

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 2004 Minutes

## 2004 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.

- [June 10, 2004](#)
- [April 8, 2004](#)
- [February 5, 2004](#)

**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](#) » [2004 Minutes](#) » June 10, 2004 Minutes

## June 10, 2004 Minutes

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Stella Coakley on June 10, 2004 at 3:00 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center. President Coakley thanked Gary Tiedeman for serving as Parliamentarian.

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Consideration of Degree Candidates - B. Balz; Category I Proposals - C. Boyer: Master of Engineering (MEng) Degree, Terminate the Master of Engineering in Manufacturing Program, Master of Health Physics (MHP) in Radiation Health Physics, Graduate Certificate in Health Care Administration, and Geographic Information Science - Undergraduate Certificate, Graduate Certificate, and Professional Certificate; Non-credit Certificate Policy - C. Boyer; Standing Rules Changes - M. Niess: Academic Standing, Computing Resources, and Graduate Admissions Committees; and Policy on Graduate Level Learning - L. Ciuffetti [Motion 04-596-01 through 16]
- Special Reports: Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and President Ed Ray
- New Business: None

### 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 4,166 students who were candidates for 4,288 degrees (this is a 6% increase over 2003) which included: 3,257 Bachelors, 755 Masters, 173 Doctors and 103 Professional degrees. There were 108 students who were candidates for two degrees and 8 students who were candidates for three degrees.

The Class of 2004, OSU's 135th graduating class, had 936 seniors who qualified for Academic Distinction and included 444 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50-3.69), 267 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70-3.84), and 225 'summa cum laude' (gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 04-5 -01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

#### Category I Proposals

Charles Boyer, Curriculum Council Co-chair, thanked Bob Burton, Alice Tucker, Michelle Rosowsky, the Faculty Senate, the Valley Library staff, Graduate Council and Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee for their assistance in reviewing and preparing Category I proposals to be presented for approval during the past year. The following proposals were presented for approval:

- 1) Master of Engineering (MEng) Degree - Boyer explained that this was a professional degree that involves all the departments in the College of Engineering. There was no discussion. Motion 04-596-02 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.
- 2) Terminate the Master of Engineering in Manufacturing Program - This was a multi-campus degree that had limited activity, the partner institution agreed to the termination, and the students have been notified. This degree is being replaced by the degree previously approved. There was no discussion. Motion 04-596-03 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.
- 3) Master of Health Physics (MHP) in Radiation Health Physics - Boyer explained that this is a new professional degree that relies on existing courses. There is considerable interest by OIT students, and others in the state, for this degree. There was no discussion. Motion 04-596-04 passed by voice vote with no

dissenting votes.

4) Graduate Certificate in Health Care Administration - Boyer explained that this program was proposed by the Department of Public Health and designed to meet an increasing need for place-bound professionals in health care administration. It will serve an important need in the state and will be delivered through various means. There was no discussion. Motion 04-596-05 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

5) Geographic Information Science - Boyer explained that this is a set of three certificates. The undergraduate and graduate certificates are meant to replace the Earth Information Science and Technology Minors. The proposed name also more accurately reflects the current description for this type of program since it was recognized that these are actually certificate programs rather than minors. The courses are currently in place.

Senator Landis, Associated, noted that the library assessment had been inadvertently omitted from the materials received by Senators. The assessment indicated that library resources were adequate to support the proposal and it was also recommended that \$1200 be allocated for journals.

- Undergraduate Certificate - Motion 04-596-06 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.
- Graduate Certificate - Motion 04-596-07 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.
- Professional Certificate - Motion 04-596-08 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Non-credit Certificate Policy**

Charles Boyer, Curriculum Council Co-chair, presented for approval the following policy statement:

#### Policy Statement: Review of Non-credit Certificates

1. Non-credit certificates authenticate a learning experience that does not involve university credits that could be part of a degree. Non-credit certificates are of two overlapping kinds: those that testify merely to participation and those that are professional in nature.
2. Non-credit certificates must be reviewed in a process parallel to the Category I process, unless excluded by OUS (see <http://www.ous.edu/aca/noncredit.html>).
3. Non-credit certificates may require 800-level courses, as long as these are properly identified as "in-service" or courses aimed at practicing professional skills with no academic assessment or credit that would lead to a University degree. New 800-level courses must be submitted to the Office of Academic Programs for approval.
4. Non-credit certificates that themselves are not transcript visible will be reviewed if they require any credit courses (XX 001-899). Note that OSU Non-credit Certificates do not appear on any OSU transcript.

Boyer explained that the rationale for creating the policy is due, in part, to the proliferation of the number of certificates and types of certificates being offered. Additionally, there is considerable variation in what is considered to be a certificate program, ranging from a certificate of participation to a credit-based program. Concerns have been raised as to the implications of certificate programs in relation to the learning experience.

Senator Coblenz, Agricultural Sciences, questioned how this policy is different from the diploma offers he receives. Boyer explained that it is not necessarily different since OSU offers several kinds of programs that result in participation certificates. This policy attempts to differentiate those programs that are a non-credit experience that involves an approval process, and is an effort to put teeth into what are being called certificate programs.

Senator Iltis, Liberal Arts, questioned whether existing non-credit programs will go through the approval process. Boyer responded there has been no discussion on this issue.

Senator Selker, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether there was a list of existing non-credit programs, who will keep the list and will there be a grace period allowed. Boyer responded there is no known list since there has been no approval process. However, if the policy is implemented, a listing of approved programs would be created, and the existing programs could go through the approval process and be placed on the list.

Boyer noted there is confusion surrounding this issue. This approval process is intended to be used where there is a more extended learning experience involving formal coursework and allows for formal faculty review and approval.

Senator Selker, questioned whether there will be criteria. Boyer responded that the criteria will evolve over time but will involve the same criteria used for other programs, i.e, learning outcomes and expectations, syllabi, etc.

Senator Hoogesteger, Student Affairs, questioned what process will be required. Boyer responded they will review the programs submitted for approval and, over time, will be able to benchmark learning experiences. As an example, student leadership already sometimes involves credit. If you think a formal certificate recognition is a benefit for students, consider running it through the process as a modified Category I.

Senator Coblenz, asked if this becomes centralized, will participant fees go to the University and be filtered back to the department. Boyer responded that the proposal was not meant to deal with fiscal issues, but is meant as a quality check only. The money still remains in the respective program.

Motion 04-596-09 to approve the policy was inconclusive by voice vote. Following President Coakley's call for a vote by show of hands, Senator Selker moved to table the motion pending clarification of the context and implementation; motion seconded. Following an explanation by the Parliamentarian that tabling typically means for a brief period of time to allow the issue to be brought up later in the meeting, the second was retracted. Senator Selker moved to return the policy to committee for refinement and further context; motion seconded. Motion 04-596-10 to return the policy to the committee passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### Standing Rules Changes

Maggie Niess, Executive Committee member, presented for approval the following proposed Standing Rules changes on behalf of the Committee on Committees (proposed deletions are bracketed in red and proposed additions are bolded):

#### Academic Standing Committee

The Academic Standing Committee is charged with the enforcement of the regulations on Satisfactory Academic Standing. In this regard the Committee has [developed] **the authority to develop** guidelines for the administration of these regulations. **These [G] guidelines** are reviewed annually to ensure that they continue to serve the interests of the University community and that they reflect current University policies and procedures. The Committee has discretionary authority to grant exceptions to the regulations on Academic Standing. The Committee hears all requests for reinstatement exceptions following academic suspension, **that meet the conditions detailed in the Academic Standing Committee's Policy Guideline #7**. Upon request of the student, the Committee conducts a personal [interview] **hearing** to determine the causes of unsatisfactory performance and possible reinstatement and remedies. [The Committee meets] **These personal hearings occur during Committee meetings** to consider [such] requests [for reinstatement by exception], as needed[, ] each term prior to the last day to register. **Hearings are scheduled prior to the last day to register, when at all possible. Once the Committee makes its decision on a request for reinstatement by exception, and the hearing is completed, the case is considered closed. Appeals to Committee decisions may only be addressed by the Provost of the University after the Committee's decision has been recorded. Appeals must be based solely on the original file reviewed and acted upon by the Committee. The Committee will re-open a case only if significant new information is presented to it.**

The Committee consists of [seven] **up to nine** Faculty and two Student members, and the Registrar (or representative), ex-officio, non-voting. **The committee chair is also a non-voting member, except in the case of a tie vote by Committee. Committee members involved in a student's request for exception may not participate in the vote.**

Senator Mills, Associated Faculty, questioned whether there was a minimum number of faculty required. Debbie Bird McCubbin, Academic Standing Committee Chair, noted that the proposed change was to reflect the intent to increase the number of members. Senator Lunch, Liberal Arts, moved to amend the Standing Rules to read 'a minimum of seven up to nine'; motion seconded. Motion 04-596-12 to amend the Standing

Rules passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

J. Nisihara for Senator Tsunyoshi, Student Affairs, questioned whether the Senate intends to have Standing Rules based on policy guidelines that are not changed by the Senate. Coakley responded that is currently possible. She did state that the EC reviewed the policy referred to and did not feel there was a problem in this instance. She also noted that this issue could be discussed in the future if there is a perception that the Senate should not proceed in this manner.

Motion 04-596-11 to approve the revisions to the Academic Standing Committee Standing Rules, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

#### Computing Resources Committee

The Computing Resources Committee reviews and recommends policy concerning technology as used by faculty in instruction, research, and service on campus and off-campus. It assists in planning and advocating for the necessary technology to maximize student learning and enhance faculty research and service activities to OSU and the wider community. It acts to advise other committees and Information Services as well as providing leadership in adoption and effective use of computing for instruction, research, and service. One member of the Computing Resources Committee serves as the designated Faculty Senate representative to the Administrative Information Systems Advisory Council. The Committee shall consist of **[nine] six** Faculty, at least **[six] four** of whom must be Teaching Faculty, and two Students, and the Vice Provost for Information Services, ex-officio, non-voting. The Vice Provost for Information Services may recommend a resource person from Information Services as another ex-officio, non-voting member.

The Executive Committee is encouraged to look for broad representation in the appointments to the committee in order to provide disciplinary diversity.

Niess noted that there was difficulty in achieving a quorum and conducting business since the members were not able to meet at the same time.

There was no discussion on the proposed revisions. Motion 04-596-13 to approve the revisions to the Computing Resources Committee Standing Rules passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

#### Graduate Admissions Committee

The Graduate Admissions Committee acts on appealed applications for admission to the Graduate School. Candidates are considered on the basis of the undergraduate record and the preparation for graduate work, with special reference to the particular field desired. The Committee consists of eight **[Graduate Faculty]** members, **at least seven of whom are Graduate Faculty members** from different colleges, with the Director of Admissions, ex-officio, non-voting. **The committee members should be selected to ensure adequate representation of International Education.** The Chair of the Graduate Admissions Committee shall be a liaison member, non-voting, on the Graduate Council.

Niess noted that it was necessary to have input from International Education faculty and this revision would ensure that input is provided.

Senator Coblenz noted that the wording appears as though all committee members are expected to have some international education experience. Niess responded that the intent was that the committee have adequate international education representation, not that all members have international education experience.

Senator Taylor, Student Affairs, questioned how adequate international education representation will be achieved. Senator Mills asked if a precise number could be given for International Education representation. Senator Westall, Science, responded that the Executive Committee chooses the members of Faculty Senate committees and councils and if adequate representation was found among the graduate faculty members, then the EC has the option of choosing eight graduate faculty members. On the other hand, if the EC didn't feel that any of the seven graduate faculty members provided adequate representation, they could appoint someone from International Education who was not a graduate faculty member.

In response to Senator Hale, Liberal Arts, questioning whether the intent was expertise in international education or a faculty member specifically from International Education, the answer was expertise. Senator Hale proposed a friendly amendment to change International Education to lower case; there were no objections.

To clarify that the intent is eight faculty members, Senator Lunch moved to amend the proposed revisions to add 'faculty' after 'eight'; motion was seconded. Motion 04-596-15 to amend the Standing Rules to read '◆eight faculty◆' passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

Motion 04-596-14 to approve the proposed revisions to the Graduate Admissions Committee Standing Rules, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

### **Policy on Graduate Level Learning**

Lynda Ciuffetti, Graduate Council Chair, presented a proposed policy for discussion at the May Senate meeting. A revised Policy on Graduate Level Learning was presented for approval in June as outlined in the Graduate Council's explanation below:

The Graduate Council on May 20, 2004 addressed concerns voiced at the May 13, 2004 Faculty Senate meeting regarding the 50% Rule on Graduate Level Learning. As stated in the original document [oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/agen/2004/200405a2.htm](http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/agen/2004/200405a2.htm) effective Fall 2005, all graduate student programs of study submitted to the Graduate School must consist of, at a minimum, 50% graduate stand alone courses. In an effort to respond to faculty concerns with the implementation deadline, the Graduate Council has approved the following:

***Departments or Programs that are unable to meet this policy for Graduate Programs beginning Fall 2005 may submit a Transition Plan that will address how the unit will move towards compliance with the policy.***

Ciuffetti noted another concern that was raised at the May Senate meeting regarding the feeling by some that the 50% policy does not improve the quality of the graduate program. The Graduate Council's response was that they recognize that this may be a judgment call, but considers the minimum of 50% stand alone graduate credits to be an improvement over the current policy. The Council believes that even a modest increase in stand alone credits is a worthy accomplishment and does indeed raise the quality of the graduate experience. The Council also considers blanket number courses to be a strong option to the stand alone classroom graduate level learning. Also, the increase from six to nine blanket number courses is a maximum allowable number.

Charles Boyer indicated that the Curriculum Council has extensively reviewed the proposal and noted that it is necessary to ensure that graduate level learning experiences for graduate students are being offered. Their concerns were around options and ability of various units to implement the policy, but felt that there was enough flexibility provided by the Graduate Council and that the blanket courses provided an option for programs to develop a method for students to meet the intent of the proposal. The Curriculum Council voted unanimously to endorse the recommendation of the Graduate Council.

Senator Roberts, Liberal Arts, noted that she and her colleagues appreciate the movement toward accommodation. Roberts had three questions: 1) To whom will the transition plans be submitted and who approves? 2) What will the approval criteria consist of? 3) Is insufficient faculty lines an acceptable criterion? Ciuffetti responded that transition plans would be submitted to the Graduate Council. The plan would be an outline of how the unit would meet the goals over time. The criteria would be that the Council has a sense that the unit is moving toward the 50% rule. If hiring was necessary, there would be some indication that the dean was in favor of supporting the situation. The feasibility of the plan would be an important criterion. The time limit would be left up to the unit, as long as it is reasonable. A lack of resources would allow the transition plan to go into place with an accompanying outline of how a unit would achieve the 50% policy. Senator Roberts requested the justification for the Graduate Council to receive the transition plans rather than the Graduate School. Ciuffetti responded the Graduate Council was identified because of the idea of a quality of graduate level learning. They felt that this was their policy, the Council has representation from every college, and felt that they would be able to look at and evaluate the policy.

Ciuffetti stated that all colleges within the Graduate Council, with the exception of Liberal Arts, supported the implementation of the 50% rule. She also noted that the plans could go to the Graduate School at some point, but that discussion has not taken place.

Senator Gupta, Forestry, explained that his department reviewed the policy and has the following concerns:

1) there is an insufficient number of courses in other departments that are not offered often; 2) the policy discourages students from taking more than the minimum number of credits since they would have to take the corresponding number of additional stand alone courses; and 3) blanket number courses don't show up as exact titles. The department feels that the policy goals are good, but has concerns that units have not determined whether the policy will fit their course offerings. Ciuffetti noted that quality issues can be addressed by putting forward an individual course of the 500 component. The policy is intended to improve the quality of the graduate level experience. The Council will revisit this issue during exit interviews and will determine if the policy is accomplishing the need.

Senator Mills questioned why the Council did not identify a specific transition date. Ciuffetti stated they were sympathetic to units and were allowing them to move toward implementation. There is no way of knowing when units will have adequate resources.

Senator Lee, Science, opposed the motion due to the approach of the problem. He felt there is no need to disrupt existing courses and degree programs that are working well. There may be 400/500 level courses that are not at the graduate level, but that is not a reason to eliminate the slash courses or implement the stand alone requirement. The offending courses should be examined and brought up to standards. Senator Lee read a message from Bill Bogley, University Honors College Council Chair, who opposed the policy as it makes it more difficult to deliver additional graduate programs when tenured faculty are in decline. Ciuffetti responded that she spoke with the College of Science dean and associate dean, who talked with all the department chairs, and they endorsed the policy. She felt that more than a few courses are involved and the policy is not related to accreditation since it was being worked on before the accreditation effort.

Senator Hale questioned who is responsible for the MAIS policy implementation. Dean Francis, Graduate School, responded that Ann Schaubert, MAIS Director, would be responsible. Francis indicated that Graduate School staff will review students' programs to determine whether it is 50/50.

Senator Roberts stated that her college does not have the faculty to fulfill the policy since budget issues prevent achieving necessary faculty lines. Ciuffetti empathized with the situation, but believes that OSU needs to go forward in increasing the graduate learning experience. She also noted that, to be done right, the 500 component of the 400/500 takes overload from faculty.

Senator Selker, who also serves on the Graduate Council, addressed several concerns. For dual major students - each major will either comply or have a transition plan, so one unit will not need to vouch for other majors. The 50% rule applies to those courses that must be on the program, this does not apply to electives, and course titles will show up on transcripts. The reason for no implementation date is because of the complexity of each case and the deans will be determining dates on the transition plan. The thought that there is no need for the policy is contrary to the facts since the Council could not think of one program where this was not a central issue. The Graduate Council does not see this as an ideal policy, but as the very best possible compromise.

Senator Flahive, Science, questioned why, if this issue has been discussed for over four years on campus, proposals weren't requested at that time. A primary objection is that faculty were not given enough notice of the proposed policy. She also didn't agree with the supposition that a uniform policy will help everyone. Ciuffetti acknowledged that, probably, uniform policies don't help everyone, but there is a uniform graduate policy in terms of credits. She also noted that two forums were held to inform faculty of the policy and to ask them for input and, as a result of the input, the original proposal was revised.

Senator Coblenz noted that quality continues to be stressed and he questioned the sample size of slash courses examined by the Graduate Council which determined that courses meet some quality standard for graduate education. Ciuffetti explained that the Graduate Level Learning Committee, a subcommittee of the Graduate Council, has been studying the various 500 level components, and the resulting graduate level learning criteria was discussed at the May Faculty Senate meeting. As graduate courses are submitted, they will be evaluated by those criteria. Dean Francis noted that the subcommittee conducted two campus-wide surveys by asking faculty to distribute the surveys in all slash courses and had a huge database that they analyzed. Coakley noted that the data was presented to the Senate and links have been available for Senators to review.

Charles Boyer noted that graduate courses also go through the Curriculum Council for review and they are paying attention to slash course differentiation and specific requirements in the syllabus. He noted that both criteria must be met.

Motion #04-596-16 to approve the Policy on Graduate Level Learning passed by hand vote with 38 in favor and 29 opposed. Ciuffetti thanked the Faculty Senate for their work and concern and noted that the Graduate

Council does appreciate the input provided.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **Interinstitutional Faculty Senate**

Kelvin Koong, OSU IFS Senator, provided a recap of the June IFS meeting. In April, the IFS requested to meet with then OSBHE President, Neil Goldschmidt. Their request resulted in a meeting with IFS and the entire OSBHE in Ashland at the June meeting. IFS discussed three major points with the Board:

1) Quality of education in the eyes of the faculty - This discussion was generated by a working group of the Board, commonly called 'More, Better, Faster'. They are in the process of developing core courses that can be transferred from community colleges to OUS four-year institutions. IFS is concerned by the approach of the Board developing the core courses and with the resulting quality. IFS proposed that faculty be allowed to deal with the issue and determine how to develop common core courses.

2) Tuition plateau - After discussing the pros and cons, IFS reached a consensus of supporting the plateau.

3) Faculty Fighting Fund - \$500,000 would be forwarded to the E-Board for approval for the fund. IFS expressed concern about the potential risk in terms of creating faculty super stars and all in light of the salary freeze. It was noted that those institutions with contracts have no way of implementing the funds.

Following the meeting, IFS sent a thank you note to the Board which responded they would like to continue meeting with IFS, and will next meet with them in October at WOU.

### **The First 316 Days**

OSU President Ed Ray provided his perspective on his first 316 days at OSU and an update of issues.

Budget Issues - Tuition increase - Ray's proposal to the Board was an 11% tuition increase at the undergraduate level for resident students. The proposal would not raise out-of-state, professional or doctoral tuition levels and there would be no increase in the plateau. He feels there needs to be a dialogue in the fall to either return to no charges in the plateau range or have a 50% discount rate on credit hours in the plateau range so there is still incentive to take additional courses.

The budget reduction is \$2.9 million. Approximately \$2.1 million was drawn back from academic support last fall in anticipation of Ballot Measure 30. Administration believes that the difference can be handled with minimal disruption to next activities in 2004-2005.

There has been discussion of additional changes to the budget model. Ray believes that college budget allocation models need to be just as explicit and transparent as the university model, and they need to be accessible by everyone.

As colleges are working on individual strategic plans to align with the overall university efforts, this provides a context and opportunity to discuss whether there needs to be transition over time in the historic base budgets.

He hopes that the Strategic Investment Program will be sustained beyond the current round and that this will be a faculty-driven process.

He is concerned about resource fees and how fee allocations occur, and thinks that a discussion needs to take place about being more explicit about differential tuition rates. Resource fees should be treated, for distribution purposes, both centrally and in a distributed environment as currently occurs with tuition dollars.

The decision was previously made to put tuition money through the RAM filter which accounts for cost differentials in programs and, while he understands the arguments for doing so, he would prefer that the money be distributed the way it is earned. Whether intentional or not, low cost units, such as Liberal Arts, disproportionately watch their dollars go to high cost colleges. The budget practice needs to reflect the budget priorities.

There is an effort underway to educate legislator's that the fee remission caps are not understand, and he has some hope that the caps will go away with the next Legislature. He is also working on eliminating the salary freeze. There is a proposal going forward to the E-Board that will make \$500,000 available for a faculty



fighting fund, and will be allocated on a pro-rated share between all seven institutions. If the unionized institutions cannot agree on a way to use it, the Board will determine how to distribute the money.

Organizational Needs - He expects that the searches for the Vice President of Research, Vice President of University Advancement, Director for Community and Diversity, and Faculty Athletic Representative will be completed in the next few weeks. The title change from Vice Provost to Vice President of Research reflects increased expectations of the position.

OSU Foundation President candidates may be here in August and, hopefully, the successful candidate will begin by the end of the calendar year.

In regard to Provost White's recent health issues, Ray stated that he is doing well, his prognosis is positive, and he will delay in reporting to the University of Idaho until August. Sabah Randhawa has been appointed Interim Provost.

Community and Diversity - The organizational structure will be reviewed to determine a realignment of which offices report to whom. The new Community and Diversity Director will assist Ray in this task.

Programs - Ray expects each college and department to create strategic plans that include benchmarks, metrics, etc. The Interim Provost, and others, will begin working on developing action and implementation plans for next year. It is clear to Ray that professional development workshops for deans, directors, chairs and professional staff need to become a regular part of doing business at OSU.

Capital Projects - OSU made capital projects recommendations to OSBHE, who is responsible for prioritization. The projects will involve 11G Bonds. OSU's recommendations included: the power plant, lab and classroom space for the Linus Pauling Institute, demolition of Snell Hall, COAS equipment facility, and a multi-purpose animal facility.

Projects in progress include: completion of the Veterinary Medicine small animal facility, raising \$5 million in matching funds to renovate the large animal facility, completion of the Kelley Engineering Building, efforts to build the ONAMI facility, continuation of upgrading access for disabled students, and improved signage.

Capital Campaign - Once the OSU Foundation President is hired, he/she will work with the search firm to hire a vice president who will head the effort for the Capital Campaign. OSU is currently in the 'quiet phase' of the campaign and expects to go public in the fall of 2005. All efforts need to be merged into the broader capital campaign, i.e., engineering and athletics.

## **DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Interim Provost Sabah Randhawa's report included the following:

Provost's Initiatives - In addition to funding ten proposals, \$350,000 has been put aside for instructional equipment for which about 50 proposals were received and are being reviewed.

Accreditation Visit Preliminary Report - Randhawa felt that the assessment was very fair of the work completed since the initial accreditation visit and the work that still needs to occur. The following four areas were included as recommendations in the preliminary report: 1) Deferred maintenance; 2) Library funding; 3) Cascades Campus - recognizing that they are in the process of developing a strategic plan that is aligned with the broader institution plan; and 4) Assessment - recognizing that some work has been accomplished, but more work needs to be done.

## **DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Stella Coakley's report included the following:

Although the Senate's reception for Provost White had to be cancelled following his heart attack, Coakley noted that the Senate does have a plaque to present to him and will be expressing formal thanks and appreciation for his strong support of faculty governance.

Senators were encouraged to review the Institutional Procedures and Criteria for Program Redirection, Reorganization, Reduction and Termination document (an Information Item on the agenda) over the summer, obtain input from colleagues, and forward comments to the Faculty Senate Office.

President Coakley noted that this was an interesting year where progress was made, but felt that some things feel incomplete and she will work on issues over the summer.

Coakley also thanked all chairs and committee members who made the progress possible.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

## **Roll Call**

### Members Present:

**Agricultural Sciences:** Boggess, Brewer, Ciuffetti, Coblenz, Doescher, Freeman, Koong, Penner, Selker, Thompson and C. Boyer for Webb

**Associated:** Averill, Brown, Christie, deGeus, Dempsey, Landis, Lee, Miles, Mills, Ratchford, Rosenberg and Strickroth

**Business:** Coakley, Hsieh, Moulton, and Reitsma

**Education:** Higgins, Pehrsson,

**Engineering:** Kanury, Levien, Lundy, McVicker, Mosley, and Quinn

**Extension:** Filley,

**Forestry:** Bose, Clauson, Erickson, Gupta, Howell, and Maguire

**Health & Human Sciences:** S. Bernell for Bowman, Cluskey, Grobe, Ho, Sorte, and Widrick

**Information Services:** none

**Liberal Arts:** Ede, Gross, Hale, Iltis, Lunch, Melton, Roberts, R. Schwartz for Shaw, and Warner

**Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences:** Jennings and Skyllingstad

**Pharmacy:** Filtz, Ishmael, and Mahmud

**ROTC:** none

**Science:** Evans, Flahive, Giebultowicz, Lee, Parks, and Westall

**Student Affairs:** Bentley-Townlin, DeBellis, Dempsey, Empey, Etherton, Hoogesteger, E. Taylor, J. Nishihara for Tsuneyoshi

**Veterinary Medicine:** Bird and Jennings

### Members Absent:

**Agricultural Sciences:** Anderson, Arp, Brown, Edge, Fanno, Huddleston, Jepson, Obermiller, Perry, and Strik

**Associated:** Faulhaber, Gomez, Majeski, Perrone and Sproul

**Business:** Wong

**Engineering:** Costello, Cull, Koretsky, and Reyes

**Extension:** Bondi, Butler and Downing

**Forestry:** Schoenholtz and Tynon

**Health & Human Sciences:** Acock and Cardinal

**Information Services:** Sheffold,

**Liberal Arts:** Daugherty, P. Farber, V. Farber, Foster, Henderson, Krause, Maul, and Olaya

**Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences:** Arsenault, Ashe, Duncan, Levine, Prah, and Torres

**Pharmacy:** none

**ROTC:** Klink

**Science:** Ahern, Barofsky, Edwards, Ho, Horne, Lajtha, Mason, Pearson, Remcho, Spatafora, and Taylor

**Student Affairs:** none

**Veterinary Medicine:** none

### Guests Present:

B. Balz, G. Beach, C. Bell, D. Bird McCubbin, S. Francis, L. Friedman, A. Klein, H. Koenig, M. Rosowsky, E. Waldschmidt, and D. Wright.

### Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-officios and Staff:

S. Coakley, Senate President; B. Sorte, Immediate Past Senate President; G. Tiedeman, Parliamentarian; Ex-officios: M. Niess, S. Randhawa, E. Ray, and J. Trujillo; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 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](#) » [2004 Minutes](#) » April 8, 2004

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2004 No. 594

April 8, 2004

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Stella Coakley on April 8, 2004 at 3:00 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center. President Coakley thanked Robert Iltis for acting as Parliamentarian during the meeting.

### Meeting Summary

- Action Item: Apportionment Issues [Motion 04-594-01]
- Special Reports: Campus Climate Survey (J. Nishihara and J. Trujillo) and Legislative Issues (J. Mills)
- New Business: Athletics Resolution [Motion 04-594-02]

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent:

Acock, Arp, Arsenault, Ashe, A. Brown, Ciuffetti, Coakley, Costello, Cull, Daugherty, Downing, Duncan, Evans, P. Farber, V. Farber, Faulhaber, Gomez, Gross, S. Ho, Hoogesteger, Horne, Jepson, Koretsky, Lajtha, P. Lee, Levine, Majeski, Mason, Maul, Perrone, Perry, Prael, Remcho, Reyes, Schoenholtz, Spatafora, Strik, Strickroth, B. Taylor, Torres, Tynon, Widrick, and Wong.

#### Members Absent with Representation:

D. Barofsky, J. Hays; G. Brown, K. Meador; S. Henderson, R. Spill; E. Ho, M. Manore; R. Iltis, L. Chandler; G. Klink, K. Macy; and E. Taylor, M. Brouwers.

#### Guests Present:

B. Becker, R. Brumley, L. Kristick, B. Parks and T. Wilcox.

#### Faculty Senate Officers and Staff and Ex-officios:

S. Coakley, Senate President; M. McDaniel, Senate President-Elect; B. Sorte, Immediate Past Senate President; R. Iltis, Parliamentarian; Ex-officios: M. Carson, M. Niess, E. Ray, and J. Trujillo; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

### ACTION ITEM

#### Apportionment Issues

Tony Wilcox, Bylaws and Nominations Committee member, presented a request from the Library faculty to restore the Library apportionment unit based on the academic nature of the work they do and that the majority of their faculty have academic appointments and are in tenure track positions. Following review of the request, the Bylaws and Nominations Committee recommended creating a Library apportionment unit and merging Information Services faculty into the Associated Faculty apportionment unit. The Committee felt that the nature of the association of the Library faculty with the entire campus, their formal classroom teaching and tenure track faculty justified the request.

Wilcox provided the following background:

- Through 1995 the Library was a separate apportionment unit.
- In 1996 the Library was merged with Information Services and became part of the newly created

Information Services apportionment unit.

- In 2003 the Library was separated from Information Services and became part of the Associated Faculty apportionment unit; Information Services retained its apportionment unit.
- In 2004 Information Services had 34 faculty with an FTE of 33.55 and 2 academic faculty.
- In 2004 the Library had 39 faculty with an FTE of 38.75 and 26 academic faculty.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, referred to possible reapportionment of off-campus units, i.e., Extension and Cascades Campus. At one point a task force was appointed to study the issue and then was postponed. This is unfinished business and he would like to have the issue studied.

Ballots to restore the Library apportionment unit and merge Information Services with Associated Faculty were distributed. The vote was 72 in favor, 4 opposed and 1 abstention; motion passed.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **Campus Climate Survey**

Janet Nishihara explained that the survey is sponsored by the Faculty Senate Diversity Council, Campus Climate Study and the Office of Multicultural Affairs. The survey will be available online for three-weeks beginning April 12. The responses are confidential and will be sent to an off-campus site and compiled by Susan Rankin from Penn State who will analyze the responses and incorporate them with information gathered at an upcoming focus group. The goal is to use the information to assist units and the campus as a whole work on a Diversity Action Plan. The following individuals are working on the Campus Climate Survey: Tracy Bentley-Townlin, Kristi Deschesne, Angelo Gomez, Phyllis Lee, Janet Nishihara, Beth Rietveld, Rich Shintaku and Juan Trujillo.

Juan Trujillo encouraged teaching faculty to emphasize to students that they are eligible to participate in the survey.

Senator Bentley-Townlin questioned whether the survey is accessible via screen reader; Nishihara will check with Rankin.

### **Legislative Issues**

Jock Mills, OSU Director of Government Relations, focused his report on OUS and Board changes and what will happen between now and when Legislature reconvenes in January 2005.

Mills felt it's good that OUS is receiving a lot of attention and momentum is being built toward change. Legislators are meeting on a regular basis with Neil Goldschmidt and Neil Bryant to discuss OUS issues. The Board is currently developing legislative bill concepts. Mills noted that the bits and pieces removed from SB 437, the Higher Education Efficiency Act, will come back for review. The items removed from SB 437 include authorities for the universities, abilities to act without Department of Justice oversight, and probably something about financial aid for students.

There is currently a more direct relationship between the OSBHE and institution presidents and Mills expects a more direct relationship between the OUS presidents and the Ways and Means Committee. This will eliminate a level of insulation between institutions and legislators in the budget area. In the past a composite OUS budget has been presented to legislators with no real breakdown per institution. Mills now expects there to be a campus-by-campus discussion with legislators regarding the cost to educate students. This could result in a favorites game being played. There will be a real need for unity among OUS. There are three variables the legislature deals with regarding the budget:

1. They focus on how much money is appropriated for the general fund.
2. They tinker with tuition levels.
3. The variable they haven't yet gotten into is enrollments.

Since Goldschmidt has indicated he wants the Legislature to make policy decisions, he's saying that the Legislature should be making decisions about setting tuition and making a decision about what the real general fund is. This approach could result in the Legislature reverting to the 2001 session decision to decrease general fund appropriation, cap tuition and tell institution's to take every student who applies. As credibility is building for the budget, there needs to be a universal agreement of all three variables - this will take time.

Mills observed that universities will have the ability to act on their own, as they have at times in the past. To be successful, university initiatives need to be endorsed by Goldschmidt and Bryant.

Since there will not be a lot of general fund money in the budget, where will the money come from to reinvest in higher education? First credibility needs to be built in terms of state appropriation efficiencies (more, better, faster). After that, a discussion of possible fund sources can occur. There has been some discussion of devoting capital gains tax, and the new State Board is discussing a ballot measure designating funds for higher education. Mills felt that most of the funds will be for student access.

Mills shared what he expects will happen between now and 2005. A bill was passed in 2003 that obligates legislators to convene after a May 31 report is issued on tax reform. However, most don't think the legislature will have a special session. Several issues are at play: Mills doesn't see changes in the tax code happening since the governor is not in favor. There may be some places where momentum occurs, including eliminating the kicker and placing the funds in a rainy day fund. However, the majority don't want to do that until there is a spending cap in place. Other legislators want the special session to take care of the gay marriage issue.

Mills speculated about upcoming elections: the Senate is likely to be controlled by the Democrats. He doesn't see any of the incumbent Senate Democrats in trouble, but three Senators are retiring or have resigned and those races may go to Republicans. The big change in the House is that the three moderate leaders have retired or been appointed to commissions.

Following the retirement of Orcilia Zuniga-Forbes, Mills is taking on some of the federal agenda duties. He is currently working on improving relationships with the congressional offices. There is a possibility of hiring a firm in D.C. to work with appropriations members and to work with faculty who are preparing federal funding proposals and help faculty identify available funding.

Senator Selker, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether there was recognition in the Legislature as to the degree of urgency institutions are facing in terms of declining faculty numbers and increasing enrollment. Selker asked why it hasn't been done and how can faculty help. Mills wasn't sure how faculty could help at this point. Legislators are still in the mode of making OUS more efficient.

Senator Manore for Ho, Health and Human Sciences, questioned if the Legislature changes the way it approaches university budgets vs. OUS budgets, do we run the risk of further budget micromanagement by them. Mills responded the State Board is unclear about how this will affect the budget process.

Senator Hays for Barofsky, Forestry, questioned whether it is known when the freeze on salaries paid through federal grants will end. Mills responded there is discussion at the Board level on overall faculty salaries, but no resolution has been reached. The issue is whether there will be relief between now and the end of the biennium or during the next budget preparation cycle.

Senator Giebultowicz, Science, questioned whether it was legal for state government to limit PI authority regarding salaries. Mills responded that, as a state employee, it is legal.

Mills reminded faculty of campaigning rules and the use of state funds. It is illegal to use state resources (i.e. copy machines, e-mail, etc.) for campaign purposes, and not advisable to use your name and university title to endorse a candidate for public office.

## **REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE PRESIDENT**

President Ray began by relating some of the messages he shares with those outside of OSU:

- OSU graduates are the most important contributors to the future of Oregon.
- What Oregon needs is a diversified economy and it needs to be globally competitive.
- OSU has many of the core programs that underlie our ability to be cutting edge and best practices in a large array of the sectors of the economy that matter.
- ONAMI represents a collaboration between PSU, UO, OSU, Pacific NW National Laboratories and Hewlett-Packard. HP is providing an in kind gift of about \$2 million toward start-up costs. Partnering with other institutions is important to ensure we are able to hold our own with competition.
- OSU's Strategic Plan and the goal of being a Top 10 Land Grant University. Maximizing the value added by graduates in the community occurs through extraordinary academic programs. The top 10 aspiration is not about rankings, it's about translating that aspiration into having the most meaningful impact on the lives of the people we serve.

Ray and others have been working very hard eliminate the salary freeze. There have been several rounds of

discussion to gain flexibility in the form of counter offers or merit; the Board has been supportive. Changes being discussed by the Board are intended to make institutions more flexible.

Senator Kanury, Engineering, commented on classroom conditions and noted that extraordinary academic programs don't come out of meager facilities. Ray responded by saying the reason he talks about compensation is that it has to do with the very best faculty that can be recruited and retained and he knows that we are substantially behind other states. He and other have been working diligently to gain flexibility in this area. He feels that the Board 'gets it'. Ray explained that the Board has set up subcommittees to work on the governor's objectives - access and affordability, building the quality of academic programs, strategic investment for promoting economic development, and end disinvestment and encourage reinvestment in higher education. They are preparing the way to allow institutions to make proposals that will represent reinvestment in higher education.

Tony Wilcox, Health and Human Sciences, asked for observations about the OSU leadership team and the challenges facing the transition in some of the positions. Ray provided information about the following positions:

- Vice President for University Advancement - He felt that the scope of this job was formerly impossible and has changed some of the duties. He felt the position should focus on internal and external communications.
- Research - The position has been changed from Vice Provost to Vice President since that is the title needed to be effective in Washington D.C. and with other associations. The position needs to be more proactive in identifying funding opportunities.
- Provost - It will be a challenge to replace Tim White. There will be a national search and he expects that an interim provost will soon be named.
- Alumni Association Director - Jeff Todd has recently been hired. Ray felt it is critical for the Alumni Association and OSU Foundation to work together well.
- OSU Foundation - A search is currently underway for the president.
- Multicultural Affairs - The title is changing to Director for Diversity and Community and it will be a University Cabinet level position. A national search will occur.

This is an opportunity to be selective and create an effective team who will complement strengths.

Senator Selker felt there is a need to explain what is broke. For example, how do you explain that the College of Agricultural Sciences has lost 80 positions in the last few years. He questioned how Ray tells people about the broke part. Ray noted that whining doesn't work anymore. He felt successful in his presentation to the State Board in March where he provided information, talked about aspirations and what we have to do to get there, and where the gaps are and what we need to do to fill them. He felt that the Board was receptive and 'got it'. He feels he needs to continue educating people in the state.

Senator Giebultowicz asked if faculty could relate stories of what is actually happening on campus and the domino effect of the weakened state of departments. Ray stated it is difficult to get someone to listen to that approach. He tried unsuccessfully to do something similar in the compensation effort and has told stories of losing faculty because of the inability to pose counter offers.

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

President Coakley announced that there is a forum being scheduled later in the month regarding PERS and ORP.

Coakley reminded faculty of three opportunities currently available to them.

Given the potential impact of quality on student lives and academic programs, Coakley urged faculty to consider volunteering for Faculty Senate committees/councils. She noted it is very important that there is a good pool from which to draw, and it is difficult to achieve diversity if there are few volunteers.

A second opportunity involves preproposals for new investments and initiatives to advance OSU's Strategic Plan. The goal is to fund up to six multi-year initiatives that will bring significant new integrative activities across campus. The intent is that the initiatives hold high promise for advancing excellence in one or more thematic areas of the Strategic Plan.

The third is an opportunity to watch out for each other and our students since there is much stress during

spring term. Coakley encouraged faculty to direct students to needed resources.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Hays for Barofsky, Agricultural Sciences, on behalf of himself and Barofsky, moved the following resolution regarding athletics, which he recommended, be moved to the Executive Committee; the motion was seconded:

***Resolved, that the OSU Faculty Senate petition President Ray to initiate action to permanently cancel the Pac-10 postseason basketball tournament, and communicate its action to other Pac-10 Faculty Senates.***

### ***Reasons:***

- 1. Participation in the tournament results in no increased benefits (e.g., scholarship stipends) to the basketball players.***
- 2. On the contrary, by taking place in the dead-week/finals-week timeframe, the tournament interferes with the academic process, making a mockery of the student-athlete concept. The fact that the competitive spirit of the athletes motivates them to play does not absolve faculty of their responsibilities.***
- 3. By pushing back the regular conference season, the tournament deprives the OSU Student Body of conference games just before Winter Term.***
- 4. Coming after a complete 18-game conference season, the tournament is irrelevant to determining who the best Pac-10 teams are or should be.***
- 5. The tournament can actually lower the seeding of Pac-10 teams in the NCAA Tournament because playing (especially losing to) low-ranked teams reduces so-called "power" ratings.***
- 6. The tournament tends to weaken Pac-10 teams for the NCAA Tournament 4-5 days later, because of the stress and fatigue associated with final exams and term papers occurring simultaneously with tournament basketball games (as many as three in three days) and sometimes because players are injured.***
- 7. The tournament serves only to increase the revenue of the Fox Network (and the Pac-10 schools), to the academic and athletic detriment of the student athletes.***

Senator Selker felt the resolution was sufficiently meritorious for further consideration and input by the Executive Committee and later consideration by the Faculty Senate.

Following an inquiry by Senator Moulton, Business, asking what the Executive Committee would do with the resolution, Coakley responded they would consider the motion and look at potential committees for appropriate referral, discuss the issue with administration and explore options of how it might be further handled, and ultimately make a decision on what to do with it. Parliamentarian Iltis noted that it is always the right of the body to pull it back from the Executive Committee or any other committee to which it has been referred.

Hays stated he would expect the Executive Committee to solicit opinions from others on campus.

Motion passed by voice vote with some dissenting votes to send the resolution to the Executive Committee for consideration.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 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](#) » [2004 Minutes](#) » February 5, 2004

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2004 No. 592

February 5, 2004

---

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Stella Coakley on February 5, 2004 at 3:01 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center.

---

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Category I - Elimination of the Master in Software Engineering [Motion 04-592-01]
  - Special Reports: Legislative Issues (M. McCambridge) and Unified Image Project (C. Pederson)
- 

### Roll Call

#### Members Absent:

Acock, Arsenault, Ashe, Balz, Boggess, Bondi, Butler, Costello, Cull, Daugherty, DeBellis, Duncan, Etherton, P. Farber, V. Farber, Faulhaber, Filley, Gross, Horne, Ishmael, Jepson, Koretsky, Majeski, Mason, Moulton, Murphy, Obermiller, Pearson, Perry, Reyes, Skyllingstad, Spatafora, Strik, B. Taylor, Torres, and Widrick.

#### Members Absent with Representation:

A. Brown, L. Goddick; Giebultowicz, B. Guakharia; Hsieh, J. Yang; Shaw, P. Watkins; and Tynon, P Hwauni.

#### Guests Present:

B. Becker, C. Boyer, T. Chovanec, S. Francis, M. McCambridge, C. Pederson, N. Pifer, S. Randhawa, J. Schuster, and S. Tesch.

#### Faculty Senate Officers and Staff and Ex-officios:

S. Coakley, President; M. McDaniel, President Elect; B. Sorte, Immediate Past President; Ex-officios: M. Carson, E. Ray, and J. Trujillo; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

### ***ACTION ITEM***

#### **Category I Proposal - Elimination of the Master in Software Engineering**

Charles Boyer, Curriculum Council Chair, noted that both the Graduate Council and Curriculum Council had approved the proposal to eliminate the Master of Software Engineering. He explained that this program had been offered through the Oregon Masters in Software Engineering degree on a number of campuses. In 2003 the OUS and Chancellor's Office conducted a review of the program resulting in the recommendation that the program be offered at one institution only. Proposals to offer the degree were solicited and PSU was selected to offer the program (OSU chose not to submit a proposal). The six currently enrolled OSU students will be accommodated through completion of their degrees.

Motion 04-592-01 to approve the program elimination passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.

### ***SPECIAL REPORTS***

#### **Legislative Issues**

President Coakley explained that Representative Kelley Wirth, who was scheduled to talk with the Senate, had been called to Salem and was not able to be present. In her place, Vice President for Finance and Administration Mark McCambridge talked about the impact of the failure of Ballot Measure 30.

McCambridge explained that last summer OSU anticipated the potential failure of BM 30 and the university and took measures to set aside funds to deal with the issue. The university does not anticipate considering any additional budget cuts or tuition or fee increases for the rest of this fiscal year.

Although McCambridge noted there is the potential of calling the legislature back into session, he feels that the immediate short-term chances of a special session dealing with budget cuts will not likely occur. The Governor is not planning to take action related to the shortfall and is hoping that the economy will improve sufficiently by the end of the biennium.

Senator Barofsky, Science, questioned the types of new revenue that the OSBHE may consider. McCambridge noted that the new Board is working in private and they have been given a mandate to increase investment in higher education. He feels that the Board will move quickly and that we can expect to see a great deal of action from this group.

Senator Foster, Liberal Arts, referred to talk about the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) with regard to givebacks. Many departments budgeted for the failure of BM 30, but felt that there would be a one-time giveback and questioned if there was any sense of the DAS interpretation. McCambridge responded that the interpretation is that the BM 30 cuts will be taken in the second year of the biennium and that the Continuing Service Levels (CSL) will be reduced by twice the Measure 30 level in 2005.

### **Unified Image Project**

Curt Pederson, Vice President for University Advancement, explained that a Unified Image Project consisting of letters and a wordmark are replacing the current OSU hexagon logo. He noted that usage of the hexagon, which has been in use since 1989, has declined and some units have created their own logo and/or wordmark that they feel is more representative. This led to the institution having a less unified image.

Pederson polled alumni at various functions as to the effectiveness of the hexagon logo and they have indicated that it is great in the State of Oregon, but people outside the state have to squint to try to make out the letters. Alumni have suggested finding in image that is more readily recognizable.

Pederson explained that the effort for a more unified image was launched in 2001, but that budgetary and national events led to the project being put on hold. The decision to move forward was made recently. He noted that it is not unusual for organizations to introduce logos and wordmarks when milestones occur, and the University considers the Strategic Plan to be a milestone. The new logo is a 21st century mark – bold, strong and clean – a positive change. It also has tradition associated with it and works well with the web. He has shared the new image with several groups and each have been supportive of the change and encouraged him to move forward. Pederson noted that car decals to publicize the new image will be ordered and distributed around campus to replace those currently in use. He is looking for non-E&G funds to be donated to assist with the cost of the decals.

As a cost saving measure, units will be allowed to exhaust current stationery and business card supplies bearing the old logo. However, units may order stationery bearing the new image, if they so choose to replace their stock.

It is anticipated that the implementation schedule will be as follows: February - printing will be working with the new image to ready it for customers; March - full implementation of the new image.

Senator Grunder, Science, questioned whether departments will be allowed to include their names, as with the off-campus units. Tina Chovanec, Publications, responded that would probably not be an acceptable use and that a Graphic ID Guide is currently being prepared to outline how departments can incorporate their name into the image.

Senator Levien, Engineering, questioned whether there would be standard OSU formats for presentations such as Power Point. Pederson responded that standard formats will be available on the web and on CDs. Chovanec noted that there will be a standardized banner for web sites. Sites using the standardized banner will automatically be updated if the image changes again.

President Coakley asked about the cost of the formal letterhead, which will run the image across the top of the page rather than on the side. Chovanec acknowledged that the cost will be more than the current letterhead, but that there will be both a color and black and white option for desktop applications.

Muneera Spence noted that the sample lettering was a sans serif font and questioned whether there was also a serif option. Chovanec responded there was no option for a serif font.

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

Sabah Randhawa, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs, provided information about several issues.

Courtesy Faculty Task Force – He noted that there have been minor changes made to the report that was issued about a year ago, but that the sense of it is intact. The task force recommended two different subsets of faculty. Since the OARs would not allow the term ‘adjunct faculty’ to be used, OSU Affiliates and Courtesy Faculty will be used. He noted that neither subset of faculty are on OSU’s payroll. The following definitions will be used: Courtesy Faculty – individuals who contribute in a substantive way (i.e., teaching, advising, etc.); OSU Affiliates – individuals who do not contribute in a significant way (i.e., visiting faculty, guest lecturers, etc.)

He noted that the expectation of Courtesy Faculty is that they associate with the University for a longer period of time (more than one year), those in academic ranks can be promoted, and they have formal periodic performance reviews. OSU Affiliates are at the University for a year or less. Previously, approval for Courtesy Faculty (both subsets) was obtained from the Provost’s Office while the newly approved recommendation allows deans to have final approval.

The implementation process is now ready to begin and Randhawa anticipates completion of the conversion process by July 1, 2004. New appointments will be processed under the new guidelines in a month or two. He hopes to distribute a detailed set of policies to the university community within the next month.

Senator Rosenberg, Associated, questioned whether OSU Affiliates will be able to use university facilities. Randhawa indicated they would have ID cards and would be able to use the Library, Dixon, etc.

Senator Arp, Agricultural Sciences, questioned why Courtesy Faculty will be evaluated annually since many are at the rank of professor, which are normally reviewed every three years. Randhawa responded that it makes sense to have their reviews consistent with other faculty.

Senator Selker, Agricultural Sciences, questioned with whom liaison was conducted and what the response was. Randhawa responded that the task force had significant involvement with academic colleges during the last 18 months. This issue was also discussed with other groups such as deans, University Cabinet and the Faculty Senate. Senator Selker questioned the formal documented opportunities for feedback. President Coakley, who was on the task force, indicated that the task force made extended efforts to contact Courtesy Faculty and others regarding the proposed changes and inviting comment.

Randhawa noted that the Courtesy Faculty Task Force Final Report was available on the Academic Affairs website at <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/2002/new/about/CourFacul.rtf> and that the guidelines should be ready in a week or so.

President Coakley, who served on the task force, stated that one intent was to reduce paperwork and questioned why time was going to be spent in moving all current Courtesy Faculty and OSU Affiliates to the new system when many will be rotating out of the system in June. Coakley recommended waiting until the next cycle begins in July for continuing faculty and immediately begin processing incoming faculty under the new guidelines. Randhawa will take this recommendation under consideration. He also noted that some departments are diligent in reviewing appointments, but other appointments have not been reviewed in years which acted as a trigger to review Courtesy Faculty.

Senator Mosley, Engineering, questioned how faculty will obtain ID cards if the paperwork only goes as far as the dean’s office. Randhawa indicated that a system to transmit information to Human Resources is being worked out to issue ID cards, etc. Mosley also questioned whether inactive Courtesy Faculty will be moved to the status of OSU Affiliates. Randhawa felt this was an opportunity for departments to take them off the books or have a conversation with them regarding their status.

In response to Senator Clauson, Forestry, inquiring as to the number of faculty affected, Randhawa indicated there are currently about 750 appointments. He also noted that, for some, their role is quite limited.

Strategic Plan – The Strategic Plan is in the final production stage and it is anticipated that it will be shared with the campus over the next 10-14 days.

Searches – The searches for Vice President for Research and Vice President for University Advancement close in mid- March with appointments expected no later than September 2004. Interviews for the Directors of the Academic Success and Teaching and Learning Centers will be in February and they are hoping to close the searches by the beginning of March.

Faculty Awards – On behalf of the President and Provost, Randhawa strongly urged that faculty be nominated for available awards. He noted that some awards received no nominations last year.

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

President Coakley thanked the meeting presenters and Senators for their contributions during the meeting.

Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule Revised – Due to a conflict with the recently rescheduled meetings of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, the Faculty Senate is changing their meeting dates to the second Thursday of the month for the remainder of the academic year. Please also hold these alternate dates for the fall until it is determined whether the revised OSBHE schedule will continue into the fall.

Optional Retirement Program (ORP) Forum – The Faculty Senate expects to co-sponsor with the Provost's Office an open forum regarding ORP.

Information Items – President Coakley encouraged Senators to read these items so they will be apprised of what is coming forward, but not yet ready for the Senate floor. She noted that Information Items may become Action Items and those having a potential impact should be communicated to Senators' constituents.

Faculty Awards Nominations – President Coakley noted that past patterns of successful nominations are indicative of colleges and departments that are willing to take the time to nominate faculty. OSU has numerous qualified and deserving faculty. She noted that the Botany & Plant Pathology departmental policy is that nominees are not advised when nominated for awards. Since preparing nominations requires updated CV's, faculty were much more willing to keep their CV's updated when they realized that this effort could ultimately result in an award nomination.

Campus Engagement – President Coakley encouraged faculty to engage in campus issues, particularly those involving students, and to reach out to students. She recently attended a student debate and was reminded of the great amount of student creativity, energy and enthusiasm and the role played by faculty to encourage students.

### ***DIALOG WITH OSU PRESIDENT ED RAY***

President Ray commented on his message that was distributed to the campus regarding Ballot Measure 30. He indicated that the point of the message was to say that OSU was not foolish in the way that funds were allocated in anticipation of the failure of BM 30. In his message he referred to the dedication of faculty who work here and feels that people are doing an extraordinary job given the resources available. He noted that the number of faculty retiring in each of the last two years has doubled from three years ago. He will be working with the Governor and OSBHE to find new ways to reinvest in higher education and noted there is speculation that it may take several biennium to see money coming back to higher ed.

Senator Ho, Science, stated that the salary freeze rule impacts faculty retention and student recruitment and questioned what the university is doing about this issue. Ray stated that it is yet to be determined whether the new State Board will implement changes in this area. He has already brought up the issue of counteroffers with the new Board, and will continue to push this issue. He feels there needs to be flexibility with respect to compensation and counteroffers.

Senator Kanury, Engineering, mentioned the concept of clusters of expertise and questioned if there was a structure to safeguard against misuse of collaboration. Ray responded that faculty shouldn't work with

someone they don't trust - there are faculty rules and expectations of colleagues with respect to plagiarism and collegiality. Although he expects these rules to be sufficient, he commented that there may be a need to sort out intellectual property rights at some point. Coakley added that there are university processes, and that faculty can contact the Faculty Senate to determine what is available to faculty regarding grievance and mediation procedures. She encouraged faculty to work through problems as they arise, and keep taking the issue to the next level if necessary. She also noted it was important for students to learn the ethics and standards expected of faculty.

Senator Ho commented that the university is conducting a search for a Vice President for Research when there is a sitting Vice Provost for Research. Ray responded that, for purposes of effective representation, the university needs someone with the right title when they go to Washington, D.C. to talk with funding agencies. It's important to have a title that is commonly recognized. Ray wants the position to be expanded to include a more active and visible presence in D.C. to lead and coordinate efforts to gain funding for the University, and he wants the office to take a more active role in bringing back research opportunities to potential principle investigators. Vice Provost Randhawa reminded Senators that Rich Holdren's appointment is fixed-term and the intent was always to conduct a national search.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Empey, Student Affairs, announced that University Housing and Dining Services has initiated a new program called 'Food for Thought' that offers an opportunity to engage with students. This program invites faculty to have a meal with students in a dining hall at no cost to the faculty member. She encouraged faculty to announce in class that they would be willing to participate in this program and meet with students for a meal. The students then take the faculty member to the dining centers' Service Centers where coupons can be obtained. The hope is that students and faculty will take advantage of the opportunity to engage in academic and scholarly discourse outside of the classroom.

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 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](#).