doesn't pass. Jarvis responded that he will be sending a message at the upcoming State Board meetings that the alternatives will be program cuts and substantial tuition increases. Potential cuts will be approached fairly and equitably. He indicated that OUS must "become more of the fabric of what this State believes in."

Jarvis responded 'wide open' when asked by Senator Doescher, Agricultural Sciences, what his thoughts were regarding changing the entire university system in Oregon. Jarvis felt that there are synergies to be capitalized on and that we need to determine what we can do that is value-added.

Senator Cloughesy, Forestry, questioned the role of certified programs. Jarvis responded that they are potentially very important, however, there must be a demand for the programs.

### **Public Employees Retirement System (PERS)**

President-Elect Bruce Sorte provided a brief history of PERS and remarked that the House Speaker has appointed a working group to review the PERS issue. He also noted that, currently, 30-year retirees could potentially receive 108% of their average salary, however, most retire with 20-29 years of service and average 71% of their ending salary. The below draft resolution was presented for discussion and Sorte indicated that the Executive Committee will revise the draft for approval based on comments received:

#### **Resolution to Restructure and Strengthen the Oregon Public Employees Retirement System (PERS):**

##### **DRAFT**

Whereas, A financially sound, stable, and successful retirement system is critical to recruit and retain public employees who have sufficient knowledge and experience to provide high quality service to Oregonians; and:

Whereas, Critical policy and operational adjustments are essential to maintain the long term financial sustainability and public support for the PERS; and:

Whereas, An effective retirement system helps to assure that public employees will be financially able during retirement to be regular volunteers and contributors to their communities; and:

Whereas, An important role of government is to serve as a model in all its actions and specifically in this case to provide an adequate, fair and secure retirement for its employees; and:

Whereas, The current structure and principles of the PERS including;

- holding the Fund in trust for PERS members and protecting the Fund from diversion to other users;
- achieving and maintaining an actuarially sound funding policy for PERS benefits authorized by the Legislature;
- taking no actions that violate member's legal rights to benefits;
- administering the System in the best interest of all the members;

- advising the Legislature so that it may fulfill its fiduciary responsibility to System members;
- monitoring the work of the Oregon Investment Council in investment of the Public Employees Retirement Fund;
- considering the entire PERS membership when making decisions remain fundamentally relevant and necessary to assure public employees' futures while doing so within a manageable cost; now, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Oregon State University Faculty Senate guarantee an adequate though not inappropriate level of retirement benefits paid from public resources both in terms of minimum [60-65] and maximum [80-85] percentages of the last year's salary or a minimum amount based on percentage of median income, whichever is greater.

2. That actuarial tables be adjusted regularly [every five years].

3. That the rate of return on retirees' accounts be indexed [20 time period] and regularly [quarterly] adjusted to adequately reflect the PERS rate of return in the long term.

4. That an adequate reserve fund [two years] be maintained to continue payments to retirees based on the long-term rate of return without using the General Fund to support any PERS expenditures when the economy lags and/or state revenues decline.

5. That the same quality of retirement benefits [Return Tier Two to Tier One] be provided to all public employees.

6. That retirees be offered the option to continue benefiting from PERS during retirement by choosing a variable payment option [increasing as a person ages].

7. That public employees are assured a certain projection of retirement benefits [at least five years out].

*This resolution is necessarily general due to the complexity of the PERS. However, the OSU Faculty Senate remains committed to finding a fair and resilient solution. The solution must meet the State's contractual and ethical obligations to Oregon's dedicated public employees and recognize the market realities of compensation packages, which rely on retirement benefits, to approach some level of competitiveness for quality employees. Equally important, the solution must demonstrate respect and appreciation for and deserve the necessary support from Oregonians and their legislative representatives.*

#### **DRAFT**

Senator Landau asked what the purpose of the resolution was. Sorte responded that the purpose is to provide a moderate solution to the current concerns of the Legislature, other than abolishing PERS or going to a Tier 3. He argued that the resolution is for those in Tier 2 who shouldn't be there, to have the ability to recruit good employees, and to allow retirees to be contributing members of society. This is an opportunity to put OSU on the Legislature's radar screen.

Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, was opposed to setting maximum caps on retirement earnings. Senator Pearson, Science, agreed with Senator Coblenz and felt it was perhaps non-sensical to put a cap on retirement benefits.

Senator Driscoll, Extension, noted that the OSU Faculty Senate cannot guarantee retirement benefits, as noted in the resolution. Sorte changed the reference to PERS.

Senator Farber, Liberal Arts, felt that many at the lowest salary level will be hurt the most by the 85% cap. The cap would compound the exploitation of those at lower salary levels and felt that percentages are not applicable. Sorte indicated that there may need to be some dollar floor included.

Senator Gray, Home Economics and Education, felt that she was not able to vote on this resolution, given the amount of specificity involved and the short amount of time allowed to be educated on the subject. Sorte indicated that the resolution could become more general and it will be revised to possibly contain several options.

Senator Landau requested that information be disseminated indicating how the proposed resolution compares to what we have now and how faculty retirement dollars compare to other universities. Sorte will prepare comparisons.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, felt that numbers one and five get to the spirit of the resolution and are attractive to the Legislature. He questioned how many would be affected by the 85% cap and how many years would it take to kick in.

Senator deGeus, Associated, expressed nervousness regarding specificity in the resolution. She questioned whether the Executive Committee considered whether a defined benefit plan is worthy vs. a defined contribution. Need to determine what it is inherently about PERS that we want to keep. Sorte indicated he could use her help in restructuring the resolution to be less specific.

Senator Weber, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether Senators are being asked what a public retirement system should look like or, if the resolution was implemented, would it be in place next year. Sorte responded that the specificity was included since there was interest in having specifics sooner so they could be studied. Rosenberger added that the Executive Committee felt that this would be something that would be implemented, not that it's the ideal system.

Senator Ellinwood, Engineering, was uncomfortable with the minimum and maximum ranges since there are many classified employees whose salaries are considerably lower than professors. Sorte indicated that the resolution may be re-ordered to take this concern into consideration.

Senators were asked to talk with colleagues and caucus with their constituents regarding the PERS resolution.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Faculty Senate Fall Elections
- Faculty Senate meeting dates through June 2003

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

President Rosenberger reported that a topic of discussion at the Executive Committee retreat was how to get more open, inclusive and better-informed discussions in the Senate. Some of the suggestions were to: distribute information to Senators as early as possible; use more caucuses; encourage more consultation with constituents; give adequate information, with pros and cons if possible; and have the president send Senators e-mail messages with key issues and elements in preparation of the Senate discussion. New issues can either be introduced via the Executive Committee or under New Business during Senate meetings, however, this occurs at the end of the meeting when there is little time for consideration.

OSU-2007 Schedule - Core Planning Team reports will come forward on either October 23 or November 15 and proposals will be posted to the web; the engagement period with campus groups will be until November 30 or December 15, depending on when reports were submitted; the Senate will discuss recommendations on November 7 and December 5, and there will be a Faculty Forum to discuss recommendations on November 21; the Core Planning Teams will incorporate feedback and addend engagement reports; final reports are due to the OSU-2007 Steering Committee by either December 20 or January 10; final reports are due to the Provost by February 3; and President Risser will make decisions on the recommendations between February 10 and 17.

Budget Cuts - Permanent cuts include: \$1 million to Engineering; \$750,000 to Education and General Funds (E&G) of graduate cells. If the income tax surcharge is not passed in January 2003, OSU would experience additional cuts of \$8.2 million to E&G funds and \$3.4 million to State-wides. If all of these cuts are implemented, it would equal almost a 10% cut to the original 2001-03 budget allocation.

Political Expression - A public employee may not, while on the job during working hours, promote or oppose election petitions, candidates or ballot measures. No person may require a public employee to do so.

Things to keep in mind:

- o Working hours are defined as 8:00-5:00 Monday through Friday, with noon-1:00 for lunch.
- o Twelve-month faculty may take official leave during work time to engage in political activities.

- o You are encouraged to keep records to verify that you have used off duty time or official leave when engaging in political expression.
- o Do not ever use university e-mail, phone, or equipment for political purposes.

Things you can do during work include: wearing political buttons; preparing and distributing impartial written material, or making impartial presentations; advising employees of possible effects of a measure; or expressing your personal political views.

President-Elect Sorte made the following suggestions: use a personal cell phone instead of university phones between noon-1:00 PM; record leave on your MicroSoft calendar; and refer to your Senator position when talking with legislators - you are elected to represent other faculty.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:58 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](#) » [2002 Minutes](#) » January 10, 2002

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2002 No. 573

January 10, 2002

### For All Faculty

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on January 10, 2002, at 3:03 PM, in the LaSells Stewart Center by President Nancy Rosenberger.

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Installation of elected Officials and Senators; Approval of Parliamentarian; and a Resolution on Terrorism [Motion 02-573- 01 through 04]
- Discussion Items: Student Evaluation of Teaching Instrument; Service or Business Centers; and Modem Pool Elimination
- New Business: None

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent With Representation:

Bowman, C. Raab; Bruce, Eklund; Franklin, J. Wilson; Jennings, J. Arrington; Middleton, P. McMillen; Rogers, T. Skubinna; and S. Shaw, M. Carson.

#### Members Absent Without Representation:

Baggott, Balz, Bontrager, Braker, Breen, Cloughesy, Collier, Costello, Daugherty, Davis-White Eyes, DeCarolus, Douglas, Ellinwood, Floyd, Haggart, Hamm, Jones, Lomax, Moulton, Mundt, Oriard, Pegau, Raja, Stang, Strik, Unsworth, and Winner.

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

N. Rosenberger, President; Bruce Sorte, President-Elect; Ex-officios - T. White, J. Geddes; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

#### Guests of the Senate:

D. Arnett, T. Barr, K. Calvery, J. Corbett, J. Dolan, S. Francis, J. Hagemeister, R. Hill, E. Holsberry, M. Keppinger, M. Merickel, C. Pederson, I. Pfund, L. Risser, D. Simpson, J. Smith, J. Sorte, S. Spears, K. Steele, and R. William.

### ACTION ITEMS

#### Installation of Elected Officials

President Rosenberger installed President-Elect Bruce Sorte; Executive Committee: Dianne Erickson, Angelo Gomez and Janet Nishihara; and Interinstitutional Faculty Senator Dan Edge. Newly elected Senators were asked to stand and were declared installed: *Agricultural Sciences*: Dan Arp, Bill Boggess, Patrick Breen, Anita Brown, Bruce Coblentz, Paul Doescher, Bernadine Strik, Elizabeth Webb; *Associated*: Jackie Balzer, Lois deGeus, Angelo Gomez, Phyllis Lee, Joe Majeski; *Business*: Ilene Kleinsorge, Jonathan Moulton; *Engineering*: Mark Costello, Nick Wannamacher, Solomon Yim; *Extension*: Marvin Butler, Bill Rogers; *Forestry*: Rakesh Gupta, Kathy Howell, Mark Reed; *Home Economics & Education*: Liz Gray; *Information Services*: Larry Landis; *Liberal Arts*: Tracy Daugherty, Paul Farber, Jim Foster, John Maul, Maria Olaya, Becky Warner; *Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences*: Joseph Jennings, Niklas Piasias, Michael Unsworth; *Pharmacy*: Bill Boyce; *Science*: Kevin Ahern, Stella Coakley, Rubin Landau, Terri Lomax, Barbara Taylor, John Westall; and *Student Affairs*: Rich Shintaku.

Rosenberger thanked those who were newly installed for their willingness to take on additional duties.



## **Approval of the Parliamentarian**

Motion 02-573-01 to approve Robert Iltis as Faculty Senate Parliamentarian passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

## **Resolution on Terrorism**

President Rosenberger explained that the following resolution was the result of a visit by College of Forestry faculty with the Executive Committee. They were concerned about acts of terrorism that had occurred in both Oregon and Washington in relation to biotechnology and forestry.

### **Resolution on Terrorism**

Whereas, Oregon State University, and its faculty, have been openly and vigorously encouraging the public debate about the applications of biotechnology in agricultural and forestry systems, and will continue to do so; and

Whereas, Oregon State University, and its faculty, have also been conducting research to develop improved production methods, and to study and minimize undesired effects of biotechnology; and

Whereas, Acts of terrorism only polarize, distort, and risk discrediting legitimate ethical and technological concerns; and

Whereas, There is no legitimate rationale for acts of terrorism that destroy university property, harm longterm research projects, and risk lives; and

Whereas, Recent acts of terrorism have caused extensive damage to field sites and university buildings; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University declares that these acts of terrorism violate the fundamental freedoms of inquiry and discourse upon which universities in free societies are based.

*Resolved*, That the Faculty Senate instead encourages those with strong concerns to use the University to make their cases public, and to debate their strengths and merits in an open forum.

Senator Reyes, Engineering, questioned the use of the word 'terrorism' since there different forms of terrorism. Greg Meilan, College of Forestry, stated that terrorism includes more than just acts against lives and felt that the term was correct.

Senator Piasias, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, questioned why the resolution was limited to Forestry. It was suggested that it may be appropriate to use the term 'biological research.' Another suggested using the term 'about applications of biotechnology.'

Steve Strauss, College of Forestry, urged restricting the resolution to biotechnology since it is a discreet area of activity and terrorism in recent years.

Senator Clinton, Liberal Arts, moved to amend the resolution by striking the word 'biotechnology and agricultural and forestry systems' in the first Whereas and replacing it with 'scientific research' and making the same substitution for 'biotechnology' in the second Whereas; the motion was seconded. There was no discussion. Motion 02-573-03 to amend the resolution passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Senator Brayman-Hackel, Liberal Arts, moved to amend the resolution to add 'against scientific research' following each time the word 'terrorism' is used; the motion was seconded. Motion 02-573-04 to amend the resolution passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Motion 02-573-02 to approve the resolution as amended passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.

## ***DISCUSSION ITEMS***

### **Student Evaluation of Teaching Instrument**

Ray William, Advancement of Teaching (AOT) Chair, provided a brief background of the rationale of their proposal to change the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Instrument. William explained that the AOT was originally asked to add a diversity question to the SET and discovered that it is an extremely complex topic that may require multiple questions. He reported that Nana Lowell from the University of Washington will be visiting OSU on March 6 and 7 and will participate in a faculty forum and workshops to discuss the issue of adding a diversity question. He noted that the Committee has received input from about 400 faculty since this project began.

He explained that the OSU Survey Research Center feels that the current SET form could be improved since some questions actually ask more than one question and others are not always clear. The University of Washington has given permission to use the first and second general questions, which have been validated:

1. Your performance in this course was?
2. Your assessment of completing readings and homework was:
  - Inspire critical thinking?
  - Challenging?
  - Too much/not enough?

The responses from these two questions would be used for promotion and tenure purposes, merit increases, and for awards at OSU.

The AOT chose to recommend 12 standard questions since they could find no models using less than a total of 12. The intent is to develop a form that has a scannable reverse side that would allow individual faculty to select which additional questions to be used, thereby allowing faculty to tailor the form to their particular course. This tailoring would satisfy ABET requirements in the College of Engineering.

The Committee has also been attempting to integrate the teaching, Extension, and Distance Education requirements in the SET. Another consideration is promotion and tenure and awards, with the major criteria being to improve teaching.

The estimated cost of the proposed forms would be about \$6,500 to the university with an additional departmental cost of 2.5 cents for each reverse side of the SET copied.

The AOT plans to bring forward two motions in February:

- 1) It is moved that OSU adopt the modified student assessment form as proposed (Wording of questions may be improved with betatesting winter quarter).
- 2) It is moved that OSU develop a policy regarding distribution of assessment results such that the first two questions be used for P&T, merit, and awards; all twelve (12) questions (front side of form) be reported to faculty and supervisors to improve teaching within departments; and results from personalized assessment questions (back side of form) be reported to faculty only.

William requested that Senators review the proposal on the web with their colleagues and be prepared to vote in February.

Senator Ciufetti, Agricultural Sciences, expressed concern about questions one and two since many of the large science courses are team-taught which the proposed form does not address. William responded that the AOT found no instruments at any university that addressed team-taught courses and acknowledged it was an area that needs work.

Senator Brooks, Business, questioned the validation as it pertains to awards. He was unsure if the validation was appropriate for awards and noted it may also not be appropriate for merit raises. Brooks suggested that the recommendation state that this was to be considered a measure to be used but was not considered to be 'the' measure.

Senator Coakley, Science, felt it would be more appropriate to change questions 11 and 12 to numbers 1 and 2. She also questioned the change in the rating scale and asked Senators to study this carefully prior to the vote.

William encouraged comments and questions be directed to the Advancement of Teaching Committee.

## **Service or Business Centers**

President Rosenberger briefly outlined that the concept of the service or business centers, which has been a topic of discussion by the Redesign Team, would be to centralize services such as travel, grant administration, personnel, budget planning, human resources, purchasing, advising, graduation audits, etc. These centers would be intermediary between central administration and college/departmental administration. Conceivably, each center would serve several colleges. Rosenberger felt it was timely for faculty to enter this discussion since several administrators will be attending an intensive training in January to discuss service centers, among other issues.

Bruce Sorte, Senate President-Elect, presented a proposed service center model. He has spent six years thinking about these centers and talking with others about their concerns. He felt that the goal of the centers must be more than just saving money and eliminating positions. Perhaps more realistic goals would be to 1) save administrative time and resources that could be devoted to programmatic time and initiatives, and 2) increase timeliness and effectiveness of administrative decisions and bring the decisions closer to those who are impacted by those decisions.

Sorte felt that landscape or overview documents were essential to the planning process. From his research, he has found

very few examples of large scale administrative service centers that haven't significantly reduced the services that faculty are used to receiving. He also felt that centralizing administrative functions, without local support, will cause departmental units to become more creative in how they work around those centralized functions.

The basic building blocks regarding service centers include:

1. Bringing authority back closer to those doing the work. Concern has been expressed that, without local control, institutional knowledge or understanding of a particular discipline will be lost. He felt that a reasonable geographic proximity between faculty and administrative functions is a few hundred yards.
2. Handling policy level decisions differently - perhaps rotating responsibility amongst department heads.
3. Recognizing that service centers will most likely be more expensive during the first few years.

Sorte suggested a pilot test to build confidence in the concept. Spend the money to monitor, adjust, and report on what happens during the test. The College of Agricultural Sciences is willing to contribute up to .4 FTE to assist in accomplishing the test. The pilot test should last at least six months and the University should be willing to abandon, or markedly change, the concept if it is not successful. He anticipates that there may be a 30% savings in administrative costs in affected areas, but there may also be a significant decrease in the amount of time, and paperwork, it takes to accomplish tasks.

Sorte's presentation will be posted to the Faculty Senate website.

Senator Raab, Home Economics & Education (proxy), questioned what impact a centralized approach would have on federal funding.

Vice President Mark McCambridge, Finance & Administration, emphasized that faculty need to understand that there is no predisposed plan and he welcomed comments from the faculty. He acknowledged that there may be functions that are appropriate at the unit level and some that are appropriate at the central levels.

Senator King, Business, was concerned about hidden costs that will not show up as a cost associated with the service center, i.e, money will be spent in the form of time on the part of chairs and faculty tracking down information that formerly resided locally. He did like the thought of committing to some form of experimentation and be willing to change if the proposal doesn't work.

Another individual expressed concern about successfully obtaining outside funding and noted the rejection of a particular funding opportunity specifically due to lack of local administrative staff. He also felt that a personal history with a particular staff person, developed over a long period of time, is important when coordinating a seminar series requiring travel arrangements, etc., that are necessary for the series to be successful.

Senator Ahern, Science, expressed concern about functions that may appear to have shared commonalities and noted that even human resources has differences and felt that local expertise makes more sense. He was also very concerned about centralizing advising. He suggested that service centers concentrate on only the most common functions and not assume that accounting or purchasing are the same across campus.

Senator Li, Agricultural Sciences, reiterated the importance of local familiarity with various processes that affects the success rate of obtaining grants and funding. She felt it was important to identify skills needed at the local level.

Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, questioned why, in light of recent events pertaining to differing budget figures, any sane person would want to see accounting functions centralized at OSU.

Senator Smythe, Science, expressed difficulty in understanding how moving functions out of local control is more effective. Sorte responded that, by combining resources, it may be possible to walk into one office and accomplish multiple tasks that formerly required processing and approval from various offices.

Senator Boggess, Science, felt it was necessary to have some authority delegated down from central administration rather than everything going up. Sorte noted that his proposal is a transitional process so that no jobs would be lost and skill sets would be changed in the process.

Senator Piasias, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, feels that we need to tell administration services need to be accomplished in a service center. He was concerned about the amount of time that may be spent waiting to talk with the appropriate person in the centralized system if others are vying for their attention at the same time.

Senator Erickson, Science, asked for case studies of successful centers elsewhere or studies of attempts that have failed.

Senator King expressed the need to include processes in the discussion rather than just structure.

Senator Boyce, Pharmacy, questioned whether the service centers would be free of charge or if departments/colleges would

be charged for their use.

Senator Taylor, Science, noted that there are issues of accountability in terms of responsibility.

IFS Senator Edge observed that one size fits all probably won't work and variations will probably be necessary.

### **Modem Pool Elimination**

President Rosenberger explained that there is a proposal to eliminate the current modem pool. In a message read by Rosenberger from Provost White, he noted that, although a decision was made, administration continues to hear strong arguments on both sides of the issue and seeks input from the Faculty Senate. He emphasized, however that, if the modem pool is not eliminated, savings would have to be made in other areas.

Curt Pederson, Vice Provost for Information Services, Jon Dolan, Virtual Academic Lab Administrator - Network Engineering, and Jim Corbett, Director of Administrative Services, each explained various aspects of the proposed elimination.

Pederson apologized for a memo distributed with an incorrect elimination date of January 15. The memo also did not indicate that he would be working with Robert Hood on a communications strategy. Pederson has heard from about 300 individuals since the message went out, with most of the responses being against elimination. He is interested to learn how much faculty now value internet access compared to 1997/98.

Pederson explained that, since there is still a deficit of under \$1 million on the general fund side that is being paid back by Information Services (IS), other cuts will need to be made. He also noted he had been told by Clara Pratt that the OSU Budget Reconciliation Group proposed elimination of the modem pool as one of their top recommendations to save money in 2002-03. Current financial pressures have made it necessary to move more quickly to cut costs.

Pederson commended Jon Dolan, Greg Edmaiston, and Tom Easley for providing coverage during Shay Dakin's absence while she is fighting bone cancer.

Jim Corbett provided financial background information. In FY '01 Telecommunications accounted for 23.3% of the IS budget while the Library accounted for 76%, and the remainder was split between the other IS units (Communication Media Center, Web Services, Network Engineering, Central Computing, and Administration).

Telecommunications, which includes the modem pool, saw a net loss of \$58,909 in FY '01. There are currently resources in the fund to cover the loss, but they cannot continue to lose money nor to take money out of other funds since a service department is not allowed to carry a negative amount and deficits must be covered from the Education and General funds.

Reasons for immediate resource issues:

- reduction in revenue due to decrease in long-distance usage
- increases in operating costs include salary increases (must be self-covered in a service department) and vacation liability (approximately \$73,000),
- GASB 34/35 (general accounting changes that affect equipment reserves) - the impact is still unknown with the dollar amount between \$133,000 and \$1.1million for this year depending on whether it is spread out over one year or five years

Corbett explained that many cost recovery options have been discussed over the last 5-6 years, including:

- charge individual users a monthly fee (ISP model) - not allowed by Oregon law since OSU would be in competition with commercial vendors
- assess the department/unit based on a percentage of users (active/retired)
- general fund allocation - if the allocation was adequate, there would be no discussion of options
- general fund reallocation within IS - becomes a matter of what services are eliminated and what remains

Jon Dolan discussed modem pool usage and cost issues.

Telecommunication usage:

- about 4,000 use the modem pool monthly, which is down from 5,000 in June 1999
- 5% of the customers use 25% of the available time during peak availability
- of the 4,000 users, 25% are non-students (faculty, staff, emeritus, affiliates, and others); the 25% has remained consistent from the beginning in both users and hours

Costs (monthly operational charges to keep the phone lines active and modems responsive):

284 modem lines are served by 12 T1 phone circuits (each T1 circuit supports 24 56k lines)

- each T1 circuit costs \$1,000 per month (the total of all lines is \$144,000/ year) in circuit costs alone - this figure does not include replacement, maintenance or staffing costs

Proposals:

- elimination of 6 of the 12 circuits would save \$72,000
- restrict access to students only
- adjust time restrictions downward for students
- seek alternative funding for the remaining service for the next fiscal year to move the modem pool service out of Telecommunications

Curt Pederson presented information regarding the impact of the modem pool elimination:

- personal financial impact - users would be required to pay for their own ISP service which creates a hardship for lower paid employees
- without an ISP, users will lose remote communications with students and colleagues
- there is a disruption while changing service providers
- users don't want to change the way the OSU network is accessed

Pederson noted that students will also be impacted since there will be fewer available hours.

Senator Ahern, Science, questioned whether there was any way of having legitimate phone numbers to do legitimate OSU-related work. He noted that users cannot access the OSU modem if they have cable vs. dial-up access. Dolan responded that they are looking at ATT access for faculty and, if the modem pool is left in place, there is still a funding issue. Pederson responded that it is difficult to restrict usage to those with legitimate needs.

Senator Landau, Science, expressed the feeling that it seems that the proposed elimination is backwards. It should be the students who are losing access since the faculty need access to do their jobs. He felt this was one more case where money was being spent on student services and being taken away from the support of faculty, i.e., research and teaching. Pederson responded that ASOSU President Justin Geddes felt that this will likely no longer remain a free student service beyond the next round of Technology Resource Fee funding. The students need to present a proposal to maintain the modem pool with the fees they already pay or IS will recommend that the service be discontinued.

Senator Niess, Science, expressed concern that the decision was made without input from faculty indicating which services they needed to perform their job. Pederson noted this was a short-term financial solution.

Senator Busse, Agricultural Sciences, stated that her department has six faculty off-campus who must use the dial-in. Pederson responded that there is an option of paying \$13 per month for a commercial ISP.

Senator Piasias, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, asked if there was a list of services that would have to be cut if the modem pool was not eliminated. Pederson responded that the self-support services include: voice communications, voice mail and the modem pool.

Senator Dollar, Liberal Arts, felt it was unfair to eliminate student access to the modem pool since there are web-based courses that require usage of the web.

IFS Senator Edge suggested reducing the number of modems so people are forced to use other methods. Pederson noted that suggestion was considered and rejected because it didn't seem ethical.

Senator Selker, Agricultural Sciences, suggested billing departments for the service provided. Dolan noted that additional costs would be incurred if a billing component was added, which may reduce the cost-effectiveness of the service.

Pederson closed with the comment that ISP's complain about OSU's service when they phone people to sell their ISP service and OSU employees/students state that their family uses OSU's free service. ISP's feel that OSU's service does take away revenue from them and the community.

## ***INFORMATION ITEMS***

### Faculty Senate Calendar

Faculty Senate meetings for 2002 have been scheduled from 3:00-5:00 PM on the following dates: February 7, 2002; March 7, 2002; April 4, 2002; May 2, 2002; June 6, 2002; October 3, 2002; November 7, 2002; and December 5, 2002. Senators are advised to check the monthly agenda to determine the meeting site.

### Library Committee Decision on June 2001 Referred Item

At the June 2001 Faculty Senate meeting, Senator Wrolstad requested that the Valley Library's policy of handling recalls of

books be revised. The request was forwarded to the Library Committee who reviewed the issue and recommends that current policy be maintained, although they encourage the Circulation staff make more widely known the informal practice of directly contacting holders of recalled books when a particular book is urgently needed. The entire Library Committee memo can be viewed on the web at:

<http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/library/agen/reports/01172002.html>

#### Faculty Senate Handbook Update

Faculty Senate Handbook materials have been updated and can be found on the Senate web site at:

<http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/handbook/index.html>.

#### Senators Electronic Discussion List

At the request of several faculty, an electronic discussion list has been created to facilitate discussion among faculty about issues of interest regarding Oregon State University. All subscribers will receive copies of each message posted.

To subscribe, send a message to [lyris@lists.orst.edu](mailto:lyris@lists.orst.edu) and in the body of the message type:  
join-discussion@lists.orst.edu

To unsubscribe send a message to [lyris@lists.orst.edu](mailto:lyris@lists.orst.edu) and in the body of the message type:  
unsubscribe discussion

NOTE: You must subscribe and unsubscribe yourself from your own computer since it will either unsubscribe or subscribe whatever individual is assigned to the e-mail address the message is being sent from.

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

Provost White's report focused on Education issues. He reported that a December 17 discussion between President Risser, Provost White and Education faculty reaffirmed that the unit will continue as a School of Education which reflects the value to OSU and the State of Oregon. The focus of the School of Education will be in three integrated areas:

1. primary and secondary teacher and counselor education;
2. leadership and health education; and
3. 4-H and Youth Development (whose faculty indicated a preference to be affiliated with the Education unit).

The unit has been established for excellence in teacher education and related research fields that support that excellence, and to help produce the best teachers and alleviate the great teacher need the confronts Oregon and the nation.

There is currently an internal search for new leadership in the form of a Dean, and faculty have been asked to submit nominations. A Dean of Education should be in place by the end of January.

Provost White noted that the School of Education will participate fully in the redesign process.

Senator Thies questioned whether there would be a return to a four-year education degree. White responded that Education has been asked to develop, within the existing degrees, undergraduate pathways to initial licensure. He noted this was not a directive to discontinue the MAT program, but to develop content areas that make sense to develop an undergraduate pathway.

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

President Rosenberger mentioned several issues the Executive Committee (EC) will be bringing forward to the Senate: a proposed Distance Education Committee, the formation of a joint task force with Academic Affairs regarding University Assessment, and revised Diversity Council Standing Rules.

She also reported that the EC had met with President Risser and a result of that meeting was to hold small group conversations with President Risser and interested faculty, facilitated by a member of the EC. These sessions will begin in January and are scheduled to continue through May. Invitations will be issued to all faculty.

Rosenberger noted that President Risser and Provost White will begin meeting with the EC on a quarterly basis in an effort to improve communication.

She noted that it was earlier proposed that the academic redesign be decoupled, to the extent possible, from the administrative redesign, and it appears as though that is occurring. The Executive Committee is working on the academic redesign process and related issues to be addressed.

One of the ways Rosenberger would like the Senate to be more proactive, particularly in light of redesign, is to have Senate

apportionment units caucus to discuss issues.

### ***NEW BUSINESS***

There was no new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:55 PM. A reception to welcome new Senators was held in the Myrtle Tree Alcove following the meeting.

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](#).