

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 2008 Minutes

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.

## 2008 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 email or phone at 541-737-4344 for more information.

- [October 9](#)
- [May 8](#)
- [January 10](#)

| [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](#) » [2008 Minutes](#) » October 9, 2008

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2008 No. 633

October 9, 2008

The October Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by President Lynda Ciuffetti in the LaSells Stewart Center.

### State of the University Address

President Ed Ray delivered his State of the University Address titled "Charting the Future." He provided a review of accomplishments during the last year and proposed actions for the coming year; his speech is online at [http://oregonstate.edu/leadership/president/state\\_university\\_address2008.html](http://oregonstate.edu/leadership/president/state_university_address2008.html).

Jeff Hale noted the economic situation and questioned what Ray expects regarding fundraising for the foundation and payouts. Ray responded that second quarter returns were negative, he didn't have a sense of the third quarter, and noted that there are ways to average payouts.

Senator Haggerty, Science, asked how OSU's 6% raises would be communicated to the public. Ray explained that the salary package was authorized by the legislature, the administration understands that people are hurting and they are following the identified schedule, he didn't feel they could afford to not go forward with the increases, and, depending on passage of November ballot measures, there may be issues beyond the next fiscal year.

Tony Wilcox, Executive Committee, expressed concern on behalf of faculty regarding the level of budget cuts related to journals in the Library. Ray responded that the sense of challenges and reductions has less to do with funding and more to do with increased costs of publications and professional journals. The library is working with OUS to identify shared subscriptions.

### SPECIAL REPORT

#### Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

Kate Hunter-Zaworski, IFS Senior Senator, reported on the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting held in Ashland on October 3-4. Her report included the following:

- Collaboration between Rogue Community College and Southern Oregon University on a new, joint facility in Medford resulting in improved communication and services to simultaneously enrolled students.
- Elizabeth Zinzer reported on the LEAP Program and the potential to standardize high school graduation requirements and allow direct admission to any OUS institution for students who have met certain minimum requirements.
- Chancellor Pernsteiner noted a possible realignment of the Oregon Department of Education and discussed the OUS Sustainability Initiative.
- There was an extensive discussion of the Dual Credit Report.

### STUDENT ATHLETE PANEL

A panel described for Senators a day in the life of student athletes at OSU. The moderator was Terry Head Coach of the Volleyball team and the panelists were: Stephanie Clough, Women's Soccer, Exercise and Sport Science, Junior; James Dockery, Football, Business Administration, Junior; Bree Knitter, Volleyball, Spanish/Sociology, Junior; Josh Tarver, Men's Basketball, Speech Communications, Senior; and Bradon Wells, Baseball, Speech Communications, Senior.

Liskevych noted that the goal is to teach 425 athletes study skills, life skills, time management, and problem-

solving skills. The panelists discussed some of the challenges faced by student athletes: practicing and training year round and being far from home while balancing a full academic load (study hall is mandatory for freshmen and sophomores) and, if injured, scheduling rehab and conditioning sessions in addition to everything else.

When asked about the best and worst aspects of OSU, most of them mentioned the positive impact of Beaver Nation and the support they receive from the community and student body; the worst was being away from home and family. Several mentioned that OSU makes athletes feel comfortable and their participation in a family-oriented program.

Senator Thomas, Student Affairs, questioned what interaction is like with peers across campus, especially for African-American athletes. Dockery responded that interaction hasn't been a problem for him and he feels welcome. Tarver noted that his interactions have been good.

Tony Wilcox, Executive Committee noted that baseball schedules present problems for faculty and asked panelists to explain the student side of the interface. Wells responded that the new NCAA schedule forces all teams to start the same day, which is tough on athletes (the old schedule was easier); some student athletes had to come back for an additional term since they weren't able to take required courses; there is a need to coordinate with faculty and load up on student credit hours in the fall (for baseball athletes); and online courses help alleviate the situation. Liskevych explained that volleyball played Friday and Sunday last year so students could attend more classes. He mentioned that coaches request that athletes meet with faculty to determine if they will be able to take courses based on their scheduled practice and playing time.

Senator Dorbolo, Associated, questioned if the internet plays an important role in learning. Wells responded that the internet is definitely helpful, especially because blackboard can be checked to get notes or schedules online; he feels compelled to check daily. Tarver felt that the internet is easier for athletes because papers can be submitted electronically when traveling.

President Ray acknowledged proposed schedule changes made by Liskevych and others. He felt it was worthwhile for people to know that some schedules have been shortened, but it didn't change the number of games. Pat Casey has been a leading advocate for a shorter baseball season because he feels that students are missing too much class. Ray noted that the NCAA self-study accreditation process will be occurring this year and many faculty are participating in the study; one area to be addressed is student athlete welfare.

Liskevych expressed a desire to bridge the gap of the railroad tracks between athletics and academics. He thanked everyone for coordinating the panel, especially Kate Halischak and Athletic Academic Advisors.

## **REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Ciuffetti's report included the following:

- Acknowledgement of efforts by Provost Randhawa and President Ray regarding the decision to grant faculty salary increases at this time given current fiscal times.
- Baccalaureate Core – Survey results last spring indicated interest on the part of faculty to revisit the Baccalaureate Core. The Executive Committee is striving for broad representation on a Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee; she anticipates that the membership will be announced in November.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.



# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [2008 Minutes](#) » May 8, 2008

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2008 No. 631

May 8, 2008

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Lynda Ciuffetti on May 8, 2008 in Peavy Auditorium.

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Resolution of Sympathy for Warren Suzuki; Category I Proposal - Initiation of a New Instructional Program Leading to the Religion and Culture Certificate in Philosophy; Standing Rules Revisions: Computing Resources Committee, Graduate Council, Research Council; Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees; and a Salary Resolution [Motion 08-631-01 through 07]
- Committee Report: Guidelines for the Student Evaluation Letter for Inclusion in the Promotion and Tenure Dossier
- Discussion Item: Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)

### Resolution of Sympathy

President Ciuffetti presented the following Resolution of Sympathy; Senator Thompson, Agricultural Sciences moved approval of the resolution; motion 08-631-01 was seconded and approved by voice vote.

*The Oregon State University Faculty Senate expresses its deepest sympathies to the family of Warren N. Suzuki upon his death on February 9, 2008. Warren joined the faculty in the College of Education in 1974. He distinguished himself in his field and was instrumental in the formation of the OSU Association of Faculty for the Advancement of People of Color.*

*Warren enthusiastically embraced both the challenges and pleasures in life. He enriched Oregon and Oregon State University during his 26 year tenure, and he truly will be missed.*

### ACTION ITEMS

#### Category I Proposals

John Lee, Curriculum Council Chair, presented a Category I proposal for [Initiation of a New Instructional Program Leading to the Religion and Culture Certificate in Philosophy](#). The proposal has been approved by the Curriculum Council and Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee; the Library holdings were also deemed to be adequate. Motion 08-631-02 passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Voting on the Category I proposal to Reorganize Administrative Units in the College of Business was postponed to the June Faculty Senate meeting.

#### Standing Rules Revisions

Mark Meyers, Committee on Committees chair, presented for approval proposed [Standing Rules revisions](#) to the following Faculty Senate Committees:

- Computing Resources Committee - the proposed revisions deleted reference to a committee that no longer exists and formalized current practices by adding a reference to representation on the University Information Technology Committee. Motion 08-631-03 to approve the proposed revisions passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes or discussion.
- Graduate Council - the proposed revisions formalized current practices by indicating review and selection of award recipients and review of funding for graduate training and education programs. Motion 08-631-04 to approve the proposed revisions passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

- Research Council - the proposed revisions formalized current practices by deleting references to grant funding and alternate members; add references to Centers, Institutes and Programs and a conflict of interest policy; and increase membership to 15 members. Motion 08-631-05 to approve the proposed revisions passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

#### Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees

Every even-numbered year the Faculty Senate votes to elect members to the Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee which is only used when a faculty member is dismissed for cause and is not related to the faculty grievance process. Information about the panels and those who previously agreed to have their name placed on the ballot were [linked](#) to the agenda.

Nominations were accepted from the floor; those nominated and accepting nomination were: Deb Pence and Tony Wilcox; President Ciuffetti closed the nominations. Voting on the panels will occur at the June 12 Faculty Senate meeting.

#### Salary Resolution

President Ciuffetti presented background and requested approval of the below resolution urging the release of funds for the State Salary Package in June 2008:

*Whereas, The 2007 Legislature established a State Salary Pool to enable state agencies to cover salary increases over the 2007-09 biennium; and*

*Whereas, legislative budget leaders decided in February to delay releasing the salary pool until after the June 2008 revenue forecast is available; and*

*Whereas not releasing the funds in June will reverse progress to increase funding for Oregon's public universities accomplished by the governor and legislature during the last legislative session; and*

*Whereas, OSU stands to lose nearly \$12 million in state general funds if the funds are not released; and*

*Whereas OSU will be forced to begin making cuts in July 2008 in order meet these budget reductions; and*

*Whereas the last time the legislature imposed a budget reduction in the middle of the biennium, OSU was forced to eliminate classes and raise tuition; therefore be it*

*Resolved, That the Faculty Senate urges Governor Kulongoski and the Oregon Legislative Assembly to take the necessary steps to release the entire \$125 million State Salary Package when the Legislative Emergency Board meets in June, 2008.*

President Ciuffetti noted that if the funds are not released salaries will not be affected and cuts will be made to programs to self-fund the salaries.

Amendments to the last paragraph:

- Senator Pence, Engineering, suggested inserting "regardless of the June 2008 revenue forecast" between "State Salary Package" and "when."
- Senator Roberts, Liberal Arts, suggested adding "OSU" prior to "Faculty Senate."  
Senator Thompson, Liberal Arts, moved to approve the two proposed amendments; motion seconded. Motion 08-631-07 to approve the two proposed amendments passed by voice vote.

Motion 08-631-06 to approve the amended resolution passed by voice vote. President Ciuffetti explained that a letter containing the resolution will be sent from her, and the ASOSU and possibly SEIU presidents urging the governor to release the funds for salaries.

#### **COMMITTEE REPORT**

##### Guidelines for the Student Evaluation Letter for Inclusion in the Promotion and Tenure Dossier

Roger Nielsen, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, presented the [Guidelines for the Student Evaluation Letter for Inclusion in the Promotion and Tenure Dossier](#). Also linked is a [PowerPoint presentation](#) that provided background and context for the guidelines.

Discussion included:

- Senator Roberts questioned if the intent is that the letter from the P&T Committee includes a reference to the letters from the students. Nielsen responded that the P&T Committee should see the summary letter and that the tone of the letter will be communicated to the candidate. This will be part of the dossier construction guidelines but will not specifically be part of this document. Provost Randhawa noted that the letters written by the departmental committee and chair refer to the student input; it's important that the chair makes the case for teaching.
- Senator Gillies, Associated Faculty, questioned if the expectation is that student letters be vetted through legal. Nielsen responded that anything not signed is excluded; he will talk with Becky Johnson regarding the recommendation to chairs to vet letters through legal.
- Senator Valentine, Veterinary Medicine, questioned if the student input would be filtered through both the student committee and P&T Committee. Senator Gillies felt there was a risk of having a strong personality drive the process; Nielsen responded that was the purpose of having a two-stage process. Senator Gillies requested adding something regarding strong personalities and teaching of different cultural values that may cause problems for some students.
- Straw vote - letters from recent but former students is a bad idea - no one opposed. About one-third of the Senators present were not comfortable with the proposed revisions. Students feel strongly that the letters are confidential.
- Senator Valls, Liberal Arts, suggested letting the candidate and committee have access to the summary letter.
- Senator Lee, Science, questioned what information the faculty actually receives regarding the content of the student letter. He felt it was important, in terms of external and student letters, what the candidate actually sees; it's important to spell it out.
- Tony Wilcox, Executive Committee, questioned both what access is given to the letters collected and the validity of representation of the letters. He also felt that the individual student comments would be lost with a summary letter. Nielsen responded that legal counsel can provide legalities.
- Next steps: Nielsen will consult with legal counsel for their perspective regarding the extent of the waiver. Vice Provost Becky Johnson noted that faculty have the option of not signing the waiver. There will be further discussion at the June Faculty Senate meeting; Senators were asked to send comments to Nielsen prior to June.

## DISCUSSION ITEM

### Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)

President Ciuffetti lead a discussion regarding the responses received by Senators from constituents to two questions regarding the SET tool: 1) Would you favor the revision or replacement of the current SET? and 2) Since the OAR requires evaluation, would you favor shifting the evaluation of teaching to an assessment of learning?

The following responses to Question 1 were provided by Senators:

- Senator Pence - by a margin of 3 to 1, faculty would like to see the SET revamped
- Senator Semprini, Engineering - in regard to NSF grants and collaborative teaching, faculty felt that it is necessary to revise
- Carol Mallory-Smith, Executive Committee - by a margin of 3 to 1, faculty favored some modification or changes in the SET; concerns about what the alternate might be
- Senator Roberts noted that the form was originally revised to include a diversity question, which never happened. Ciuffetti hoped that the diversity question would be considered if the SET was again revised
- Senator Bailey, Forestry - by a margin of 3 to 1, faculty felt it's not worth the effort to revise the form which may result in something equally 'hateable'; they felt there are bigger things to work on
- Senator Trujillo, Liberal Arts - faculty were in favor of revisions
- Senator Roberts - Philosophy faculty agreed with Senator Bailey, but would also like to include to the mean
- College of Business faculty felt the form is not great, but there is no pressure to change
- Senator Stevens, Pharmacy - faculty were in favor of the current version, but would consider another proposal
- Stan Gregory, Agricultural Sciences - Fisheries and Wildlife faculty are interested in shifting toward outcome assessments

- Senator Chappell, Liberal Arts - most History faculty were disappointed with the current form and called it a disservice; she felt that the University Honors College evaluation form is better
- Senator Cardinal, Health and Human Sciences - 13 faculty felt that question one should be kept; others felt it should be revised  
Responses to Question 2 included:
- Senator Roberts - Philosophy faculty were opposed to shifting to an assessment of learning
- Senator Mallory-Smith, Agricultural Sciences - faculty were adamantly opposed
- Senator Trujillo - faculty were in favor of shifting to an assessment of learning
- Senator Pyles, Forestry - Forest Engineering has been doing learning objectives since assessment began
- Senator Helle, Liberal Arts - English does some assessment of learning outcomes in an exit survey; fearful of legislature attaching funding to outcomes
- Senator Pence - faculty were split 50/50
- Senator Alexander, Student Affairs - learning environment is important to assess
- Senator Bailey - no strong call for change
- Senator Chappell - strong feelings to separate the two
- Senator Peters, Associated Faculty - new faculty would like some place to talk about attempts at learning outcomes
- Senator Cardinal - by a margin of 2 to 1, faculty were in favor of changing to an assessment of learning

President Ciuffetti asked Senators to send a summary of responses, including the number of respondents, to the Faculty Senate Office. The Executive Committee will review and discuss the responses and determine the next steps.

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

Provost Sabah Randhawa's report included the following:

- The OUS Vice President for Strategic Planning is now the co-chair, with him, of the OUS Provost's Council. Randhawa proceeded to outline the duties of the Provost's Council.
- Regarding the April IFS conversation with the Chancellor:
  - The OSBHE has not discussed the 2009-11 legislative session; the highest priority is the core teaching package, i.e., increased funding for programs and faculty salaries.
  - The OSBHE considers requests for policy level packages; OSU's priorities are: 1) state-wide public services and 2) E-tech money.
- The OSBHE is focused on improving the educational base for the Portland area in terms of educational access and research opportunities. Beyond access, the emphasis is on life and health sciences in the Portland area. OSU is interested in moving the Pharmacy program to Portland.
- Facilities Services - there is still a backlog related to maintenance issues, but not due to a lack of effort - a memo dated March 21 indicated 2400 work orders; the priorities are for health and safety issues. Classroom renovations are also a priority. They recognize that needs on campus are immense and they are working on further improving communication with campus.

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

President Ciuffetti's report included the following:

- Update from fall: A joint Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs ad hoc committee was appointed to review and suggest revisions to Post Tenure Review; recommendations for policy changes will be presented for approval at the June Senate meeting. The changes will be distributed to Senators to gather input from their constituents prior to the June meeting.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Bell, Engineering, appealed for marshals for commencement; send him an email if interested. Volunteers for ushers are also needed.



## Roll Call

### *Members Present:*

Agricultural Sciences: Arp, Curtis, Dreher, Field, B. Jeter for Hartley, Mallory-Smith, Pereira, Sears, Thompson

Associated Faculty: deGeus, Dempsey, Fernandez, Gaines, Gillies, Greydanus, Halischak, T. Withrow-Robinson for Healey, Hemmer, Hoff, Leslie, Martorello, Nishihara, Pribyl

Business: Banyl, Caplan, Marshall, Neubam, Raja

Education: O'Malley, Ward

Engineering: Bell, Bose, Higginbotham, Hunter-Zaworski, Jovanovic, Pence, Plant, Porter, Semprini

Extension: None present

Forestry: Bailey, Freitag, Leavengood, Pyles, Vandetta, Zahler

Health & Human Sciences: Braverman, Cardinal, Friedman, Gunter, Porter

Liberal Arts: Chappell, S. Rom for Chavarria, Clough, Edwards, Gross, Helle, Lunch, Plaza, Roberts, Steel, Trujillo, Valls, Warner

Library: Chadwell

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Lerczak, Skillingstad, A. White for Spitz, Ungerer

Pharmacy: Cui, Indira, Stevens

ROTC: None present

Science: Blair, Bogley, Escher, Fowler, Gable, Gitelman, Lee, Lesser, McIntyre, Parks, Thomann

Student Affairs: Alexander, Davis-White Eyes, D. Desilet for Etherton, P. Robinson for Larson, Vina, Yamamoto

Veterinary Medicine: Bird, Estill, Valentine

### *Members Absent:*

Agricultural Sciences: Anderson, Azarenko, Bolte, Gamroth, Goddik, Herring, Jepson, Ketchum, Parke, Rao, Selker

Associated Faculty: Averill, Bruce, Dorbolo, Gomez, Oldfield, Ross

Business: None absent

Education: None absent

Engineering: Huber, Momsen

Extension: Angima, Galloway, Godwin, McGrath, Tuck

Forestry: Sexton

Health & Human Sciences: Acock, Hofer, Hooker, McAlexander

Liberal Arts: Bernell, Daugherty, Henderson, Orosco

Library: None absent

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Allan

Pharmacy: None absent

ROTC: Sullivan

Science: Bruslind, Edwards, Haggerty, Lajtha, Mason, Rajagopal

Student Affairs: Thomas

Veterinary Medicine: None absent

### *Guests Present:*

S. Francis, R. Gupta, B. Johnson, K. Kuo, M. McCambridge, M. Meyers, P. Saunders

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

Officers: L. Ciuffetti, president; P. Doescher, president-elect; J. Hale, past president

Ex-officio Voting Members: S. Gregory, S. Randhawa, E. Ray, T. Wilcox

Staff: V. Nunnemaker

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 PM.

### *Respectfully submitted by:*

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](#) » [2008 Minutes](#) » January 10, 2008

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2008 No. 627

January 10, 2008

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Lynda Ciuffetti on January 10, 2008 at 3:00 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center.

President Ciuffetti addressed new Senators who were unable to attend the New Senator Orientation and provided the following information related to meetings:

- Action Items indicate that a motion is on the floor and there is no need to make a motion prior to voting.
- Senators are to sign in on the attendance sheet outside the meeting room.
- Senators are responsible for finding a proxy to attend Faculty Senate meetings in their absence.
- When speaking from the floor, Senators should rise and state their name and Senate apportionment unit, not department.

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Approval of October Minutes; Installation of Elected Officials and Senators; Approval of Parliamentarian; Policy on Mid-Term Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty; and Status of OSU Faculty Salaries [Motion 08-627 through 04]
- Special Report: Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
- New Business: None

### ACTION ITEMS

#### Approval of October Minutes

The October minutes were approved as distributed; motion 08-627-01.

#### Installation of Elected Officials and Senators

President Ciuffetti introduced the newly elected officials and declared them installed:

- President-Elect – Paul Doescher
- Executive Committee – Stan Gregory, Carol Mallory-Smith, Deb Pence
- Interinstitutional Faculty Senator – Lani Roberts

Ciuffetti then asked the new Senators to stand as their respective apportionment units were read and declared them installed.

#### Approval of Parliamentarian

Motion 08-627-02 to approve Michael Beachley as Parliamentarian passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes or discussion.

#### Policy on Mid-Term Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty

Roger Nielsen, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, presented for approval revisions to the [Policy on Mid-Term Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty](#). Nielsen thanked the committee members for their work: Bill Braunworth, Paul Farber, Jim Liburdy, Dwaine Plaza, and Maret Traber.

Nielsen explained the rationale behind the revisions:

- Mid-term reviews have the purpose of providing timely guidance to the faculty member.

- The process also keeps the department informed regarding the faculty member's progress.
- Experience has shown the value of well conducted reviews, as well as problems created when reviews are not done, or done poorly.
- Based on these experiences, the committee made several recommendations last year pertaining to the process that resulted in the proposed revisions.

Nielsen noted that many units have engaged in the process for many years, however, others have not. The process will save time in the long run and could save careers.

Specific issues with the current application of the mid-tenure review process:

- No university-wide guidelines for what constitutes a mid-term review.
- Individual units often have no guidelines.
- Faculty within units are sometimes treated differently from year to year (i.e., change in chair or P&T committee).
- Reviews take place too late in the process.
- Lack of clarity as to who should initiate and drive the process, and where information from the review is routed.

General Considerations:

- Revisions have been reviewed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, as well as by the Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- The committee was intentional about the use of "must" and "will" versus "should" or "may" in order to provide flexibility where needed, yet provide the needed guidance to the units.

Specific components to the policy:

- The review should be near to the mid-point between hiring and tenure. For a 'typical' tenure-track assistant professor hire, that would be the spring quarter of their third year.
- Prepared P&T materials are similar to the P&T dossier format, with the exception that the new process specifically states that external letters will only be requested in extraordinary cases, i.e. where the unit doesn't have the disciplinary expertise to make a decision.
- Responsibility for initiating the process rests with the supervisor (normally the chair or head).
- Review and development of recommendations is done through the unit P&T committee and supervisor.
- Review and recommendations go to the college for affirmation or adjustment.

The committee's vision of a 'typical' process:

- At the end of the second year of the appointment, the department chair notifies the faculty member that they will be up for a mid-term review in the next year (approximately one-year notice).
- The unit P&T committee is notified by the department chair at the beginning of the academic year.
- The faculty member works with the chair or mentor to prepare the dossier, including information on teaching and advising.
- In late winter or early spring of the third year, the faculty member submits the dossier to the department P&T committee and department chair.
- The department P&T committee and department chair review the dossier; each write letters of evaluation, then collaborate on a list of expectations for the period remaining to tenure.
- The faculty member meets with the department chair and P&T chair to discuss the results.
- The letters, together with the dossier, is sent to the dean's office where they are signed – signifying the college's approval of the department's plan – and returned.

Senator Gable, Science, questioned the use of external letters. Nielsen responded that, in general, faculty do not use outside letters, although some are allowed one letter. His experience is that external letters are not requested in his discipline.

Senator Lee, Science, was not supportive of the policy, noted it addresses a problem not present in his unit, and felt it was an additional administrative burden. His unit does three-year reviews and the spirit of the information in the policy is transmitted to the junior faculty. Nielsen responded that was not the case university wide.

Senator Henderson, Liberal Arts, felt this policy would be helpful for junior faculty and noted that a review

currently doesn't occur across the college. Nielsen explained that the policy likely doesn't change anything in the units currently conducting reviews, but the policy states that this needs to be done in the units where the review is not occurring.

Provost Randhawa stated that a number of P&T cases could have been avoided if the mid-term reviews had been accomplished. He addressed Senator Lee's concern regarding additional administrative work and noted that there is an ad hoc committee looking at reducing the workload related to the Post-Tenure Review Process. Senator Trujillo, Liberal Arts, explained that the ad hoc committee is looking at ways to use existing structures to implement policies and looking at revisions to the Periodic Review of Faculty process.

Senator Marshall, Business, questioned if the committee had considered the liability that the university might incur if tenure is denied and the faculty member charges that the policy was not followed. Nielsen responded that the proposed policy has been reviewed by the legal office, and he felt that it greatly reduces liability by making the goals clear at the mid-point.

Senator Valentine, Veterinary Medicine, questioned whether one could declare that the review was done improperly if one element within the policy is not addressed, and whether the guidelines were binding. Nielsen responded that what was outlined is considered guidelines; however, it is the responsibility of the department chair and candidate to ensure that the process is followed, particularly with regard to where they are getting input.

In response to a question regarding how frequently lawsuits are brought after mid-term reviews, Nielsen stated that there are a significant number of cases each year where mid-term reviews create problems, but they don't necessarily result in lawsuits.

Senator Lee questioned the intent of Guideline C (applying the process uniformly to all faculty). Randhawa stated that the intent is that all tenure-track faculty go through a third-year review. There may be differences in how things are applied, but the key elements in the process must be the same. The goal is to ensure the success of faculty and ensure they are getting appropriate feedback.

Senator Clough, Liberal Arts, felt that the burden was being put on the faculty member preparing the dossier. Nielsen responded that the goal is to encourage tenure decision makers to discuss the performance of the faculty member based on the dossier.

Senator Pence, Engineering, thanked the committee for their work and questioned whether the focus was too much on the symptoms and not the problem. She noted that the third year is more than half-way through the process since the P&T dossier must be completed by the end of the fifth year. She also suggested focusing on the mentoring system where there is a lack of support. Nielsen indicated that the third year is earlier than most institutions. The timing in the spring is meant to give time to focus on junior faculty and provide mentoring time since P&T has a fall focus. If mentoring has not occurred, the third-year review will force that activity prior to P&T submission, which is one reason why the dean is involved.

Senator Trujillo stated that some research indicates that the third year is too late. He is participating on a committee to determine what should be done annually to assist faculty with P&T or promotion; related documents should be available in the next few weeks.

Senator Curtis, Agricultural Sciences, suggested that the unit P&T Committee should be involved earlier and felt it was important to have someone other than the department head assist the faculty member and provide feedback.

Motion 08-627-03 to accept the Policy on Mid-Term Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote. President Ciuffetti noted that the document would be sent to President Ray, Provost Randhawa and Vice Provost Johnson.

#### Status of OSU Faculty Salaries

Maggie Niess, Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee (FEW&RC) chair, presented for endorsement the [Review and Update of the Report of the 2005 Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee](#). Niess expressed sincere appreciation to the committee members for their efforts in preparing the report, as well as support from administrators and Institutional Research.

Her background explanation included the following:

- In 2000 an Issues Group on Faculty Compensation recommended:
  1. Faculty compensation should be increased to 100% of the mean of our peer institutions over the next three biennia.
  2. The salary increases should be applied differentially to correct for salary compression.
- In 2004-05 the FEW&RC reviewed the progress recommended by the earlier group. They found that:
  - The situation, with respect to our peers, had worsened; and
  - They reiterated the four principles identified in the 2000 report and challenged that faculty salaries be given the top priority in the university. Niess noted that salaries have been a top priority, but acknowledged constraints.
- The FEW&RC found that determining OSU's peer group is problematic since four sets of peers are currently used (the purposes range from budgeting, strategic planning, and combinations of these); an analysis was completed on all four groups.
- OSU is below the mean called for by the 2005 group. Assistant professors are close to the mean but the serious situation is with full professors, where there is a large gap. Niess noted that the figures include only salary and not benefits, which are more difficult to determine.
- There are both compression and inversion issues.
- Cost of living has not been maintained for faculty with fully satisfactory service.
- The FEW&RC determined that OSU is not keeping up with inflation, making little progress toward the mean, and there is a serious problem at the full professor level despite the work that President Ray has done to focus on faculty salaries. Niess acknowledged that part of the problem is the way the State of Oregon is funded.

The committee is recommending that the Faculty Senate endorse the recommendations in the report:

1. The administration shall endorse and promote the four basic principles relating to salary (identified in the 2005 report):
  - Average faculty compensation (salary plus benefits) shall be increased and maintained at a level of sustained competitive parity matching or exceeding the average for comparator institutions (peers as defined for OSU's Strategic Plan), based on rank, discipline, and the nature of duties performed.
  - All campus-wide salary adjustments shall include a cost of living component.
  - The merit component of salary adjustments shall be based upon distinguished performance.
  - Faculty compensation shall address salary compression and inequities by rank.
2. All salary increases shall contain percentages distributed among three aspects as a means of addressing serious issues with faculty salaries:
  - cost of living adjustments for fully satisfactory service,
  - merit increases for meritorious service, and
  - equity (compression and inversion, diversity, and gender).
3. Faculty salary and benefit actions at OSU shall be more transparent. The committee found differences of understanding of the meanings of 'merit' and 'fully satisfactory' among both faculty and unit heads.
4. The University shall embark upon a concentrated analysis of faculty salaries with the intent of proposing an extended plan for improvement. This task force shall consider all faculty salaries – instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, full professors as well as professional faculty. A task force and appropriate subcommittees shall provide extended, in-depth analysis along with recommendations that ultimately result in a proposal for a long-term plan for sustaining faculty capacity that strengthens OSU's teaching and research infrastructure. At a minimum, the various subcommittees should consider issues that have been raised in this report:
  - Equity issues, including:
    - Gender;
    - Diversity;
    - Compression and inversion for the various professorial levels; and
  - Impact of reduction of full professors due to retirement. Typically it is full professors who attract outside funding.

Senator Gillies, Associated Faculty, noted that the report did not look at Faculty Research Assistant and Associates; Niess responded there was not enough time and that the intent was to include all faculty ranks.

Senator Alexander, Student Affairs, questioned whether there was an analysis of cost of living in all areas as

compared to salary. Niess responded there was not enough time to do that, but that could be a component of the recommended task force.

Senator Field, Agricultural Sciences, questioned the perception of the legislature. Jock Mills, Governmental Affairs Director, noted that the legislature earmarked a total of \$1 million for salaries at all OUS institutions in 2005; however, in 2007 the amount increased significantly to \$8 million. Other people need to advocate for faculty salaries since faculty are not the best advocates – students are very good advocates. The local legislators understand the issues but have not previously been in a position where they could assist with change. There is not a deep appreciation of the problem by legislators who are not impressed by peer comparators from other states. OSU is still ranked in the low to mid-40's nationwide in terms of per capita investments in higher education.

Senator Higginbotham, Engineering, suggested approaching the legislature with the economic impact to the state related to senior faculty leaving for higher salaries. Mills did approach legislators with a list of terminating faculty, but it was not compelling. Mills will again 'buddy up' faculty with legislators in 2009 so they will experience first hand classroom conditions and workload.

Senator Higginbotham questioned if the recommendations include having the task force look at alternate funding sources for specific targeted goals. Niess responded that the recommendations are broad enough to allow flexibility regarding the task force; the thought was to have a broad-based task force with sub-groups.

Senator Dorbolo, Associated Faculty, noted that he can provide statistics if legislators are looking for instances where faculty are working harder.

Tony Wilcox, Executive Committee, noted that compression, merit and equity issues are under our control, while funding is not.

Laurel Kristick (proxy for Chadwell), Library, questioned whether the data also included faculty not affiliated with colleges; Niess responded negatively.

Bob Becker, FEW&RC member, felt it was possible to address compression at OSU and noted the following faculty salary increases:

- Faculty at EOU are receiving a 14% salary increase during this biennium;
- WOU settled for 11.7% for the biennium; and
- OSU is at 4%.

Senator Higginbotham questioned whether EOU was unionized. Mills responded that they are unionized, as is WOU, but EOU is laying off faculty to balance the funding equation. He also felt that Becker's data did not draw a fair comparison since the dollar amounts for EOU were not included.

Provost Randhawa noted that, in the recent past, OSU's salary increases have been self-funded. He felt we were in a better position this biennium and hopes to do better than 4% in January 2009. He has had a chance to look at salary aggregate levels: the minimum increase for satisfactory service was around 2%; other increases seem to be in line with parity or equity; however, he acknowledged that the 2009 guidelines need to be more explicit in terms of fully satisfactory service and merit. He noted that the percentage increase has been so little that it can hardly be justified to address all elements but, with additional funding in 2009, the intent is to talk about equity adjustments. He feels that OSU can begin making some progress.

Senator Roberts, Liberal Arts, noted that a problem with a percentage increase is that it accentuates the compression issue.

Senator McIntyre, Science, cautioned to be careful with benefits. Niess noted that benefits appear to have decreased, but are still better at OSU than most institutions.

Motion 08-627-04 to endorse the recommendations in the FEW&RC report passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. President Ciuffetti thanked the committee for their hard work in a short time. Ciuffetti noted that the report would be forwarded to the president, provost, vice president for finance and administration, and the director of government relations.

## **SPECIAL REPORT**

### Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

Kate Hunter-Zaworski, IFS Senator, provided a recap of the December IFS meeting. Her report included the

following:

- A quote from Senator Devlin, who visited with IFS, was "Education is an investment, not an expenditure."
- She thanked faculty for the unexpectedly large response to an IFS request for student preparedness in December. The underlying message was that students don't know how to read, write or add.
- IFS was asked by OUS to participate in the Lincoln Commemoration; Mina Carson (OSU) is taking on that responsibility on behalf of IFS.
- Chancellor Pernsteiner announced six major target areas that OUS is working on, resulting in participation on committees by IFS members:
  - Constitutional Amendment – to include higher ed as a guarantee in the State of Oregon
  - Governance – looking at a relationship between OUS and institutions
  - Portland Committee – areas related to the Portland area, particularly PSU and budget issues
  - Student Success – struggles with K-12 student preparedness
  - Graduate Education and Research – recognition of economic value of, particularly, doctoral education and research; looking primarily at OSU and UO for input
  - Regional Institutions – issues related to educating students in rural areas of the state
- In regard to faculty salaries, OSU is the only OUS institution to not deal with equity issues.

Senator Higginbotham questioned whether IFS was talking about EOU becoming a part of OSU. Hunter-Zaworski responded that the committee is looking at administrative restructuring for the regional institutions; however, there was no explicit discussion regarding branch campuses.

#### **DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Provost Randhawa's report included the following:

- OSBHE approved eliminating most fees at OUS institutions by rolling them into tuition to create a base tuition rate, instituting differential tuition levels for different programs, or a combination of the two strategies. No changes will be made for fall 2008 since the tuition rate has been advertised and students have already been admitted; implementation is anticipated for fall 2009. The University Budget Committee is reviewing the issue.
- The organizational structures for the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences will remain separate. The CLA dean search will be initiated immediately; a search firm will be hired; and a hire is anticipated by fall 2008 – the objective is to have a strong candidate, not just fill the position. Larry Roper and Sherm Bloomer are forming an Arts and Sciences thematic group.

Senator Huber, Engineering, noted that units now keep fees and questioned whether an equivalent amount will be earmarked for units once the fees are included in tuition. Randhawa responded affirmatively.

Senator Dreher, Agricultural Sciences, questioned whether the fee issue includes labs. Randhawa responded that it did not include course/lab fees, including TRF and university fees, other than matriculation fees.

T. Wilcox, in relation to the CLA dean search and commitment to graduate education, questioned what the thinking is about this in an accelerated atmosphere. Randhawa noted that CLA has been working to define its future. He would like to avoid going from one interim dean to another interim. The point is well taken for articulating graduate education, but recognizes that resources are extremely limited.

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

President Ciuffetti's report included the following:

- Faculty governance plays a key role in determining the university's future. She noted that both Provost Randhawa and President Ray seek and consider guidance and input from the Faculty Senate. She hopes to begin a dialog with Senators to identify approaches to engage faculty to be actively involved in shared governance. There is a feeling among some faculty that all Faculty Senate does is cross the t's and dot the i's. She wants to start exploring ways of helping faculty realize that administration wants faculty to participate in shared governance.
- She thanked Senators for their willingness to serve and their participation in shared governance.



## **NEW BUSINESS**

None

## **Roll Call**

### *Members Present:*

Agricultural Sciences: Azarenko, Bolte, Curtis, Dreher, Field, Goddik, B. Jeter for Hartley, Herring, P. Dysart for Mallory-Smith, Sears, Thompson

Associated Faculty: Averill, deGeus, Dempsey, Dorbolo, Fernandez, Gaines, Gillies, Gomez, Greydanus, Halischak, Healey, Hemmer, Hoff, Leslie, Martorello, Nishihara, Pribyl, Ross

Business: Banyl, Caplan, Marshall, Neubam, Raja

Education: O'Malley, Ward

Engineering: Bell, Bose, Higginbotham, Huber, Hunter-Zaworski, J. Nason for Jovanovic, Momsen, Pence, Plant, Semprini

Extension: Angima, Godwin, McGrath

Forestry: Bailey, Leavengood, Sexton, Vandetta, Zahler

Health & Human Sciences: Acock, Braverman, Cardinal, Friedman, Gunter, Hofer, McAlexander, Porter

Liberal Arts: Bernell, Chappell, Chavarria, Clough, Daugherty, Edwards, Gross, Henderson, Orosco, Plaza, Roberts, Steel, Trujillo, Valls, Warner

Library: L. Kristick for Chadwell

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Allan, Lerczak, Skyllingstad, Spitz, Ungerer

Pharmacy: Cui, Indira, Stevens

ROTC: None present

Science: Blair, Bogley, Bruslind, Escher, Fowler, Gable, Gitelman, R. Nielsen for Haggerty, Lee, Lesser, McIntyre, J. Pohjanpelto for Parks, Thomann

Student Affairs: Alexander, Davis-White Eyes, Prokey for Etherton, Thomas, Vina, Yamamoto

Veterinary Medicine: Bird, Estill, Valentine

### *Members Absent:*

Agricultural Sciences: Anderson, Arp, Gamroth, Jepson, Ketchum, Parke, Pereira, Rao, Selker

Associated Faculty: Bruce, Oldfield

Business: No absences

Education: No absences

Engineering: Porter

Extension: Galloway, Tuck

Forestry: Freitag, Pyles

Health & Human Sciences: Hooker

Liberal Arts: Helle, Lunch

Library: No absences

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: No absences

Pharmacy: No absences

ROTC: Sullivan

Science: Edwards, Lajtha, Mason, Rajagopal

Student Affairs: Larson

Veterinary Medicine: No absences

### *Guests Present:*

B. Becker, B. Johnson, M. McCambridge, J. Miller, M. Niess

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

Officers: B. Boggess, past president; L. Ciufetti, president; P. Doescher, president-elect; J. Hale, past president

Ex-officio Voting Members: S. Gregory, S. Randhawa, T. Wilcox

Ex-officio Non-voting Members: M. Beachley

Staff: V. Nunnemaker

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 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](#).