

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 2009 Minutes

2009 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.

- [April 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](#) » [2009 Minutes](#) » April 9, 2009

Faculty Senate Minutes

2009 No. 639

April 9, 2009

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Paul Doescher on April 9, 2009 at 3:00 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center.

Meeting Summary

- Action Items: None
- Special Reports: Women's Advancement and Gender Equity (WAGE) – Donna Champeau; Integrated Marketing Communications – Luanne Lawrence; and Interinstitutional Faculty Senate – Joanne Sorte
- Committee Report: Proposed Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure College Review and Recommendation – Jim Liburdy
- Discussion Item: Budget and Tuition Update Based on Legislative Actions
Jock Mills and Mark McCambridge
- New Business: None

SPECIAL REPORTS

Women's Advancement and Gender Equity (WAGE)

Donna Champeau, WAGE Director, explained the role and activities of the WAGE office. She noted that a challenge of the office is to collaborate well with other units, including Community and Diversity, Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, Women's Center, international community, and Athletics. The [PowerPoint](#) used by Champeau outlines her presentation..

Below are some of the points made during the presentation:

- The office was established in July 2007 – not many institutions have an office of this type. Focus areas – climate and culture, leadership development, and transparency
- Accomplishments include – Gender Forum, development of a Leadership Institute, collaboration on NSF grant with Utah State, and development of a Lactation Policy for campus.
- Goals of the WAGE Office include:
 - providing professional development opportunities for the preparation and support of women on the OSU campus;
 - promoting visibility, recognition and advancement of women qualified by education, experience, and personal characteristics for leadership position in higher education; and working to eliminate barriers to women's achievement in higher education.

Future directions for the office include:

- providing support for campus community and expand the role of Ombudsperson Services;
- providing continued primary and secondary research to uncover and address gender related issues; and
- expanding collaborations on and off campus.

Integrated Marketing Communications

Luanne Lawrence, University Advancement (UA), presented the Powered by Orange marketing campaign created by Lipman Hearne. Lawrence referred to the following websites during her presentation: [Integrated Marketing Communications](#) and the [Powered by Orange](#). Lawrence's report included the following information:

- University Advancement has 25 employees with 23 paid from E&G funds; funds are raised from the

trademark licensing program; the current campaign will cost about \$200,000

- About 2,000 individuals participated in marketing surveys related to the campaign. UA has worked with Lipman Hearne for about 1.5 years who indicated that OSU's general marketing approach must change
- Lipman Hearne's research revealed the following: external individuals' perception of OSU is that it is grounded in the 1960's; need to create contemporary image; alumni don't talk about academic achievement or research; OSU is identified with rural Oregon; need to enhance contributions relative to state, national and global peer sets. Alumni and students talked about the approachability of faculty – OSU is perceived to be 'kinder.'
- Lipman Hearne identified a baseline message platform on which the marketing campaign is built ... 1) intention – what we exist to do; 2) Benefit – why it matters; 3) Value – what the brand will stand for over time; operating principle; 4) Personality and Stance – the face we show the world; how we get it done: a) mindful, b) authentic, c) confident, d) achieving
- Internal community is highly enthusiastic about OSU, but that enthusiasm isn't shared outside of OSU
- Implementation groups include – Executive Marketing Cabinet (President Doescher serves on the cabinet), Dean's Integrated Marketing Communications (IMC) Council, IMC Implementation Team, IMC Network, and a student Powered by Orange Council
- The Powered by Orange Campaign includes a campaign to encourage alumni to support businesses owned by other alumni, an environmental campaign in the fall, a banner campaign, an international component, national tactics include an alumni admissions program that will allow alumni to recruit for OSU, and a student Powered by Orange component.

Ray Brooke, Business, questioned how the campaign connects with Athletics. Lawrence responded that Athletics has a seamless marketing attachment to the academic side; their campaign is 'I Am Orange.'

Leslie Burns, Faculty Senate President-Elect, questioned how the words relate to Powered by Orange. Lawrence responded that Powered by Orange is a personal branding campaign, for example, "I am Powered by Orange" translates to "I am mindful" or "I am authentic."

INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE REPORT

Joanne Sorte, OSU Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senior Senator, presented a recap of the April IFS meeting that included the following:

- She noted they were told that, in this economic climate, whatever was related three days ago will be irrelevant.
- OSBHE is implementing a plan for a common admissions form that will include the option of applying at another OUS institution if not accepted at the one to which they applied. UO and SOU now have a dual admission agreement; anyone not admitted at UO will be accepted at SOU; the expectation is that 20% will enroll at UO after the sophomore year.
- Chancellor Pernsteiner's report included the following: he related that no stone will be unturned related to budget issues; discussed whether OUS employees should become DAS employees; will attempt to hold students harmless; OSBHE was inclined to implement larger than 30% cuts to Extension – following a report by Scott Reed, the Board understood Extension better and had no desire to make additional cuts to Extension; OSBHE is working with a 30% cut scenario, but the Chancellor feels that cuts will be about 20%; regional campuses will be cut less than 30% with the expectation that the larger campuses will absorb the balance of cuts to the smaller campuses; OSU-Cascades will likely be cut more than 30% - he felt this was an attempt to force a discussion of whether Cascades is needed; anticipated tuition increases will probably result in enrollment reductions; institutions will make financial exigency determinations on a campus-by-campus basis, if needed;
- OSBHE actions under review that need faculty input include: required minimum class sizes; minimum program sizes (i.e., five or fewer graduated in the last five years; program cost reduction; and salary reductions. OUS legal counsel will determine what options are allowable.
- Tuition increases will likely be 12% per year.
- Some IFS members were opposed to donating a day per month to address spending reductions while others felt that state workers need to participate in the pain that other workers are feeling. Need to provide opportunity for Oregon students and keep optimism high at universities.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure College Review and Recommendation

Jim Liburdy, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, presented for discussion revisions to the [College Review and Recommendation](#) section of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The purpose of the presentation was

to gather additional feedback for consideration by the Committee. It is anticipated that the proposal will be voted on in May.

Liburdy noted the current three levels of review include unit, college and university with each level providing information to the next level. The Committee looked at the process, including uniformity, availability of diverse information, and the balance of information (whether coming from faculty or administration), and is proposing revisions necessary to achieve the desired balance. The goal is to provide the Provost a balanced and diverse level and breadth of information to be used for an adequate assessment of P&T as well as providing flexibility within individual units.

Because college level committees vary from college to college, the Committee is proposing a unit level committee elected by faculty; a unit supervisor provides their recommendation to the college after reviewing materials from the unit level committee; and, not covered in the proposal, is the dean level review, which typically involves a committee. The P&T Committee feels that this process would provide a balanced set of opinions that would be forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for consideration and a final recommendation. A restriction proposed by the Committee is that the faculty committee would be elected by faculty within individual units which changes the guidelines to be more specific about the way in which the committee is determined.

Senator Jansen, Science, felt that a unit level committee was unnecessary. Liburdy responded the proposal would determine how the review process goes forward and how the evaluators are selected.

Senator Bailey, Forestry, questioned whether there was any consideration of eliminating the college level review. Liburdy responded that the college level review is still there, but the proposal is designed to add diversity and balance of input to assist the Provost in determining whether issues are viewed differently by faculty and administrators.

Senator Magana, Engineering, felt that due to a lack of uniformity, some colleges have a track record of appointing committees that result in abuse; he felt the proposal would provide an element of justice and fairness and will minimize abuse.

Senator Gable, Science, expressed serious concerns and felt this was another way of diluting the impact of the departmental recommendation.

Senator Leavengood, Forestry, felt that the wording in the second sentence of the second paragraph should be clarified; he felt it wasn't clear whether it's a review of faculty member's performance or if the committee is voting on a P&T decision. Liburdy responded that these levels provide recommendations not decisions. Leavengood felt that the word 'accurately' in the second sentence of the third paragraph raised concerns and questioned whether it implies correctly assessing performance. He suggested alternate wording, such as 'fairly,' 'effectively,' 'reasonably,' or 'fully.'

Senator Trujillo, Liberal Arts, reminded Senators that a collaborative group was established several years ago that made specific recommendations regarding consistency of the process. He urged the Committee to contact Anne Gillies for a copy of the report.

Senator Wilcox, Health and Human Sciences, supported the principle of faculty elected at the college level, but hasn't seen recommendations for the department level. He didn't feel it was feasible to expect that tenure level faculty can be elected from every unit. Liburdy responded that the department level is being addressed and a draft is being created. The Committee is first gathering feedback regarding the college level, then will move forward with department level recommendations.

Senator Dreher, Science, felt that most faculty need several years experience to contribute and adequately review dossiers. The committee composition in the College of Science is typically chairs with a few faculty; he felt that chairs have the experience to adequately review dossiers. Liburdy responded that chairs and heads have an opportunity for input at several levels. As far as being knowledgeable, the committee would be elected and one criteria for effectiveness is addressed in the 2nd paragraph where it states that "The size of the committee shall be decided within the college to provide fair and equitable faculty representation based on the diversity within the college." Liburdy felt that the recommendation is written to allow college variations while also allowing diversity.

Immediate Past President Ciuffetti noted that the report to which Trujillo referred has been revised during the past year, and will be presented to the EC for discussion when finalized. Trujillo felt that some of the recommendations would be pertinent to the P&T Committee.

Senators were encouraged to contact Liburdy with additional comments.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Budget and Tuition Update Based on Legislative Actions

Jock Mills, Government Relations Director, and Mark McCambridge, Vice President for Finance and Administration, discussed budget issues and the current direction of the legislature.

Mills noted that Oregon voters have provided legislators very little flexibility due to mandated spending. He explained that a projected 30% cut would result in an OUS budget of \$674 million which is equivalent to 1999 levels (not adjusted for inflation). Additional resources available to legislators are \$700 million in the Education Stability Fund that could be applied to K-20 and community colleges and included in that amount is a Rainy Day Fund. Using these funds requires approval by two-thirds of the legislature action; legislators are leery about spending these funds because it is one-time money. There is also about \$900 million in federal stimulus funds, some of which may be directed to higher education.

Mills explained that legislative budget hearings will occur April 16-28 and the role of faculty can be helpful, but legislators interpret faculty as not doing their job if they are in Salem. Mills suggested that faculty communicate with legislators on behalf of students so it doesn't appear to be self-serving. Because students are encouraged to participate in public hearings, faculty were encouraged to allow students to participate. There is an effort to secure funds at sustainable levels. There will be a forecast in late April following the hearings, and legislators will try to make decisions. There is a lot of anger and angst in Salem.

Mark McCambridge reported that the Provost has initiated a group to advise him on parameters with which cuts will be dealt. There is a clause allowing the governor of any state to waive cuts below 20%. An anticipated 30% OSU cut for the biennium is about \$75 million, which would include a proposed tuition increase (9.6% increase for in-state students and 4% for all other students) and applying half of the student credit hours for each credit hour presently in the plateau, resulting in an approximately 25% tuition increase for 15 credit hours. Additionally, to make up the remaining \$75 million, \$25 million would result in a 4.6% salary reduction. The remaining \$20 million in recurring costs will need to come out of existing budgets - \$8 million for first year and \$12 million in cuts in the second year of the biennium. The group, whose membership consists of Leslie Burns, Paul Doescher, Nancy Heiligman, Ryan Mann, Larry Roper, and Becky Warner, hopes to have recommendations to Provost Randhawa by late April.

There has been much discussion about whether the anticipated cuts will be reduced later in the year. McCambridge and Randhawa are concerned that some decisions may need to be made during the summer, but attempts will be made to have as many decisions as possible determined by the end of the term.

Senator Jansen, Science, expressed concern about the 2011-2013 biennium and questioned whether OSU is planning for it? McCambridge also expressed concern, but noted there are many unknowns such as PERS, PEBB, etc. He believes that this is a four-year problem.

Senator Alexis, Science, questioned whether major restructuring should continue, i.e. Business Centers, given the economic volatility. McCambridge responded that he believes strongly that the Business Centers will result in significant savings and OSU will continue to move forward with them.

Senator Pence, Engineering, referred to INTO and questioned whether there are enough students to assist with the budget situation. McCambridge responded that we are two years away from a real financial impact from INTO. It's expected that 170 students will be accepted into the pathway this fall. The goal is to complete the dorm for INTO students in 2011. He also noted there is help in the short term because international applications are up by 100.

Senator Bose, Engineering, questioned how much money will be saved from the Business Centers. McCambridge responded that it was too early to determine the savings; the estimation is that 40 FTE will be redirected to other activities. He believes that savings will be realized two years from now.

Jansen noted that the final fall course lists need to be turned in soon and asked what advise administration has; McCambridge's response was to serve the students.

Pence questioned rumors she's heard about the Kicker. Mills responded that the kicker is problematic because if the State economist blows the projection in May and the economy outperforms the projection by 2%, the difference is returned as Kicker checks. Restructuring of the Kicker and forecasting processes are being discussed in the legislature.

REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Paul Doescher's report included the following items:

- The Executive Committee is still doing the work of the Faculty Senate, but budget issues are discussed at every meeting. He noted concern expressed by faculty regarding budget planning and conveyed that planning is occurring at the departmental, college and university level, but many decisions can't be made until after the May 15 budget forecast. Doescher offered to meet with individuals or units regarding the budget. He noted that administrators are committed to engagement.
- There are still openings in the small group faculty sessions with Dr. Ray; the registration form is accessible from the Faculty Senate homepage.
- The Faculty Senate continues to compile comments from the anonymous Budgets Comments Form and will forward those comments to administration – the form is accessible from the Faculty Senate homepage.
- There is an online comments form, also accessible from the Faculty Senate homepage, for comments directed to the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee.
- There will be two Faculty Senate special sessions dedicated solely to budget issues; Senators were asked to be present or provide a proxy. The first session will be a joint session with ASOSU on April 30 from 3:00-5:00 PM; the second session will be June 2 from 3:00-5:00 PM – this will not be a joint session. As always, Faculty Senate meetings are open to all faculty.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business

Roll Call

Members Present:

Agricultural Sciences: Anderson, Braunworth, Dreher, Field, Mallory-Smith, Perry, Putnum

Associated Faculty: T. Withrow-Robinson (v. Averill), Barr, Brubaker-Cole, Bruce, Dorbolo, S. Grey (v. Hemmer), Hoff, Leslie, Nishihara, Perrone, Pierson-Charlton, Pribyl, Rogers, Ross

Business: J. Moore (v. Caplan), Lykins, C. Kolstad (v. Marshall), Neubam, M. LeMay (v. Simpson)

Education: Frost, O'Malley

Engineering: Bay, Bell, Bose, Hunter-Zaworski, Magana, Pence, Plant, Porter, Semprini

Extension: Bubl

Forestry: Bailey, Huso, Leavengood, Vandetta, Zahler

Health & Human Sciences: Cardinal, Gunter, Jones, Mahana, McAlexander, Wilcox

Liberal Arts: Cytrynbaum, K. Ahearn (v. Helle) Tilt, Trujillo, B. McGough (v. Warner)

Library: Chadwell

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Davis, Lerczak, Spitz, Ungerer

Pharmacy: Cui, Proteau

ROTC: none present

Science: Alexis, Blair, Flahive, Gable, Haggerty, Hsu, Jansen, Lesser, McIntyre, Parks, Remcho, Thomann, Trempy

Student Affairs: Davis-White Eyes, Stroup, Thomas, J. Gana (v. Vina), Yamamoto

Veterinary Medicine: Bird, Heidel, Valentine

Members Absent:

Agricultural Sciences: Arp, Azarenko, Bolte, Cassidy, Curtis, Gamroth, Hartley, Herring, Jepson, Parke, Pereira, Rao, Sears, Selker

Associated Faculty: Dempsey, Eklund, Gaines, Gillies, Halischak, Martorello, Ott

Business: none absent

Education: none absent

Engineering: Higginbotham

Extension: Angima, Bondi, McGrath, Tuck

Forestry: Pyles

Health & Human Sciences: Hofer, Hooker, Porter

Liberal Arts: Bernell, Chappell, Chavarria, Clough, Daugherty, Gross, Hale, Henderson, Orosco, Plaza, Steel

Library: none absent

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Allan

Pharmacy: Indira

ROTC: Sullivan

Science: Bruslind, Edwards, Faridani, Fowler, Rajagopal, Taylor

Student Affairs: Alexander

Guests Present: R. Brooks, N. Heiligman, M. Kanury, K. Kuo, J. Liburdy, B. Lunch, M. McCambridge K. Peterson, M. Sandlin

Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-officios and Staff:

Officers: L. Burns, President-Elect; L. Ciuffetti, Immediate Past President; P. Doescher, President

Ex-officio Voting Members: S. Gregory, J. Sorte

Ex-officio Non-voting Members: M. Beachley, Parliamentarian

Staff: V. Nunnemaker

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 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](#).

Women's Advancement and Gender Equity (WAGE)

Donna Champeau, PhD

<http://oregonstate.edu/wage/>

Background

- July, 2007
- 266/268 Waldo Hall
- Mirabelle Fernandes-Paul, EdD
- Established an advisory committee



Mission and Goals

We will create an environment that attracts women, that nurtures and sustains learning and working at OSU, and serves as a model around the world.

- provide professional development opportunities for the preparation and support of women on the OSU campus.
- promote the visibility, recognition, and advancement of women qualified by education, experience, and personal characteristics for leadership position in higher education.
- work to eliminate barriers to women's achievement in higher education.

Key Areas

- Climate and Culture
 - Providing support for women on campus through training, policy development, ombudsperson services, collaboration.
- Leadership Development
 - Offering and collaborating with programs to support leadership development, initiatives for training and development, and other support structures.
- Transparency
 - Collaborate with Human Resources, affirmative action and other units to assist with efforts to educate and make more visible the policies that directly impact all genders.



Climate

Leadership
and
development

Transparency

Accomplishments

- Successful Gender Forum
- Collaborations with Community and Diversity, AAEO, PCOSW, Women's Center, DPD, CTL, HR, Athletics, the International Community, and more.
- Development of a Lactation Policy for Campus.
- Development of a leadership institute
- Analysis of institutional data (annual report)
- Collaboration on NSF grant with Utah State
- XO on AAC to provide gender equity lens for Athletics
- Development of OSU Women's Network

Office of
Women's
Advancement
& Gender
Equity

- *Identities: Gender & intersection with other identities*

- Safe & fair community
- Equity aspect of difference
- Data Analysis
- Design/ implement policy/best practice

- Educated & aware community
- Value aspects of Difference
- Welcoming environment
- Effects of policy & practice

- *Identities: Protected status*
- *Plan - Affirmative action plan*
- *Resolve grievances*
- *Federal compliance*

Office of
Affirmative
Action & Equal
Opportunity

Office of
Community &
Diversity

- *Identities: Any difference*
- *Plan - Diversity action plans*
- *Bring people together*

Future Direction

- Continue to provide support for campus community and expand the role of Ombudsperson Services.
- Provide continued primary and secondary research to uncover and address gender related issues.
- Expand collaborations on and off campus