

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 2006 Minutes

2006 Minutes

Minutes for Faculty Senate meetings can be accessed by clicking on the desired year. Minutes are distributed to Senators for approval each month. Contact the [Faculty Senate Office](#) via the web or phone at 541-737-4344 for more information.

- [October 12](#)
- [June 8](#)
- [March 9](#)
- [February 9](#)

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](#) » [2006 Minutes](#) » October 12, 2006

Faculty Senate Minutes

2006 No. 615

October 12, 2006

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Bill Boggess on October 12, 2006 in the LaSells Stewart Center.

Meeting Summary

- Action Item: Approval of June Minutes [Motion 06-615-01]
- Special Reports: State of the University Address - E. Ray; Online Network Education and User Program (One-Up) - S. Etherton; and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate - L. Curtis.
- New Business: None

ACTION ITEM

Approval of Minutes

The June 2006 minutes were approved as distributed.

SPECIAL REPORT

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Recap

Larry Curtis, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator, reported on the following items from the October IFS meeting:

- Ballot Measure Impacts - Passage of BM 48, which would limit spending to inflation plus population growth, would be devastating to higher education. Passage of BM 41, which increases deductions available on Oregon income tax, may reduce recent funding increases to higher education.
- Community College Transfers - IFS will request additional representation from four-year colleges on a committee reviewing concerns that community college courses are not equal, particularly in the sciences. The committee is currently heavily populated by community college representatives.
- AP Classes - There is some variance in the way they are evaluated before being transferred in. Both IFS and OUS are pushing for competency tests to be consistently accepted.

Tax Deferred Investment Options - Curtis is the IFS representative on the OUS Investment Committee and IFS spent some time discussing the OUS proposal to change employees' tax deferred investment options. Coupled with this is the new investment platform available to those in the Optional Retirement Plans (ORP).

Curtis explained that, with changes in PERS, OUS felt it would be necessary for faculty to invest some of their own money toward their retirement. They also felt that the existing plans might not be the best plans available since the costs may be high and the best products may not be in the vendors' portfolios, so the return may not be as high as it could be. OUS contracted with a financial firm to review the concerns. Curtis explained the rationale for the plan redesign:

- Combining the TDI and ORP plans under a single recordkeeper and investment menu provides an array of high-quality, low cost retirement investment options for OUS employees.
- New regulations, investment options, and administration technology have arisen that will improve

the current OUS plans.

- Redesigning plans will provide usable information and easy access to retirement accounts.
- Encouraging OUS employees to take full advantage of the retirement savings plans that OUS sponsors for them.

Under the current plan, OUS makes it possible for employees to contract with individual vendors they have certified and allows direct deposit from employees' checks; the vendor handles plan selection, sets rates and charges fees. OUS would like to consolidate these activities into a group plan that should result in significantly lower recordkeeping fees - the more money in the plan, the lower the fee. The consultants would assist in obtaining better products and would have oversight on the performance of the products. They would also recommend that ORP be rolled into the same vendor plan for cost and product improvement. Curtis will meet annually with the committee.

Under the current plan, OUS makes it possible for employees to contract with individual vendors they have certified and allows direct deposit from employees' checks; the vendor handles plan selection, sets rates and charges fees. OUS would like to consolidate these activities into a group plan that should result in significantly lower recordkeeping fees - the more money in the plan, the lower the fee. The consultants would assist in obtaining better products and would have oversight on the performance of the products. They would also recommend that ORP be rolled into the same vendor plan for cost and product improvement. Curtis will meet annually with the committee.

There is an Implementation Committee, with representatives from each OUS campus, that will interview vendors and record keepers on the accounts. Following plan selection, there will be oversight by the Investment Committee which will meet at least annually with the consultant to monitor performance of the products. Information will be posted online.

Although the Legislature limits the number of available vendors, the committee worked with the consultant to obtain the option of a Self-Directed Account "Mutual Fund Window" that will allow employees to choose a vendor that is not offered under the plan. Overall, based on his participation in the discussions, Curtis felt that this was the best option for OUS employees.

Lynda Ciuffetti, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether ORP members could use their current vendor and if they can move their funds. Curtis noted that the TDI plan is effective in March, but the ORP plan does not take effect until October. ORP mutual funds are covered through the "window", but an insurance company annuity may be more restrictive. Typically a surrender fee is charged when changing plans, but the consultant is negotiating a plan to not charge surrender fees.

David McIntyre, Political Science, questioned whether vendor options will be available. Curtis responded that one can select any vendor for mutual funds, but there will be restrictions on annuities. McIntyre then requested IAP information. Curtis responded that he doesn't have IAP information, but both the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and IFS is requesting IAP information. Curtis also noted he has no information on decoupling the ORP from PERS, but it is a concern. President Boggess noted he is trying to get additional information on these two issues and will continue to track developments on the process reported on by Curtis.

State of the University Address

President Ed Ray's State of the University Address, titled "Choosing Our Future," consisted of three main focus areas: 2005-06 accomplishments, current circumstances and the agenda for the coming year, with a particular focus on the student experience. His entire speech is available online at http://oregonstate.edu/leadership/president/state_university_address2006.html

Accomplishments:

- Salaries - Provided a 6% merit increase in faculty salaries.
- Budgets - Established a schedule for the re-basing of college budgets.
- University Diversity Action Plan - Positioned for completion and adoption during fall 2006.
- Student Athletes - Kate Halischak was hired as the Director of Student Athlete Academic Services with a direct reporting line to Vice Provost Becky Johnson. Initiated the summer bridge program, BEST, to ensure that students prosper both as students and athletes.
- Accreditation - OSU's accreditation was reaffirmed through 2011.

Commencement - OSU graduated a record 4,300 students in June 2006.

- Capital Campaign - \$237 million of the campaign goal has been raised, with 20 gifts of \$1 million or more.
- Dual Enrollment Agreements - 13 of 17 agreements with Oregon community colleges have been signed, with an additional two in Hawaii.

Current Circumstances:

- Higher Education Funding - The Governor committed to increase funding by at least 10% in each future biennium.
- Oregon Opportunity Grant - Increased from \$45 million to almost \$75 million during the last legislative session.
- Funding - Continued funding for ONAMI has been proposed, as well as for two new Oregon Signature Research Centers - the Oregon BEST Center will focus on clean energy and bio-products and the Drug Discovery SRV will focus on infectious diseases. Funding is also earmarked for two additional initiatives - Ocean Wave Energy and Food Processing. OSU colleges and centers will have an opportunity to play major roles in these initiatives whose total funding request is close to \$40 million.
- OSU-Cascades - The Board of Higher Education agreed to support Cascades Campus using the same formula for smaller OUS institutions. Under the plan, OSU-Cascades would also receive enrollment growth funding.
- OSU Statewide Programs - The State Board strongly endorsed increased funding.

Agenda for the Coming Year:

- Continue to collaborate across disciplines.
- Create new programs from current resources in the five thematic areas in the Strategic Plan, areas where OSU currently has world-class capability, or the potential to rank among the best universities in the nation.
- Remain focused on three goals: 1) increasing academic program excellence, 2) enhancing the quality of the student experience, and 3) managing costs and expanding resources.
- Academic Excellence - A 4% merit raise package will be distributed in January, and guidelines have been distributed to implement the raise package.
- Faculty Diversity - 1) All faculty search committees shall include a designated affirmative action representative who has been trained to serve in this capacity; 2) The Tenured Faculty Diversity Initiative will be supported to assist in adding senior faculty from diverse backgrounds; 3) A Director for Women's Advancement and Gender Equity will be appointed to assess issues of gender parity, campus climate and culture, professional development, and to advance best practices for creating a diverse environment; and 4) Launch a Life-Balance OSU Initiative to make the OSU community a healthier and more family-friendly environment.
- A President's Commission on Ocean, Coastal, and Earth System Futures will identify a vision that integrates biological, physical, and social sciences in studies of ocean and coastal systems and communities, and defines new ways of engaging with society.
- Student Experience Initiative - For OSU to be among the top land grant universities, first-year retention rates should be close to 90% rather than 80% and the six-year graduate rate should be close to 80% rather than 60%. To assist with the initiative of focusing on the first two years of student experience, the University Council for Student Engagement and Experience has been formed. This initiative will be lead by the Provost, in collaboration with the Faculty Senate and Provost's Council, and will refine and implement recommendations from the Student Experience Research Task Force.
- Facilities - A multi-year university classroom renovation plan to upgrade instructional space and technology has been initiated. The goal is to include every classroom.
- Managing Costs, Increasing Resources - 1) OSU must narrow the menu of programs offered. This means down-sizing or eliminating good programs; 2) Explore right-sizing enrollment to better correspond to financial capabilities. Ray has asked the Office of Enrollment management to take the lead in developing a long-term enrollment management plan; 3) Steadily enhance budget transparency and create appropriately defined incentives to increase our ability to raise resources and apply them effectively. A discussion will commence involving the Provost, Deans, Senate leaders, and others to determine how incremental resources should be allocated; 3) Continue pursuing partnerships with government, industry, and educational institutions. OSU has degree partnership agreements with 13 of Oregon's 17 community colleges and hopes to soon finalize partnerships with the remaining four. OSU also has partnerships with two of Hawaii's seven

community colleges; 4) Continue to increase ability to tell our story more effectively. OSU is averaging at least one national story in the media per week; and 5) Maintain progress in fundraising to secure the philanthropic support the university merits.

During his speech, President Ray announced that Kathleen Dean Moore has agreed to serve as the University Writer Laureate.

President Boggess referred to the 13 dual enrollment agreements with Oregon community colleges and questioned whether Ray expects to sign more agreements with other institutions outside of Oregon. Ray responded that the goal is to sign the last four community colleges this calendar year. He would like to pursue the other five community colleges in Hawaii (due to historical ties), and felt that OSU needs to think about others outside of Oregon.

In regard to Ray's comments regarding 'right-sizing' the university, Boggess asked Ray how he sees this unfolding. Ray stated that enrollment targets need to be determined. He felt that enrollment consists of a mix of undergraduate, graduate and professional students and related revenue and cost shares of those consequences. Another related consideration is the mix of lower and upper division course. If OSU is serious about increasing first-year retention and graduation rates, the result will be a larger number of upper division students/courses. If top ten is a serious goal, one can expect to see systematic shifts in students' major. If the financial picture deteriorates dramatically for higher education, the State Board will have discussions regarding right-sizing enrollment. Ray would prefer that OSU determine its own target enrollment rate rather than have the Board make the determination. The Office of Enrollment Management will take the lead in the enrollment discussion, but Ray expects the Faculty Senate and Provost to identify faculty to be on the team. Ray feels the time to begin the discussion is now.

Senator Iltis, Liberal Arts, noted reference to downsize or eliminate programs and questioned if there is a timeline for elimination. Ray responded that he expects these discussions to occur in every college and within departments, depending upon resource constraints. Faculty need to understand how to best manage this undesirable situation.

Senator Sullivan, ROTC, questioned what metric is used to evaluate top ten and where are we now. Ray responded that comparator universities are in the Strategic Plan. The metrics include first-year experience and retention rate increases.

Senator Sorte, Agricultural Sciences, felt that OSU's focus should be on serving those whom the land grant is designed to serve rather than focus on the 'best and the brightest' students. OSU should take students with potential and retain them - he questioned how this can occur when budget cuts reduce teaching faculty and increase GTA's by 10%. Ray noted that the reason student experience is being discussed is that the desire is to have students come from diverse backgrounds, which is not necessarily the easiest course in terms of retention. The student experience group will focus on what needs to be done better to keep and create opportunities for access and results in more graduates given the level of resources.

Online Network Education and User Program (One-Up)

Scott Etherton, Assistant Director of Residential Life, provided an overview regarding online networks such as Facebook, which is popular with college students, and Myspace, which is popular with high school and middle school students. Assisting him with the presentation were Jill Creighton, Kathryn Magura, and Bryan Stroup. The One-Up group provides education regarding online safety, and faculty were encouraged to contact the Dean of Students Office to participate in the group and provide a faculty perspective.

An Online Network is a site that allows people to search for and view personal information about others. Features of these networks include: picture posting, posting of identifiable demographic information, physical location disclosure, blogging, mp3 sharing, social calendar ability, and the ability to write and receive comments from others. The networks provide avenues to advertise for programs, receive homework assistance, personally express oneself, and catch up on campus events.

A handout was distributed that contained the following risks:

- Information Disclosure - All information a user posts online is optional; positive identification may

lead to personal harm; and posted information may affect other individuals, such as a roommate or family member.

- Personal Control - Once the user posts information, all control over personal information is then diminished or lost completely; users should understand and edit the privacy settings associated with his or her personal profile; and users should be aware of who can view his or her profile, such as prospective employers or professors.
- Communication with Others - Users should exercise caution when communicating with others via online communities and continually evaluate their physical and emotional safety with online and personal relationships.
- User Intent - Not all online community members log on with the same intentions - some intents may include identify theft, stalking, or harassment.
- Authenticity - Authenticity of users is not confirmed.

Senators were able to view information posted on actual Facebook sites. Care should be used when posting personal information to avoid the information being used in a negative manner. On the positive side, Facebook can also be used to issue invitations or advertise (for a small fee) events. One recently introduced controversial feature is the Main Feed that brings to the attention of viewers any recent changes to an individual's site. It was emphasized that all information posted is voluntary. However, it was also cautioned that anyone can register a site using another's name, which then prevents the person whose name is being used to create their own account. Faculty can have a site on Facebook, and that is actually recommended.

DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bill Boggess' comments included the following:

- Parking - Some faculty have experienced difficulty when coming to work on game days. The policy is that faculty and staff may park in lots without paying the athletic fee on game day if they are parking to go to work. Jason O'Quinn is the contact in Athletics if you have comments. Senator Curtis, Agricultural Sciences, questioned how much Athletics contributes to the maintenance of the parking lots for which fees are being charged; Boggess did not have that information. Senator Mason, Science, noted that students coming to campus to study are also being turned away from lots or expected to pay for the day and felt that this situation needs to be reviewed and resolved,
- AR 17 - Revisions to AR 17 were approved in June, with the implementation scheduled for fall 2007. Since then, there has been a suggested revision to allow faculty to submit both an I grade and a letter grade which would be defaulted to if no grade change is submitted within a year, rather than the grade converting to an F. The Executive Committee has been in conversation with the Registrar's Office to determine if this is a possibility and has referred the issue back to the Academic Regulations Committee for further discussion and possible revision. It's hoped that additional revisions will be presented to the Senate by December. Senator Flahive, Science, questioned the possibility of automating a reminder one month prior to the one year period. Another suggestion was to have an I convert to an F at the time of graduation. Boggess will refer both suggestions back to the committee.
- Senate Committees - A message indicating committee vacancies was distributed and faculty were encouraged to volunteer for these vacancies.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Present:

Agricultural Sciences: Anderson, Coblenz, Curtis, Dreher, Edge, Engel, Mallory-Smith, Penner, Sorte.
Associated Faculty: Arthenayake, Beach, Dempsey, Dorbolo, Eklund, Elmshaeuser, Gillies, Gomez, Greydanus, Hughes, LeBeouf, Minear, Oldfield, Ross.
Business: D. Caplan for Banyl, LeMay, Raja, Wu, Yang.
Education: Ward, White.

Engineering: Bose, Huber, Hunter-Zaworski, Levien, Lundy, Pence.
Extension: Galloway, W. Hein for Godwin.
Forestry: Brunner, Clauson, Doescher, Freitag, Puettman, Reuter.
Health & Human Sciences: M. Mahana for Asbell, Bowman, Braverman, Friedman, Grobe, Ho, Wilcox.
Liberal Arts: Carson, R. Hammer for Edwards, Iltis, Kingston, Lunch, P. Curtis for Melton, Roberts, Shaw, Valls.
Library: McMillen.
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Benoit-Bird, Spitz, Wheatcroft.
Pharmacy: Mahmud, Stevens.
ROTC: Sullivan.
Science: Flahive, Ho, Jansen, Mason, Matzke, McCune, McLeod, Parks, Rajagopal.
Student Affairs: Etherton, Hoogesteger, Langford, Larson, C. Empey for Schwab, Tsuneyoshi, Winter.
Veterinary Medicine: Estill, Mosley.

Members Absent:

Agricultural Sciences: Bolte, Brewer, Cassidy, Duncan, Gregory, Huddleston, Jepson, Meink, Savage, Thompson, Wolpert.
Associated Faculty: Barr, Fernandez, Larkin, Rosenberg.
Business: No absences.
Education: No absences.
Engineering: Jovanovic, Lee, Momsen, Sillars.
Extension: Butler, Carr, Hathaway.
Forestry: Sexton.
Health & Human Sciences: Acock.
Liberal Arts: Anderson, Barker, Brayman Hackel, Farber, Folts, Helle, Henderson, Mutschler, Oriard.
Library: No absences.
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Duncan, Skyllingstad, Torres.
Pharmacy: Nauman.
ROTC: No absences.
Science: Barofsky, Brown, Giebultowicz, Gitelman, Grunder, Jones, Kimerling, Lajtha, Smythe, Taylor.
Student Affairs: No absences.
Veterinary Medicine: Jennings.

Guests Present:

B. Becker, G. Bruce, S. Coakley, J. Creighton, L. Dillard, S. Leslie, K. Magura, D. McIntyre, M. McDaniel, B. Rietveld, G. Shellhammer, B. Stroup, A. Tucker.

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-officios and Staff Present:

Officers: B. Boggess, President; M. Quinn, President-Elect; and Ex-officios: L. Cuiffetti, S. Randhawa, E. Ray, M. Beachley

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted by:

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](#) » [2006 Minutes](#) » June 8, 2006

Faculty Senate Minutes

2006 No. 614

June 8, 2006

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President-Elect Mike Quinn on June 8, 2006 in the LaSells Stewart Center.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Revisions to Academic Regulation 17; Revisions to the Standing Rules for: Diversity Council and Library Committee; and Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee Election [Motion 06-614-01 through 06]
- Discussion Item: President Ed Ray
- Special Report: Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Recap - M. Carson
- New Business: Resolution in Support of Baha'i Students in Iran [Motion 06-614-07]

Past President Jeff Hale presented Keith Prickett with a plaque in appreciation of his three years as a student worker in the Faculty Senate Office. His creativity and innovation allowed the Senate to streamline operations and, among other things, have the ability to conduct elections, volunteer for committees and review Baccalaureate Core courses all on line.

ACTION ITEMS

Academic Regulation 17 Proposed Revisions

Sherri Argyres, Academic Regulations Committee member, presented for approval the following revisions to AR 17.

AR 17. Grades (*proposed deletions are bracketed in red and proposed additions are bolded*)

When a requirement of a course has not been completed for reasons acceptable to the instructor and the rest of the academic work is passing, a report of I (incomplete) may be made and additional time granted. The I is only granted at the discretion of the instructor. The instructor documents the deficiency and the deadline for completing the missing work. A record of the deficiency shall be kept on file in the unit or department office. The additional time awarded shall in no case exceed one calendar year. To remove the I grade, the student must complete the deficiency within the allotted time and the instructor will then submit the appropriate grade. If the student fails to complete the work within the allotted time, **[the instructor has the option of either submitting a substitute grade or allowing a permanent grade of I to remain on the student's record. The I grade will have no effect on the student's grade point average.]** **the Registrar's Office will automatically change the I grade to an F (failure), an N (no-credit), or a U (unsatisfactory), as appropriate, on the student's record. The resulting grade could have an effect on the student's grade point average. Under no circumstances shall a student who earns an A-F grade or an N or U grade have their grade changed retroactively to an I grade.**

Rationale: Students not completing incompletes in a timely manner can cause great difficulty for themselves and instructors when and if they do get around to changing the I grade. AR 17 gives students one year to finish course requirements; however, students with legitimate reasons needing an extension can petition to do so or they can opt to withdraw from the course. Additionally, faculty have requested a way to reduce the prevalence of requests by students to have grades changed - typically to change F grades to I grades from previous academic terms or years, which then changes the gpas and academic standing of these students. There are also petition processes for other circumstances, i.e.,

students with a medical emergency have the option to petition for a drop or late withdrawal. Additionally, this change provides support to faculty when requested by students to change a letter grade to an I grade.

Discussion:

- In response to a question inquiring whether there was already a 12-month deadline for I grades to be changed, Barbara Balz, Registrar, stated that an I grade may remain for 12 months; after that time the I becomes permanent under the current system.
- Senator Wilcox, Health & Human Sciences, was strongly opposed to the proposal and felt it was, in effect, relying on some machine to turn an I into an F grade, as opposed to an instructor changing the grade. He suggested that the instructor indicate the default grade that the I would change to if the work is not completed rather than an automatic F.
- Balz indicated some felt that the current I policy is being abused in particular cases since some students opt for an I when it is too late for a W, knowing that the I can remain permanently.
- Senator Iltis, Liberal Arts, requested specific evidence indicating an abuse of I grades and that the increase in I grades has been substantial. Balz was not prepared to present data, but did note that there are many I grades that have been on the books in excess of one year.
- Argyres explained that the instructor still has the option at the end of 12 months to submit a letter grade, rather than allowing the I to change automatically to an F. Even if the grade changed to an F, the instructor may still submit a change of grade to another letter grade. Another reason to handle the I grades in a timely fashion is that faculty have related instances of students requesting removal of an I grade up to four years later, and there is no way to assist the student in resolving the situation if the instructor has since left and no records remain of the students' work.
- Senator Doescher, Forestry, questioned when the policy would be implemented, and noted instances of a faculty member who forgot to change an I grade. Balz stated that the soonest the change could be implemented would be fall 2006.
- In response to the effect this policy would have on I grades already on the books, Balz stated there would be no effect.
- Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, recognized the value of not allowing a grade change after one year, but the shift to an F was troubling. He noted that an I grade should not be a mechanism to avoid completion of a course. He strongly supported prohibition of a letter grade changing to an I.
- In response to Senator Jovanovich, Engineering, questioning whether this policy also applied to graduate students, Balz stated this applied only to undergraduates.
- Senator Matzke, Science, spoke in opposition to the proposal and felt there would be many instances of the I converting to an F and the regulation states that the grade cannot be changed. She felt the system was working fine as it is. Argyres clarified that the grade cannot be changed to an I after one year, but the faculty member can submit a grade change from an F to another letter grade.
- Senator Barker, Liberal Arts, felt the proposal was fair and noted that she receives pressure to give students I grades, which is not fair when other failing students take the final and receive a letter grade. She liked placing the onus on the student to resolve the grade situation.
- A faculty member from Business related personal experience with students requesting I grades and noted the prevalence seems to be increasing.
- Another faculty member supported the proposal because it appears to be a better policy.
- Senator Dempsey, Associated, felt that, from an academic success point of view, it would be positive to create a culture on campus of the expectation of a contract between the faculty member and student resulting in a timely removal of the I grade.
- Senator Ciuffetti, Agricultural Sciences, was in support of the proposal and felt it was not appropriate for an I to remain forever. She noted that a large number of faculty are not taking responsibility to change the grade after a period of time.
- Senator Parks, Science, has not noticed a problem in Math.
- Senator Gomez, Associated, felt that the current policy is more fair than the proposal.
- Past President Hale supported the proposal and felt the current policy was unfair to students who are not trying to maintain their gpa by using the I grade, have actually received the grades they deserve and have an honest gpa. He felt there needs to be some incentive for faculty to resolve the I grades.
- Senator Jepson, Science, expressed concern for students who receive an I due to medical reasons. Argyres noted the student has the option of either completing the course within a year or dropping or withdrawing from the course due to medical reasons.
- Senator Roberts, Liberal Arts, supported the policy because it is a way of motivating faculty and students to resolve the I grade. She finds the unfairness of students maintaining their gpa

through the use of I grades to be very disturbing. The only way she assigns an I grade is if she and the student have a signed contract stating the date by which the student will complete the remaining work; if the date passes and the student has not upheld their end of the contract, she submits a change of grade request and assigns the letter grade earned by the student.

- Senator Asbell, Health and Human Sciences, felt it was the student's responsibility to clear the I within a year. She questioned whether the Registrar's Office can notify faculty that a particular student is within a month of the one year period. Balz stated that all departments have access to that information and can run a Data Warehouse query to determine how many I's are outstanding, in what courses, by instructor and the length of time since it was assigned.

Senator Galloway, Extension, called for the question. Motion 06-614-02 to end debate passed by voice vote with several dissenting votes.

Motion 06-614-01 to approve proposed changes to AR 17 passed via show of hands.

Proposed Standing Rules Revisions

Sherri Argyres, Committee on Committees member, presented for approval proposed revisions to the Standing Rules for the Diversity Council, Library Committee, and Student Recognition and Awards Committee (proposed deletions are bracketed in red and proposed additions are bolded):

Diversity Council *Proposed Standing Rules*

The Diversity Council addresses ongoing planning and implementation of university diversity initiatives, including equity, access, educational environment, and cultural competence. The Diversity Council has authority to make recommendations regarding policies and practices in areas of faculty development, recruitment and retention of faculty and students, scholarship/research and curriculum in consultation with appropriate standing committees, if applicable. The Diversity Council also provides a forum for communication among faculty regarding OSU's diversity related activities.

The Diversity Council reports directly to the Faculty Senate.

The Council consists of seven faculty members, with at least three being teaching faculty. There shall be two student members, one of whom may be the Multicultural Affairs Task Force Director, or designee. In addition, ex-officio, non-voting members shall include the Director of Community and Diversity, the Director of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, and the Director of Difference, Power, and Discrimination, or designees.

Rationale: The committee is being reconstituted and this proposal better reflects duties of the Council.

Motion 06-614 -03 to replace the current Standing Rules with the proposed Standing Rules passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Library Committee *Standing Rules Revisions*

The Library Committee advises the University Librarian in 1) meeting the learning, instruction, and resource needs of students, faculty, and staff; 2) formulating library policies in relation to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; [and] 3) interpreting the needs and policies of the library to the University; **and 4) identifying and addressing issues regarding scholarly communication (e.g. print and electronic journals and books)**. The committee consists of nine Faculty members, ideally providing a broad representation of academic disciplines, and three Student members, including at least one undergraduate and one graduate student, and the University Librarian, **or designee**, as an ex-officio, non-voting member. One faculty member may be retired.

Rationale: The Scholarly Communication Task Force has merged with the Library Committee at the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, consequently, it is important to include this facet (#4) of the Library Committee's work.

Motion 06-614-04 to revise the Standing Rules to add #4 above and provide for a University Librarian designee passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Student Recognition and Awards Committee *Standing Rules Revision*

The Committee consists of [eight] **ten** faculty, eight Students, and a representative from Financial Aid,

ex-officio, non-voting.

Rationale: Due to the workload of the committee, and in particular by the chairs, in selecting and notifying the award recipients, coordinating the awards program, writing the script, etc., additional faculty are needed on this committee.

Motion 06-614-05 to revise the Standing Rules to increase the membership passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Consideration of Degree Candidates

President-elect Quinn noted that Barbara Balz is retiring this summer and acknowledged her work as Registrar for the past 16 years and chair of the Commencement Committee for the past 15 years.

Barbara Balz, Registrar, recommended for approval the proposed lists of degree candidates and honors subject to final confirmation of all degree requirements. There were 4,410 students who were candidates for 4,581 degrees which included: 3,627 Bachelors, 669 Masters, 167 Doctors and 118 Professional degrees. There were 153 students who were candidates for two degrees and 9 students who were candidates for three degrees.

The Class of 2006, OSU's 137th graduating class, had 1,029 seniors who qualified for Academic Distinction and included 485 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50-3.69), 289 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70-3.84), and 255 'summa cum laude' (gpa 3.85 and above).

Motion 06-614-06 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

In reference to the previous AR 17 discussion, Balz noted that I grades in place at the time of commencement will remain an I indefinitely.

Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee

Voting for members of the Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee occurred during the meeting. The Board's Administrative Rules define criteria and procedures for the imposition of sanctions for cause, including termination of appointment (OAR 580-21-320 through 580-21-375). If such a sanction is to be imposed, the faculty member is entitled to a formal hearing of charges by a hearing committee to be selected from a faculty panel that has been duly established.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Discussion with President Ray

President Ray made the following observations, and then responded to questions from the floor:

Ray noted that the financial challenges seem to be daunting. He clarified that his comment regarding doing 'less with less' did not mean that we want to do a less effective job of anything, but that we need to be more focused and purposeful given the amount of resources available. He stated it was important to 'right size' our efforts because he felt that many are literally 'working ourselves to death.' He acknowledged challenges related to unmet needs, i.e., facilities, faculty and staff compensation, etc. He also spoke of the need to make consistent decisions at the appropriate level, with appropriate consultation.

Enrollment Management - Ray's sense was that a university enrollment management plan was needed. He felt that, with the current resources, the enrollment target should be 17,000. He outlined the following issues that may change over time that could change that target number.

- One element of being a top-ten university is that we expect to do better with first-year retention (currently 82%) and six-year graduation rates (currently 62%); if these rates increase, there will be fewer lower division classes and more upper division classes which cost more to offer than

lower division - these changes would decrease the level of enrollment.

- Another element is that OSU would be more selective and admit students who are better prepared. Ray noted that the profiles of OSU's comparator group show a higher percentage of undergraduate students enrolled in Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Business.

Ray was pleased that the Senate has been discussing what level of enrollment can be managed. He mentioned that several colleges have been discussing increasing the number of course credit hours, i.e., 3 vs. 4 credit hours, and noted that these decisions need to go through the proper governance groups, such as the Curriculum Council and Budgets and Fiscal Planning. He expects these groups to engage in a dialogue with the appropriate unit(s) related to the proposed changes, and ask why the changes are appropriate for the university, what impact do they have across the university, and what we collectively agree ought to be happening in individual units.

Ray indicated that OSU needs to develop its own enrollment plan, in varying circumstances with regard to resources, to be used in future conversations. He felt that it's time to recognize that each OUS institution has different needs and each should determine what the cost is per student to provide an appropriate, quality education based on available resources.

Priority Decision Making - Ray noted the need to consider both context (Strategic Plans have been created) and governance. The Strategic Plans should be used as a guide in determining the order in which projects will be completed. He outlined a plan that makes sense to him related to deferred maintenance which is to designate a floor in one building where classroom upgrades would demonstrate what could be done if more resources were available.

Senator Huber, Agricultural Sciences, expressed concern about the emaciation of individual units when they are forced to self-fund pay raises. Ray responded that there is a need to make reductions in good programs, which otherwise would not occur if the resources were available, and noted that none of the choices were good. He also felt it was important to preserve the core activity of each unit. His hope is that, eventually, each college will be able to assist faculty in understanding the reallocation by providing them with a statement indicating where resources were reallocated from, the implications of the reallocation, and how it is most consistent with the Strategic Plan.

Senator Oriard, Liberal Arts, felt there was a need for a campus wide discussion of what OSU aspires to be as a university (in more specific terms than aspiring to be top ten), what the educational experience for students should be, and questioned if this type of conversation would be initiated at any level. Ray responded that he is interested in a dialogue related to the elements of an enrollment plan, which would be necessary on a college/departmental level to determine the aggregate number. He also felt that there should be a Senate, as well as university wide, discussion related to the Baccalaureate Core - what is it, why is it there, what should it consist of? He indicated there should be parallel processes at the university, college, Senate and dean level to address these issues.

A Forestry faculty member referred to the report that is being prepared for the Forestry dean. Ray responded that part of what Dean Salwasser wants to get out of the committee process is a sense of how to move forward in a more effective way than has occurred in the past. Ray considers this an opportunity for faculty, staff and students to indicate what they think should change in Forestry and whether the dean can effectively pursue needed changes. The provost will meet with the dean next week to discuss the results and expectations.

SPECIAL REPORT

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Recap

Mina Carson provided a brief recap of the June IFS meeting and included the following items:

- The Board sponsors 'coffee meetings' with faculty and reiterated to IFS that any faculty are welcome to attend - OSU IFS Senators will inform OSU faculty when these meetings will be held locally.
- Geri Richmond, the faculty representative, is rotating off the State Board and Dalt Miller-Jones, who also serves as a PSU IFS Senator, will replace her.
- The Chancellor's Office is working on a proposal to rationalize the ORP and TDI investment process and choices. Carson noted that Larry Curtis is working on this issue with the Chancellor's Office.
- A draft policy package has been created by the Chancellor's Office related to faculty salaries that

proposes to elevate OUS to the peer average.

DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Sabah Randhawa's report included the following:

- He will be meeting with the deans next week to discuss university issues, including those raised during the Senate meeting, and determine what to work on over the summer. Before fall term begins, he will draft a report outlining what was done well during the academic year, status of issues, and ideas of how to move forward.
- On May 24 he attended the Student Recognition and Awards Banquet where over 100 students were recognized for their academic performance and superior extra curricular achievements. He shared that students expressed to him how appreciative they are of the education they are receiving. He noted that the June 18 commencement will be the largest graduating class in OSU's history. Randhawa acknowledged that these achievements are only possible due to the commitment to education and the value placed on education, as well as the work and time contributed by both faculty and staff. He personally, and on behalf of the university administration, thanked the faculty for their efforts and contributions in helping to shape the future of over 4,400 graduates. He related that both he and President Ray tell audiences that OSU is very fortunate to have an outstanding faculty, of which they are very proud.
- Randhawa acknowledged and thanked retiring faculty for their contributions in helping to shape OSU.

NEW BUSINESS

Adel Faridani, proxy for Senator Flahive, Science, presented the following motion in support of Baha'i students in Iran, which was seconded:

The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University wishes to express its concern about the ongoing denial of higher education to Baha'i students in Iran on the sole basis of religious belief.

According to the International Religious Freedom Report 2005 released by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor of the U.S. Department of State, public and private universities in Iran continue to deny admittance to Baha'i students. While recently, for the first time, Baha'i applicants were permitted to take part in the nationwide exam for entrance into state-run universities, for those students who passed the exam matriculation was again conditioned on their denying their faith.

Iran enjoys the distinction of being one of the 48 member states of the United Nations in 1948 that unanimously adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 26 of the Declaration states that "everyone has the right to education" and that "higher education shall be made equally accessible to all on the basis of merit". The Declaration also establishes the right to freedom of religion.

As teachers and researchers committed to our university's mission to "promote economic, social, cultural and environmental progress for people across Oregon, the nation and the world", we affirm the importance of these fundamental human rights.

We urge the Iranian government to allow everyone to enjoy the rights and freedoms set forth in the Declaration "without distinction of any kind such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."

Faridani supplied the following information in support of the motion: the denial of higher education to Baha'i students has continued for over 25 years and jeopardizes the whole community as a viable entity of society; although Baha'i students were allowed to participate in the nationwide exams for university entrance, the government used these results to identify the capable, young people in this community and target them for future persecution; the United Nations has expressed concern regarding monitoring of Baha'i students by the Iranian government. Faridani felt there is a strong sense of urgency since the climate in Iran is becoming more dangerous and noted it was important to inform the public of these actions and encourage them to speak out in an appropriate manner. He also felt that the motion was focused on the mission of educators.

Motion 06-614-07 passed by voice vote with no further discussion and no dissenting votes.

Roll Call

Members Present:

Agricultural Sciences: Anderson, Coblentz, Dreher, Huddleston, Mallory-Smith, Penner, Savage, T. Eyehrant for Sorte, Thompson
Associated Faculty: Arthenayake, Beach, Dempsey, Eklund, Elmshaeuser, Fernandez, Gillies, Gomez, Hughes, LeBeouf, Minear, Oldfield
Business: Banyl, LeMay, Raja, Wu, Yang
Education: Ward, White
Engineering: Huber, Hunter-Zaworski, Jovanovic, Levien, Lundy, Pence
Extension: Galloway, Godwin
Forestry: Brunner, Clauson, Doescher, Freitag, Puettman, Reuter, Sexton
Health & Human Sciences: Acock, Asbell, Bowman, J. Murray for Braverman, Friedman, Grobe, Ho, Wilcox
Liberal Arts: Barker, Carson, Folts, Iltis, B. Tilt for Kingston, Lunch, Melton, Mutschler, Oriard, Roberts, Shaw, Valls
Library: McMillen
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Benoit-Bird, Skyllingstad, Spitz, Wheatcroft
Pharmacy: Muhmad, Stevens
ROTC: Klink
Science: A. Faridani for Flahive, Gitelman, Jansen, C. Manogue for Kimerling, Mason, Matzke, McCune, Parks, Taylor
Student Affairs: Etherton, Langford, Larson, Schwab, Tsuneyoshi, Winter
Veterinary Medicine: Estill, Mosley

Members Absent:

Agricultural Sciences: Bolte, Brewer, Cassidy, Curtis, Duncan, Edge, Engel, Gregory, Jepson, Meink, Wolpert
Associated Faculty: Barr, Dorbolo, Greydanus, Larkin, Rosenberg, Ross
Business: None absent
Education: None absent
Engineering: Bose, Lee, Momsen, Sillars
Extension: Butler, Carr, Hathaway
Forestry: None absent
Health & Human Sciences: None absent
Liberal Arts: Brayman Hackel, Edwards, Farber, Helle, Henderson
Library: None absent
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Duncan, Torres
Pharmacy: Nauman
ROTC: None absent
Science: Barofsky, Brown, Giebultowicz, Grunder, Ho, Jones, Lajtha, McLeod, Rajagopal, Smythe, Spatafora
Student Affairs: Hoogesteger
Veterinary Medicine: Jennings

Guests Present:

M. Albright, B. Balz, B. Becker, R. Burke, P. Dysant, M. McCambridge, K. Prickett, S. Willard
Argyres

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-officios and Staff Present:

Officers: M. Quinn, President-Elect; J. Hale, Immediate Past President; and Ex-officios: T. Bentley-Townlin, L. Cuiffetti, S. Randhawa, E. Ray, M. Beachley

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](#) » [2006 Minutes](#) » March 9, 2006

Faculty Senate Minutes

2006 No. 611

March 9, 2006

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Bill Boggess on March 9, 2006 at 3:02 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Category I Proposals - Create a New B.S. in Forest Operations Management, Reduction in Graduation Requirements for Selected College of Engineering Programs, and Name Change for the Rangeland Resources Degrees; and OSU Procedures for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct [Motion 06-611-01 through 04]
- Discussion Item: Joint Report of the Renewable-term Professorial Rank Task Force and the College of Agricultural Sciences Fixed Term Faculty Issue Group
- New Business: None

ACTION ITEMS

Category I Proposals

Mary Cluskey, Curriculum Council co-chair, presented the following proposals which have all received approval from the Curriculum Council.

1. Create a new B.S. in Forest Operations Management - The degree is based on technical forestry and forest operations courses in Forest Resources and Forest Engineering areas and in the College of Business to earn a minor in business management. This will be a third option for the College of Forestry and is distinct from the other two options since it is focused primarily on forest practices and industrial forest organizations. It is less quantitative than the Forest Engineering degree and less multi-use management oriented than the existing Forest Management option. The intent is to submit the B.S. for accreditation through the Society for American Foresters upon approval. It is anticipated there will be about 20 graduates per year with a total of about 70 undergraduate students. The proposal will use existing faculty, but additional sections, labs and GTA support may be necessary when the full projected numbers are reached. The proposal suggests that the funding needs will be met with student credit hour generation, donor support, reallocation of funding and perhaps endowment funds. There was no discussion.
Motion 06-611-01 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.
2. Reduction in Graduation Requirements for Selected College of Engineering Programs - The proposal would reduce credit hours from 192 to 180 and includes the Colleges of Science, Forestry and Engineering. Cluskey noted that Electrical and Computer Engineering degrees are in the process of merging and may submit a proposal to change hour requirements at a later time. The rationale is to bring the engineering degrees in line with other OSU degree programs. This proposal may result in a slight reduction in tuition and expenses for students since there are fewer credits. The proposal has met with the approval of college faculty and is consistent with their accreditation requirements. There was no discussion.
Motion 06-611-02 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.
3. Name change for the Rangeland Resources Degrees to Rangeland Ecology and Management - This proposal would change the name of the B.S., M.S., Ph.D., M.Agr., and M.A.I.S. degrees, and the minor in Rangeland Resources to Rangeland Ecology and Management. The rationale is that the change aligns the degree titles with the department name which was changed last spring, it is a better reflection of

the current market and industry terminology, and it was felt that the proposed name is a more accurate description of the course of study. There was no discussion.

Motion 06-611-03 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

OSU Procedures for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct

Larry Curtis presented for approval the revised [OSU Procedures for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct](#) document initially discussed during the February Faculty Senate meeting. Curtis noted two substantive changes to the report: 1) The committee composition is now listed; and 2) Regarding confidentiality of the complainant - the complainant is not identified in the early phases of an allegation, including the initial assessment or inquiry. However, if the complaint moves to the investigation phase, the identity of the complainant is included in the investigation document received by the respondent. There was no discussion.

Motion 06-611-04 to approve the document passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Joint Report of the Renewable-term Professorial Rank Task Force and the College of Agricultural Sciences Fixed Term Faculty Issue Group

Dan Edge presented for discussion the [Joint Report of the Renewable-term Professorial Rank Task Force and the College of Agricultural Sciences Fixed Term Faculty Issue Group](#). He and Bill Braunworth each chaired separate, but related, groups representing Extension and Agricultural Sciences whose reports were merged at the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee since there were similar and parallel concepts. The purpose of the presentation was to make Senators aware of the report and to solicit feedback. Edge acknowledged the work of faculty on both groups.

Basically, the charge was to look at the use of professorial ranks for non-tenure faculty. Although some consider this recommendation to be the first in a series to eliminate tenure, this is not the case.

Recommendation #1 - Would establish a new series of renewable-term, professorial Extension faculty ranks: Assistant Extension Professor, Associate Extension Professor and Extension Professor. (The term 'renewable-term' is being used as opposed to 'fixed-term'.) Rationale: Extension has changed substantially in areas of funding and emerging short-term issues and needs. An example of an emerging issue is the avian flu which would not require a long term commitment to a faculty member. There are multiple resources from which faculty are hired and it is no longer clear whether the funds are dedicated state, federal or grant related, so it made sense to begin thinking about renewable-term professorial ranks. Use of the new ranks would be appropriate under the following situations:

1. Position description includes at least 15% scholarship;
2. Funding for the position is entirely or partially state or federal funds;
3. If state/federal funds are used, the programming need is of limited duration (2-10 years); and
4. Up to a maximum of 30% of an Extension program's state and federal funds are allocated to renewable-term positions. In this instance, program is defined as the major Extension program areas (4-H, Agriculture, Family and Community Development, Forestry, and Sea Grant).

Recommendation #2 - Would allow hiring of non-tenure track professorial faculty on state/federal funds or a combination of funding. Use of non-tenure track professorial ranks would be appropriate under the following situations:

1. Position description includes at least 15% scholarship;
2. Funding for the position is entirely or partially non-recurring funds;
3. If state/federal funds are used, the need for the position is of limited duration (2-10 years); and
4. Up to a maximum of 30% of a unit's state/federal funds are allocated to renewable-term positions including Instructor rank faculty.

Recommendation #3 - Would permit multiple year, rolling contracts for renewable-term professorial and instructor rank faculty after a three-year probationary period. Edge noted that the OSU Faculty Handbook allows a two-year contract and the Chancellor has given authority for three-year contracts with presidential authority.

Recommendation #4 - Would provide comparable compensation for renewable term and tenure/tenure-track professorial rank faculty. Edge it was felt this was necessary to attract quality faculty.

Recommendation #5 - Would monitor salaries and renewal term options. Each college dean shall be responsible for monitoring equity of salaries between renewable-term and tenure-track positions of similar ranks, and prepare a report no less than every five years that is accessible to the OSU administration and Faculty Senate. This would ensure that units are not exceeding the 30% limit on renewable term positions and to make sure that they are, where possible, providing comparable salaries.

Senator Lundy, Engineering, noted the 2-10 year time frame and questioned what happens in year 9 or 10 when it is realized that a short-term need has turned into a longer term. Edge responded that the committee felt there was a need for a 'sunset.' If a longer term was needed, it could be opened up to a tenure track position and the individual could compete for the position.

Senator Brewer, Agricultural Sciences, noted that the Fixed-Term Faculty Task Force also recommended rolling contracts over a year ago.

Senator Wilcox, Health and Human Sciences, questioned the process and asked whether the Faculty Senate would need to approve the faculty ranks. President Boggess was unsure, but responded that may be the case. Provost Randhawa was also unsure and offered to check on the process. Edge noted that there are similar, existing positions for clinical faculty in Veterinary Medicine and Pharmacy. Wilcox felt that this should pass through the Faculty Senate and perhaps also the Faculty Status Committee.

Senator Wilcox referred to the preamble which states that some institutions have no tenure-track Extension faculty, and the OSU rationale is that some faculty are currently misclassified as instructors. He felt it is not clear there is a 10-year limit. Edge noted that the initial report contained language that would allow a waiver of search, but it was determined that a permanent position should have a national search. Wilcox felt the interpretation should be more clearly defined.

Senator Wilcox expressed concern that an Extension tenure-track position creates an option with limited application. Edge responded that most groups providing input felt strongly that there was an appropriate role for tenure-track positions, but there are needs that could be served by the type of position proposed. President Boggess mentioned he has not heard a systematic conversation against a continuing role for tenure-track in Extension. He noted that, in the past, 100% of the Extension budget was in tenure-track positions and the proposal allows flexibility. A national report on Extension suggests no more than 70% of Extension budgets should be allocated for tenure-track and 30% for all other expenses.

Senator Wilcox felt there would be advantages to having three categories - tenure-track, renewable and instructor. However, people may be confused to have a title with Extension tenure-track and one without. Edge noted the intent is not to create a second-class professorship. Braunworth explained the difference is the use of state and federal funding vs. only using contract funds. Edge mentioned that colleagues were contacted nation-wide and, although many have non-tenure-track positions, some felt it would be helpful if tenure-track positions were available in terms of evaluation and recognition within the university system.

Senator Iltis, Liberal Arts, questioned the process by which a faculty member moves beyond the 10-year period into a tenure-track position and how this would align with the existing promotion process. Edge responded that the committee did not take the process that far since their charge was to determine whether or not the process had traction, and suggested that reference to this would need to be included in the Faculty Handbook. During discussions, it was felt that the Provost or Faculty Senate President would develop criteria for advancement. Iltis felt it was reasonable that the proposal would come back to the Faculty Senate for approval. Provost Randhawa felt that, if the university moved in this direction, the Faculty Senate would need to be involved in determining the criteria and anticipates a similar process in developing criteria for the research track; he suggested that the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee could draft the criteria.

President-Elect Quinn asked if the third criteria in Recommendation #2 meant there is a need for a limited duration class or if the need for the position is related to scholarship. Edge indicated it referred to the sunset period, but stated they did not give thought to a limited duration class. Quinn also questioned flexibility related to non tenure-track spousal accommodation. Edge responded that accommodation was college and unit specific and there are a number of scenarios. Quinn felt that the need for the position should be clarified.

Edge encouraged Senators to share the report with colleagues and contact either Braunworth or him with comments by the end of spring break.

REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Randhawa's report included the following:

- Budget - Need to reduce 2006-07 recurring expenses about 5-6%, or about \$13-14 million, in response to increased costs associated with health care, PERS, salaries, etc. He noted that, although the average is about 5.5%, there is quite a bit of variation with academic units ranging from 4-13% to 4-20% in support units. There are two elements related to the negative numbers: one-time spending, consisting of about \$30 million in carry-over during the past year, has ceased and recurring expense reductions resulting from health care costs, etc.
- Rebasing - This involved looking at the sources and uses of Education and General Fund money, which is about \$235 million that comes into the university. An evaluation was performed to determine how much is being allocated to academic units and how much is allocated to teaching expenses. An objective was to determine if the core enterprise of the university was being funded at a reasonable level. The analysis, based on two full fiscal years (2004-05) of data, revealed that the following four colleges contribute more than they are allocated: Science, Liberal Arts, Health and Human Sciences, and Business. Colleges receiving more resources than they provide are Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, Forestry, and Veterinary Medicine. In terms of E&G budget, the size for these colleges is relatively small, and they are more heavily focused on research. Following analysis and deliberation, the decision was made to move about \$7.5 million over the next five years into the four colleges that are under funded relative to what they are providing to the institution. The amounts to be received by college are: Science, \$2.5 million; Liberal Arts, \$2 million; Business, \$1 million; and Health and Human Sciences, \$2 million. For 2006-07 the under funded colleges will receive the following amounts: Science - \$1 million, Liberal Arts - \$800,000, Business - \$500,000, and Health and Human Sciences - \$200,000. Randhawa noted that this funding is based on OSU's current educational structure. The money being reallocated comes from several sources: reducing \$1.5 million in Athletic subsidies; recovering overhead charges from auxiliaries and statewide public services; and ending the seed money to E-campus to get the program going. He hopes to recover more than \$7.5 million with the biggest priority to building central reserves. Randhawa stated there are absolutely no resources available centrally.
- Long-term planning - In the long-term, given the available resources, Randhawa felt there are two areas in which OSU needs to move in the direction of top ten: distinction in selected programs within the five thematic areas and providing an exemplary student experience. He has talked with the Executive Committee and the Provost's Council on this topic. There are potential scenarios being considered in terms of the size of enrollment, the mix of the students, programs offered, etc. Once the direction is solidified, Randhawa will share the information either in person or via email. He is working with Mark McCambridge and will place the information on the web and will provide an opportunity for feedback.
- Veterinary Medicine Dean Search - Sherm Bloomer is chairing the search committee.
- Carnegie Classification - Randhawa will forward a message to faculty regarding OSU's Carnegie classification. He explained that, initially, OSU was ranked Research Extensive. However, due to efforts by Rebecca Sanderson and others in Institutional Research providing additional data, the classification was revised to Very High Research University, which is the highest ranking.
- Fixed-Term Faculty Task Force - Randhawa and Becky Johnson are working on the multi-year contract recommendations and are drafting a set of recommendations that will be shared with President Ray.

REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Boggess' report included the following:

- Scientific Ethics Forum - He thanked Philosophy and the Spring Creek Project for co-sponsoring the forum and Kathleen Dean Moore and Charles Goodrich for their efforts related to the public forum. He recognized those on the panel: Edward Brook, Courtney Campbell, Jonathan Kaplan, Mary Jo Nye, John Cassady and Anne Guerry and thanked Karyle Butcher for hosting the forum in The Valley Library. The Executive Committee suggested working toward a University Day keynote speaker to address core issues of academic freedom and professional responsibilities; no specifics have been discussed. Boggess encouraged Senators to email him with thoughts or suggestions, particularly related to either the research enterprise and activities or graduate student issues. He anticipates involving appropriate Faculty Senate committees in these issues. Senator McLeod, Science, observed that no issues were mentioned related to undergraduate students. Boggess noted that the Executive Committee talked about this, but has not yet gone to the next step. He has not contacted anyone, but felt that there are opportunities within the Baccalaureate Core to

better integrate ethics and science and possibly ways to work with the Horning Endowment. Senator Roberts, Liberal Arts, shared conversations during the forum that OSU graduates students who are literate in either the arts or sciences, but not both - well educated graduates need literacy in both science and humanities. Senator McLeod stated there are graduates trained in the content of an area but not in all aspects of the practice or culture of a discipline.

- Long-term Financial Planning Scenarios - Boggess has discussed with the Executive Committee, Provost Randhawa and others his frustration at the sense of being unable to tell a coherent story about the future of OSU. If the aspiration is to be a top-ten land grant, the meaning and metrics need to be defined, such as: what would the student/faculty ratio need to be, what would be the average per student expenditure, what would faculty salaries and average class size look like, etc., then work backwards from that using various funding scenarios. Assuming that the legislature will not increase funding, it would be necessary to work backwards with lower enrollment, increased entrance requirements, maintaining state funding, and increased control over tuition; Boggess is working on a scenario that may allow these elements. Resources would be saved if students are more prepared and remedial courses are not needed. He suggested the possibility of creating baccalaureate core themes, a learning community and integration of science and humanities. There are ongoing conversations around what would be possible, what the implicit contracts would be with the state to gain approval and with students and parents regarding class size, enhancing the learning experience, etc. He noted that Provost Randhawa has asked Institutional Research and the Business Office to calculate the median parameters and work backwards to determine what that would mean.

Boggess noted that some conversations are occurring within the state system related to selling one of the OUS institutions. He felt there was no reason why OSU needs 19,000 students when WOU is desperate for students and could deal with some of the access issues. There is also talk of allowing some differentiation of missions within OUS and felt that the research mission could differentiate OSU from other institutions and create a different undergraduate environment. Boggess invited faculty to visit with him or Executive Committee members if they have ideas on how to address issues of accountability, access and affordability in the context of constraints and possibilities.

Senator Barker, Liberal Arts, suggested that the metrics from top-ten land grant institutions would increase the number of faculty in Sociology by about 40, but the scenario presented would actually reduce the number of faculty. Boggess felt it would be possible to attain measures of quality and differentiation, may attract more resources, and noted his comments were not defined in terms of the median number of faculty and students. Barker felt that a critical number of faculty were needed to be considered a top ten.

Senator Curtis, Agricultural Sciences, reminded faculty that promises from the legislature of increased funding for additional students have not been realized and noted that enrollment per student above 15,000 results in a loss.

Senator Iltis noted that frustration regarding access is palpable. He related that there are seniors who can't get into speech courses, and the problem is getting worse. He felt the crisis will get serious when students realize OSU is no longer a four-year institution, but a five-year institution. He appreciates any innovative ideas to move away from that crisis. Boggess felt he could go to the legislature and make a case for the scenario he is working out that assures access for 15,000 students and increases requirements so there is less need for remedial courses which results in fewer and, hopefully, smaller sections. He has been working closely with Mike Quinn on this issue. He felt there is a lack of energy because faculty are concerned about how to get through next year and there is no vision to follow. He noted there are some very elite educational institutions that are quite small.

Boggess invited faculty to share thoughts and reflections with him, and felt it was time to determine how to articulate the future.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Roll Call

Members Present:

Agricultural Sciences: Brewer, Curtis, Dreher, Edge, Engel, W. Austin for Huddleston, Penner, Savage, Thompson.

Associated Faculty: Arthenayake, Barr, Beach, Dempsey, Dorbolo, R. Johnson for Eklund, Elmshaeuser, Fernandez, Gillies, Gomez, Hughes, Larkin, S. LeBoeuf for Miles, Minear, Oldfield, Rosenberg, Ross.

Business: Banyl, LeMay, Raja, Wu, L. Dang for Yang.

Education: L. Hinman for Ward

Engineering: Bose, Huber, Hunter-Zaworski, Lundy, Pence, Sillars.

Extension: Galloway, Godwin.
Forestry: Clauson, Doescher, Freitag, Reuter, Sexton.
Health & Human Sciences: Acock, Asbell, Bowman, M. Mahana for Braverman, Friedman, Ho, Wilcox.
Liberal Arts: Anderson, Barker, Carson, Edwards, Folts, Iltis, Kingston, Melton, Oriard, Roberts, Shaw, Valls.
Library: V. King for McMillen.
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Benoit-Bird, Skyllingstad, Spitz.
Pharmacy: Nauman, Stevens.
ROTC: Klink
Science: Barofsky, Flahive, Giebultowicz, Gittleman, Ho, Lajtha, McCune, McLeod, Parks.
Student Affairs: Langford, Larson, Schwab, Tsuneyoshi.
Veterinary Medicine: Estill, Jennings, Mosley.

Members Absent:

Agricultural Sciences: Anderson, Bolte, Cassidy, Coblenz, Duncan, Gregory, Jepson, Mallory-Smith, Meink, Sorte, Weber.
Associated Faculty: Greydanus.
Business: None
Education: White.
Engineering: Jovanovic, Lee, Levien, Momsen.
Extension: Butler, Carr, Hathaway.
Forestry: Brunner, Puettman.
Health & Human Sciences: Grobe.
Liberal Arts: Brayman Hackel, Farber, Helle, Henderson, Lunch.
Library: None
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Duncan, Torres, Wheatcroft.
Pharmacy: Mahmud.
ROTC: None
Science: Brown, Grunder, Jansen, Jones, Kimerling, Mason, Matzke, Rajagopal, Smythe, Spatafora, Taylor.
Student Affairs: Etherton, Hoogesteger, Winter.
Veterinary Medicine: None

Guests Present:

M. Albright, M. McCambridge, M. McDaniel, S. McLaughlin, and S. Tesch

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

B. Boggess, President; M. Quinn, President-Elect; J. Hale, Immediate Past Senate President; Senate; Ex-officios: L. Ciuffetti and S. Randhawa; M. Beachley, Parliamentarian; and V. Nunnemaker, Senate Staff.

The meeting adjourned at 4:41 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](#) » [2006 Minutes](#) » February 9, 2006

Faculty Senate Minutes

2006 No. 610

February 9, 2006

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Bill Boggess on February 9, 2006 at 3:01 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Category I Proposals - Name change for the B.S. in Forest Recreation Resources to Recreation Resource Management; Name Change for the Department of Bioengineering to Biological and Ecological Engineering and for the M.S. and PhD degrees and Graduate Minor from Bioresources Engineering to Ecological Engineering; Name Change for the Graduate Certificate in Health Care Administration to Graduate Certificate in Health Management and Policy; Name Change for the BS and Undergraduate Minor in Health Care Administration to BS and Undergraduate Minor in Health Management and Policy; and Name Change for Degrees and Minor in Health Promotion and Education - B.S. Health Promotion and Education to B.S. Health Promotion and Health Behavior, Undergraduate Minor in Public Health Promotion and Education to Undergraduate Minor in Health Promotion and Health Behavior, M.S. Health Education to M.S. Health Promotion and Health Behavior, and Graduate Minor in Health Education to Graduate Minor in Health Promotion and Health Behavior[Motion 06-610-01 through 05]
- Discussion Items: OSU Procedures for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct
- Special Reports: Facilities Services Customer Services Survey Overview and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
- New Business: Resolution on Academic Freedom [06-610-06]

ACTION ITEMS

Category I Proposals

Mary Cluskey, Curriculum Council co-chair, presented the following proposals which can be found online at <http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/cat1sweb/index.htm>. Cluskey explained that: the Curriculum Council has approved all of the proposals; at the request of the Executive Committee, some of the proposals have associated minors that are included for approval, but may not appear on the agenda; name changes would be in effect spring term; and current students have the option of choosing the current or new name.

Category I Proposals

- Name change for the B.S. in Forest Recreation Resources to Recreation Resource Management*
Cluskey explained that the rationale is that that name better reflects the mission and focus of the degree, that including the word 'Forestry' is restrictive due to their broader focus, and that the majority of graduates function in some level of management. Motion 06-610-01 to approve the proposal was moved, seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes and no discussion.
- Proposal to Change the Name for the Department of Bioengineering to Biological and Ecological Engineering and for the, M.S. and PhD degrees and Graduate Minor from Bioresources Engineering to Ecological Engineering* Mary included 'B.S.' on the tape.
Cluskey noted that the minor was not included on the agenda. The rationale is that the name better reflects the current and planned foci in the department and is a more suitable department name. She noted that the department name was previously changed in 1999 to correspond to a B.S. degree name, but the degree is no longer offered in this department.

In response to Senator Coblentz, Agricultural Sciences, felt that a name was being reinvented and he questioned if another name change could be expected in a few years, President Boggess noted that the previous name change was tied to an undergraduate major, which still exists, that was shifted to the College of Engineering. The name change is consistent with the department creating a new undergraduate major, and will reduce the confusion of having a major and department with the same name but not associated.

Wayne Huber, Engineering, felt that they are not reinventing themselves, but the name change better reflects what they are doing and will attract more students.

Senator Spitz, Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, questioned the budget figures. John Bolte, Bioengineering department head, responded that the budget numbers represented a ballpark guess and included incidentals for which they don't know the exact cost, such as stationery and website costs.

Motion 06-610-02 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

- c. *Proposal to Change the Name of the Graduate Certificate in Health Care Administration to Graduate Certificate in Health Management and Policy*
Cluskey explained that the current name is not a good reflection of the scope of the program or the graduate's professional opportunities and the name change would put this certificate in better alignment with the MPH and PhD in Public Health. Motion 06-610-03 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes or discussion.
- d. *Proposal to Change the Name of the BS and Undergraduate Minor in Health Care Administration to BS and Undergraduate Minor in Health Management and Policy*
Cluskey explained that this proposal has the same rationale as the proposal immediately preceding. She noted the proposal had been amended to include a minor that was not on the agenda. Motion 06-610-04 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes or discussion.
- e. *Proposal to Change the Name for Degrees and Minor in Health Promotion and Education:*
 - i. *B.S. Health Promotion and Education to B.S. Health Promotion and Health Behavior*
 - ii. *Undergraduate Minor in Public Health Promotion and Education to Undergraduate Minor in Health Promotion and Health Behavior*
 - iii. *M.S. Health Education to M.S. Health Promotion and Health Behavior*
 - iv. *Graduate Minor in Health Education to Graduate Minor in Health Promotion and Health Behavior*
Cluskey noted the proposal had been amended to include a minor that was not on the agenda. She explained that the name change reflects evolution since it previously focused on school health and educational methods while 'Health Promotion' indicates an emphasis on community health and the social and behavioral strategies relevant to promoting health and preventing premature death and disease. Motion 06-610-05 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no discussion or dissenting votes.

DISCUSSION ITEM

OSU Procedures for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct

Larry Curtis presented for discussion the OSU Procedures for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct; formal review and adoption will take place at a future meeting. Curtis reported that the committee, commissioned by the Research Office, began meeting in January 2005 and consisted of Leslie Burns, Larry Curtis, Caroline Kerl, Peggy Lowry, and Mike Quinn. The existing document on scientific misconduct was used as a starting point for the revised document. Curtis encouraged faculty to email concerns related to the document to him for review by the committee.

The rationale for a scientific misconduct procedures document is that federal granting agencies require it and new agency guidance made the existing procedures outdated. The committee tried to draft the OSU guidelines in a generic way to meet moderately variable requirements for various agencies. The timeline is about 240 days from the time the allegation is made to sanctions being imposed.

Curtis explained the current definition of research misconduct - fabrication of data (making up results), falsification of data (manipulating results), or plagiarism (appropriation of another's work). He noted that disputes over authorship do not usually fit these categories and are handled via different procedures. Federal agencies are concerned with the data and not with authorship.

Senator Friedman, Health and Human Sciences, questioned whether there is protection for the individual making the allegation. Curtis responded there is protection and confidentiality for both the individual placing the allegation and the accused to the extent possible. Curtis did not feel there was a possibility of reprisal and noted there is no requirement to report the complainant's name.

Wayne Huber, Engineering, referred to mention of a Collaborative Research Projects Policy attached document regarding authorship disputes. Curtis responded that it will be a separate document, but XXXXXXX it is not yet ready for review and noted that the guidelines include agreements before collaboration begins. He felt that this issue will be taken up with another group.

Senator Jovanovich, Engineering, suggested that a panel of peers be made more prominent in the document. Curtis explained that the committee agreed that if the complaint goes from the inquiry phase to the convening committee, there will be a panel of faculty convened to review the allegations. The document will be reviewed to determine if this step is not clear and corrections will be made, if necessary.

Senator Jovanovich, Engineering, suggested that a panel of peers be made more prominent in the document. Curtis explained that the committee agreed that if the complaint goes from the inquiry phase to the convening committee, there will be a panel of faculty convened to review the allegations. The document will be reviewed to determine if this step is not clear and corrections will be made, if necessary.

Senator Flahive, Science, questioned confidentiality for the complainant. Curtis corrected himself and stated that the complainant will not need to know.

SPECIAL REPORTS

Facilities Services Customer Services Survey Overview

Stella Coakley (2004 Faculty Senate President) presented an overview of the Facilities Services Customer Services Survey conducted by the Faculty Senate Office in summer 2005. Vincent Martorello (Interim Director of Facilities Services; Associate Director, University Planning; and Transit & Parking Services Manager) presented a summary of the follow-up that has occurred and that is planned for in the immediate future. Results of the 12-question survey can be found at <http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/agen/2006/fssurvey.pdf>. There were 321 individuals who responded to the Survey which was made available on the web from July-August, 2005.

Coakley shared the following:

- *The survey was never intended to be a statistical survey, rather it was an indicator of ???*
- *Each question had an associated open answer - the responses have been shared with Mark McCambridge, Vincent Martorello and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Only responses referring to classroom conditions will be shared with others. Protecting...*
- *The demographics included professorial and professional faculty and classified staff.*
- *Frequency*

Martorello viewed the survey as a good thing and was pleased with the feedback. Get list from VM

They now have the basis of the groups of categories.

- *What will the Faculty Senate do? - Factors - internal morale, staffing and peer review*
- *Perception of Faculty Senate - internal morale - need to have a peer review ??? so they can benchmark*

An employee survey will be distributed soon.

Looking at staffing - completing a needs assessment to identify where they are lacking in skills and staffing.

All information will be reviewed and assessed and will formulate a business plan to better address - Martorello is willing to return to the Senate and review results.

Now are reviewing the custodial contract and letting at better ways to... For complete restructuring for

projects internally actively realigning to campus as a customer service unit.

Recognizes there is a big task ahead.

Martorello offered to come back at any time and provide transparency of what Facilities Services is doing as an organization.

An individual addressed the issue of Cordley Hall losing power again. Martorello stated that Facilities Services shares the same type of frustration and noted that the current power grid needs a lot of work. System failures occur off-campus which affects buildings on campus. They are currently working with Risk Management who is engaging with PP&L. Options are currently being reviewed regarding upgrading of facilities. To be free of outages would require a \$2-3 million investment. Faculty should contact Martorello or Bill Morris regarding amount of losses.

Senator Spatafora, Science??, stated that power outages are hampering high end computing and science needed today. He questioned who will be paying for students tuition, stipends, benefits and loss of wages because students cannot graduate due to lost experiments resulting from the power outages. OSU needs to provide infrastructure or risk losing millions of dollars in funding.

Senator Dreher, Agricultural Sciences, recognized this issue needs tireless attention, but felt that it would be helpful if Facilities Services would take ownership. Martorello responded how are we effectively managing projects and do not have enough staffing, when emergencies occur a project ?? has to be pulled. Try to provide a reasonable amount of time, but are reevaluating resources. Dreher suggested revisiting outsourcing with the preference of using Facilities Services.

Senator Freitag, Forestry, addressed the lack of staffing by noting that the UW has 19 staff in Environmental Health and Safety vs. 7 at OSU.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

Larry Curtis, IFS Senator, provided a brief recap of the December and February Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meetings.

- 1. JBAC committee - SB 342 and 300 dealing with transparency of junior college credit module approved by the Senate last year.*
- 2. Academic quality report prepared by IFS and released to the Board in January was released to IFS in February. The report will be discussed with the Executive Committee who will determine whether it should come to the Senate.*
- 3. Chancellor Pernsteiner is trying to convince the Legislature that faculty salaries are low.*
- 4. Chancellor Pernsteiner observed that the OUS OPE rate is 45% and noted that health care costs are driving it higher. PERS is driving the problem. For peer institutions, it is 9%; however for PERS Tier I or II, it is 21% and for new employees it is 14%. If OUS withdrew from PEBB, it may be possible to get a better deal. IFS is also nervous about limiting benefits for new employees from 14% to 10%. There is little confidence that the Legislature would allow the savings to be used for faculty salaries.*

DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST

Provost Randhawa's report included the following:

- OSBHE is wrestling with a system-level strategic plan for the entire system. Understanding is that they in March they will come to some decision and have conversations in April.*
- Due to a change in leadership in the College of Veterinary Medicine, Rich Holdren is the interim dean. The decision came down to how to manage growth in a manner that is fiscally sustainable; OSU is supportive of the growth of the college. The difference is that the college is projecting a very aggressive trajectory which would have resulted in a fairly substantial deficit. A search for a permanent dean will commence within the next few weeks.*
- Space Planning Task Force Report - The task force did an excellent job. They were asked to start with the premise that all space belongs to the University and how do we do a better job of managing and planning and moving forward. The report can be found at oregonstate.edu/leadership/provost/office/initiatives.html; Randhawa welcomes input.*

Key recommendations included:

- *A permanent space committee that reports to the Provost's Office is needed.*
- *Space inventory needs improvement and enhancement.*
- *Looking at flexible space. Mark McCambridge, Vincent Martorello and Randhawa are working on a five-year plan regarding classroom renovation. Randhawa has discussed the issue with the Technology Resource Fees Committee and is trying to link the two groups to align resources.*
- *Concerns regarding publication of article in Science and used by others in addressing their concerns. Provost Randhawa and Faculty Senate President Boggess released a memo on this issue February 8.*
 - *The BLM has lifted the temporary suspension of the grant.*
 - *Wanted to talk about externally driven events that provide an opportunity to look internally at the culture and environment of the College of Forestry. Dean Salwasser acknowledged that the situation could have been handled better and is considering this to be a learning opportunity to have a broader conversation within the college and how it could be made better.*
 - *Confident that collective, conscientiousness concerned that incidents like this point out resolutions of power. Whether in a college or at the university level, to be aware of the issues.*
 - *Important that power does not impact students.*
 - *Important that power does not impact students.*
 - *With more funds coming from private resources, there is a responsibility to ensure it does not impact how the university have the same issue in areas other than Forestry. The industry is critical in identifying problems, but a balance must be maintained.*
 - *OSU is in the middle of a capital campaign and donors will have their own expectations.*
 - *There is a lot to learn from this issue, but Randhawa feels the university can handle it.*

DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bill Boggess outlined positions the Faculty Senate has taken related to the Forestry issue:

- *The primary concern is to protect academic rights of all faculty. He has been talking with the individuals involved in the situation.*
- *He has been facilitating conversations within the College of Forestry to encourage them to take advantage of this teachable moment. This is an opportunity to have conversations about important issues.*
- *A joint statement was released from him and Provost Randhawa.*
- *The issues are academy wide. Within Forestry, they have enlisted Kathleen Moore and other Philosophy students to construct forums. Boggess' perspective is much broader and goes across the academy. The Executive Committee is discussing a forum, *The Academy in the 21st Century*, to include...*

Coblentz, Agricultural Sciences, stated that faculty rights were addressed in the joint statement, but there was no mention of student rights and it was a student who has attacked. Boggess indicated the point was well taken. Randhawa noted he has been working with Dean Francis related to the perception of how other students are handled and he has been working with the involved student.

Senator Doescher, Forestry, thanked Boggess and Randhawa for releasing the joint statement. He felt it was important for the Faculty Senate to know that the vast majority in the College of Forestry support the principles in the statement. A lot of debate about how the

Senator Gregory, Agricultural Sciences, suggested the possible need to have a discussion with those who work with the University (i.e., federal agencies) to reinforce to them that attempts to coerce or intimidate will not be tolerated.

Boggess noted that being relevant often means there is potential for controversy. His observation is that when science and policy become too intertwined... Science operates on a different time frame than policy.

Senator Gregory felt it was important to distinguish science from setting policy - will be closely

associated.

Senator Iltis, Liberal Arts, noted that the Faculty Handbook states very clearly... He believes it is necessary for the Faculty Senate as a whole...

Senator Wilcox, Health and Human Sciences, felt that the letter from Dean Salwasser was well considered. At the end it... to reasserting core values. This is something that we could control. Not hearing if there was a proper analysis of what occurred. Was it properly dealt with- is appropriate to focus on academic freedom, but may not fully appreciate the dynamics. He questioned why the dean wrote a critique on the paper and asked if it would be appropriate to have the two sides presented. Randhawa responded that he has had conversations with Salwasser in terms of his handling of the situation and the motives of those who write the letter. Requires work in the college. Invite Salwasser to talk about what was learned and how to deal with it. Might be worth considering. Having a forum to determine the learning and long-term impact on the college.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Iltis moved the following resolution, which was seconded:

Whereas the Oregon State University Faculty Handbook "Statement of Faculty Responsibilities" expresses that members of the university community:

"Respect and defend the right of free inquiry of fellow faculty members,"

"Encourage free pursuit of learning and free inquiry in students,"

"Seek and state the truth as he or she sees it,"

"Exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge to diverse audiences on and off campus,"

"Exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge to diverse audiences on and off campus,"

"Show due respect for the rights of others to hold and express their opinions,"

The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University stands resolved that the actions taken by faculty members of this university that attempted to interfere with the publication of Mr. Dan Donato's research in Science violated both the spirit and the letter of the "Statement of Faculty Responsibilities."

There was a friendly amendment to the resolution to add (et al.) following 'Dan Donato's' to indicate there were other authors; amendment accepted. Motion 06-610-06 to approve the above resolution, as amended, passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Roll Call

Members Present:

Agricultural Sciences: Anderson, Bolte, Brewer, Coblentz, Curtis, Dreher, Engel, Gregory, Huddleston, Mallory-Smith, Meink, Penner, Sorte, Thompson

Associated Faculty: Arthenayake, Dempsey, Elmshaeuser, Fernandez, Greydanus, Hughes, Larkin, Miles, Minear, Oldfield, Ross

Business: Banyl, LeMay, Raja, Wu, Yang

Education: Ward, White

Engineering: Bose, Huber, Hunter-Zaworski, Jovanovic, Lundy, Momsen, Sillars

Extension: Carr, Galloway, Godwin

Forestry: Brunner, Clauson, Doescher, Freitag, Puettman, Reuter, Sexton

Health & Human Sciences: Acock, Asbell, Bowman, Braverman, Friedman, Grobe, Ho, Wilcox

Liberal Arts: Brayman Hackel, Carson, Edwards, Folts, Helle, Iltis, Kingston, Lunch, Melton, Roberts, Shaw

Library: McMillen

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Skyllingstad, Spitz, Wheatcroft

Pharmacy: Muhmad, Stevens

ROTC: Klink

Science: Flahive, Giebultowicz, Gitelman, Ho, Mason, Matzke, McCune, McLeod, Parks, Rajagopal, Spatafora

Student Affairs: Etherton, Hoogesteger, Langford, Larson, Tsuneyoshi, Winter

Veterinary Medicine: Estill, Jennings, Mosley

Members Absent:

Agricultural Sciences: Cassidy, A. Duncan, Edge, Jepson, Savage, Weber

Associated Faculty: Barr, Beach, Dorbolo, Eklund, Gillies, Gomez, Rosenberg, Ross

Business: None

Education: None

Engineering: Lee, Levien, Pence

Extension: Butler, Hathaway

Forestry: None

Health & Human Sciences:

Liberal Arts: Anderson, Barker, Farber, Henderson, Oriard, Valls

Library: None

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Benoit-Bird, Duncan, Torres

Pharmacy: Nauman

ROTC: None

Science: Barofsky, Brown, Grunder, Jansen, Jones, Kimerling, Lajtha, Smythe, Taylor

Student Affairs: Schwab

Veterinary Medicine: None

Guests Present:

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

Tracy Bentley-Townlin, Bill Boggess, Jeff Hale, Mike Quinn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 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](#).

Joint Report of the Renewable-term Professorial Rank Task Force and the College of Agricultural Sciences Fixed Term Faculty Issue Group

20 February 2006

Task Force Members

Andrea Dailey, Extension and Experiment Station Communications
Dan Edge (Chair), Fisheries and Wildlife
Linda McMahan, Yamhill County Extension Office
John Panches, Douglas County Extension Office
Jay Rasmussen, Extension Sea Grant
Tammy Skubinna, Benton County Extension Office
Janice Smiley, Washington County Extension Office

Issue Group Members

Jim Males, head, Department of Animal Sciences;
John Henry Wells, superintendent, Food Innovation Center Experiment Station, Portland
Deb Maddy, assistant director, OSU Extension Service;
Bill Braunworth, leader, Extension Agriculture program

Charge and Process

The Renewable-term Professorial Rank Task Force was charged 17 May 2005 by Interim Dean and Director of Extension, Kelvin Koong, to develop policy guidelines for Extension/Outreach renewable-term professorial rank faculty positions. Specifically, they were asked to develop guidelines for appointment, evaluation and criteria for promotion and to guide the processes through adoption by the University. Dr. Koong charged the task force because during his visits to county offices some faculty had questioned the benefits or value of a tenure-track system for county agents. Secondly, during conversations with President Ray and Provost Randhawa the issue of tenure and promotion for Extension faculty had been discussed. The basic issue raised was whether Extension appointments were fundamentally different from teaching/research appointments, especially for off-campus faculty. The task force charge was reaffirmed by Dean and Director, Scott Reed on 1 September 2005.

Concurrent with the Task Force an Issue Group within the College of Agricultural Sciences was developing a proposal describing changes in appointing faculty that would enable the College to better address both needs and opportunities. Changes included rolling contracts, use of state or federal funds for certain types of non-tenure track appointments, and clearly defining additional options available with certain types of faculty appointments.

The task force met with Becky Johnson, Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs to solicit input from OSU administration. Task Force Chair, Edge met with the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate to discuss the task force's work and to solicit input. The Task Force reviewed OSU Extension's Strategic Plan and the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) of the National Association of

State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges' (NASULGC) Vision document (*The Extension System: A Vision for the 21st Century*). The Task Force also communicated with colleagues at other Land Grant universities around the country to benchmark the nature of appointments at their respective institutions. The College of Agricultural Sciences Issue Group solicited input from the CAS Administrative Team and discussed the proposal with Becky Johnson during a CAS Administrators' Workshop. Based on similarities between the Task Force's draft report and the CAS Issue Group proposal the Faculty Senate Executive Committee requested that the two be combined into a single report.

A Commitment to Tenure and Academic Freedom

During multiple conversations while developing this report both the committee and issue group heard concerns regarding the erosion of tenure and loss of academic freedom that these recommendations may cause. According to the OSU Faculty Handbook, "Tenure ensures the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the free search for truth and the attainment of excellence in the University. But in addition, tenure also reflects and recognizes a candidate's potential long-term value to the institution, as evidenced by professional performance and growth. Tenure sets universities apart from other institutions. Faculty are not merely employed by the University but are the educational and research programs of the University; tenured faculty are the community of educators who create institutional stability and an ongoing commitment to excellence." Tenure and tenure-track positions, therefore must remain a core commitment to OSU faculty, and is the reason we have proposed limits to the adoption of renewable-term positions in support of teaching, research and extension at OSU.

Recommendations and Rational

Recommendation 1

Establish a new series of Renewable-term, Professorial Extension Faculty Ranks: Assistant Extension Professor, Associate Extension Professor and Extension Professor

Extension personnel serve a unique role at OSU in developing and delivering research-based educational programs to the general public and to specific clientele groups. This role requires professorial rank faculty with excellent educational and outreach skills and the ability to develop scholarly products. Traditionally, these have been tenure-track appointments with academic homes in departments representing the faculty members' area of expertise.

Over the past decade state and federal support for the OSU Extension Service has declined and Extension has adapted by funding programs with a mixture of state and federal funds, non-recurring federal funds, grants and contracts, donations and service fees. Some Extension faculty are funded entirely on grants and contracts. At the same time, many of the issues facing Oregon, which would benefit from Extension

programming, are ephemeral in nature with educational programming horizons of three to ten years. The changing nature of Extension/Outreach programming issues requires an organization that is flexible and responsive with respect to staffing. OSU Extension's strategic plan (*A Framework for Engaging Oregonians*, 2004, page 15) calls for no more than 70% of state and federal general funds (including salaries, OPE, travel, and supplies and services) to be used to fund tenure-track faculty appointments. In addition, ECOP's Vision document also recognized the dynamic nature of Extension issues and suggested that state Extension services maintain flexibility by allocating no more than 70% of their regular state and federal funds (including salaries, OPE, travel, and supplies and services) to permanently funded positions (NASULGC 2002, *The Extension System: A Vision for the 21st Century*, page 7). Finally, Extension faculty at many Land Grant Universities around the country are not on tenure-track appointments; annual renewal contracts are the norm.

The current renewable-term faculty ranks do not fit Extension faculty positions. Currently, some renewable-term Extension faculty are hired using the ranks of Instructor, Professional Faculty, or Research Assistant Professor. Sometimes these ranks are not well suited to Extension roles. For example, the Instructor rank may not always be appropriate because many Extension faculty have scholarship expectations (15% or greater) consistent with professorial ranks, and do much more than present educational programs. The Instructor rank would be utilized when the scholarship requirement is less than 15% in the position description. Professorial ranks are important for faculty recognition both within and outside OSU. We believe that clientele and faculty perceive differences between Instructor and Professor ranks that creates a two-tiered system. Administrators in departments and county Extension offices have suggested that a rank of Assistant Extension Professor would be a more attractive appointment, allowing units to recruit and retain higher quality faculty than may be recruited at Instructor ranks. The Research faculty ranks are not appropriate because even though Extension faculty conduct applied research, most of their duties involve translating research to a variety of audiences.

Renewable-term, professorial faculty ranks currently exist at OSU. OSU has clinical faculty associated with the colleges of Veterinary Medicine and Pharmacy who are on renewable-term contracts. The OSU Faculty Handbook has guidelines that define and differentiate clinical track faculty appointments from the traditional academic (tenure) track appointments. Our recommendation is to establish Extension faculty ranks with similar guidelines.

Criteria for Using New Ranks

Use of the new ranks would be appropriate under the following situations:

1. Position description includes at least 15% scholarship;
2. Funding for the position is entirely or partially state or federal funds;
3. If state/federal funds are used, the programming need is of limited duration (2-10 years); and

4. Up to a maximum of 30% of an Extension program's state and federal funds are allocated to renewable-term positions. Here we define program to mean the major Extension program areas (4-H, Agriculture, Family and Community Development, Forestry, Sea Grant).

Recommendation 2

Allow hiring of non-tenure track professorial faculty on state/federal funds or a combination of funding.

Fulfilling OSU's 3-fold mission of teaching, research, and extension has become more complex in large part because of changes in the character of the state OSU serves, the programs that stakeholders request and expect, and the budget resources that are available to support these programs. The state has become more diverse, socially and economically. Oregon's economy has diversified and become more entrepreneurial and dynamic. Funding sources can no longer be categorized or predicted as being "hard" or "soft"; instead, funding often is made available from any of a variety of sources to address particular needs during a specified period of time. Additionally, highly qualified individuals are more accustomed moving from job to job and are available and willing to accept positions of finite duration, rather than expecting career-long appointments.

Currently, non-tenure track, renewable-term professorial positions are restricted to clinical faculty or research faculty on grants and contracts. However, some of these current positions are initiated with state funding such as in the case of spousal accommodations, and many of these positions are partially supported with state funds as teaching responsibilities are added to the position description over time. Thus, our recommendation is to eliminate the "research" descriptor for non-tenure track, renewable-term professorial rank faculty, and explicitly allow use of state/federal funds to hire non-tenure track faculty.

Criteria for Using Non-tenure Track Professorial Faculty

Use of non-tenure track professorial ranks would be appropriate under the following situations:

1. Position description includes at least 15% scholarship;
2. Funding for the position is entirely or partially non-recurring funds;
3. If state/federal funds are used, the need for the position is of limited duration (2-10 years); and
4. Up to a maximum of 30% of a unit's state/federal funds are allocated to renewable-term positions including Instructor rank faculty.

Recommendation 3

Permit multiple-year, rolling contracts for renewable-term professorial and instructor rank faculty after a 3-year probationary period.

Where funding is stable and job performance has been outstanding, multiple year (2 or 3 year) rolling contracts are appropriate. Multiple-year rolling contracts would provide an increased level of job security for outstanding renewable-term faculty following a probationary period. Rolling contracts of 2 years would provide an employee security of 1 year's notice of non-renewal of his or her appointment beyond the current appointment year. A 3-year contract would provide 2 years of security. Faculty in these non-tenure track positions would be evaluated annually and contracts would be renewed annually. The OSU Faculty Handbook currently has a provision for 2-year contracts with administration approval, but this provision is rarely used. Furthermore, Chancellor Pernsteiner recently issued a memorandum allowing each of the OUS universities to offer multiple-year contracts for up to 3 years with the Presidents' authorization. Multiple year contracts are used at other universities including Cornell, University of Maryland, and Washington State University. Recruiting and retaining the highest quality faculty would be enhanced by offering extended contracts. The 3-year probationary period is similar to a normal mid-term review for a tenure-track faculty member. A longer probationary period would not seem to be appropriate because these positions would generally be either grant funded or of limited (< 10 years) duration. However, additional multi-year contracts could be continued as needed. In all cases, the unit administrator proposing a multi-year contract would identify and assure funding for the contract period.

Recommendation 4

Provide comparable compensation for renewable-term and tenure/tenure-track professorial rank faculty.

Renewable-term professorial rank faculty will fill functions and hold responsibilities that vary little from those of tenured or tenure-track professorial rank faculty. As such it is anticipated that, regardless of position type (renewable-term vs. tenure), the highest caliber applicants will be sought and the most qualified individuals recruited. Compensation for renewable-term positions should, therefore, be comparable to tenure-track positions, except where limited by the funding source.

Recommendation 5

Monitor Salaries and Renewal Term Options.

We recommend that the Dean of each College be responsible for monitoring equity of salaries between renewable-term and tenure-track positions of similar ranks. Also, the Dean's office would be responsible for monitoring the percentage of renewable term and tenure track positions that are paid for by state/federal funds, with the goal of not exceeding 30% renewable term positions. These reports would be completed and available to OSU Administration and Faculty Senate no less than every 5 years.