Faculty Senate Meetings

- 2008-2009
- 2009-2010

Beginning April 2011, Faculty Senate meetings will be Webcast when possible to allow greater participation by off-campus senators.

- 2010-2011
- 2011-2012
- 2012-2013
- 2013-2014
2008-2009 Webcast

- June 2, 2009
2009-2010 Webcast

- September 29, 2009
- October 8, 2009
- November 19, 2009
2010-2011 Webcast

- April 14
- May 12 - no webcast available
- June 9
2011 - 2012 Webcast

- October 13
- November 10
- December 8
- January 12
- February 9
- March 8
- April 12
- May 10
- June 14
2012-2013 Webcast

- October 11
- November 8
- December 6
- January 10
- February 14
- March 14
- April 11
- May 9
- June 13
2013-2014 Webcast

- October 10
- November 14
- December 12
- January 9
- February 13
- March 13
- April 10
- May 8
June 2, 2009 Webcast

Special Session Regarding the 2009-2010 budget (the agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2009/06_2.html)
September 29, 2009 Webcast

Special Session and Question & Answer portion (the agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2009/09.html)
October 8, 2009 Webcast

- President Ray's State of the University Address titled 'Setting Our Course'
  - Speech Transcript
- Questions and Answers in response to President Ray's Address
  - Q&A Transcript
- October 8, 2009 Faculty Senate Agenda
November 19, 2009 Webcast

Continuation of the November 12 Faculty Senate meeting - Furlough/Temporary Pay Reduction Motion (the agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2009/11_2.html)
April 14, 2011 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2011/20110414.html

- Webcast
  - Part 1 of 3
  - Part 2 of 3
  - Part 3 of 3

- PowerPoint Presentations
  - Provost Randhawa
  - Budget Update

- Attachments
  - Proposed Revisions to Academic Regulations
  - Promotion & Tenure Revisions
  - Graduate Council Recommendations
  - Budget Update
June 9, 2011 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2011/20110609.html

- Webcast
  - Part 1 of 3
  - Part 2 of 3
  - Part 3 of 3

- PowerPoint Presentations
  - Category I Proposals - Mike Bailey, Curriculum Council Chair
  - Joint Task Force on Shared Governance - Lynda Ciuffetti and Becky Warner, co-chairs

- Attachments
  - Faculty Senate Consideration of Degree Candidates
  - Proposed Standing Rules Revisions:
    - Administrative Appointments Committee
    - Academic Standing Committee
  - Category I Proposals:
    - Create a School of Public Policy with the Departments of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology
    - Professional Science Masters (PSM) in Fisheries and Wildlife Administration
    - Initiation of a New Instructional Program Leading to the MA in Women Studies
    - Reorganize the College of Health & Human Sciences into the College of Public Health and Human Sciences
    - Accelerated Baccalaureate (BA/BS)/Law (JD) Degree Program
    - Rename General Agriculture to Agricultural Sciences
  - Joint Task Force on Shared Governance Final Report
  - June 3 and 4 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting Recap

- Video
  - Student-athlete Community Service Project in Guatemala - Bob DeCarolis, Athletics Director
October 13, 2011 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2011/20111013.html

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 4 – Category 1 Proposals
  - Part 2 of 4 – Special Report – Task Force on Shared Governance
  - Part 3 of 4 – PEBB
  - Part 4 of 4 – OSU President Ed Ray's State of the University Address titled 'Next Steps'
    - MP3 file of President Ray's address

- **PowerPoint Presentations**
  - Category I Proposals
  - Task Force on Shared Governance

- **Links**
  - June 9, 2011 Faculty Senate Minutes
  - Category I Proposals
    - Merger of the Department of Geosciences with the College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences: Creating the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences
    - New Degree Program – Earth Sciences (BS)
    - New Degree Program – PhD in Public Policy
    - New Degree Program – B.A., B.S., B.F.A in Digital Communication Arts
  - Task Force on Shared Governance Final Report
  - Executive Committee Memo of Concern Regarding PEBB Actions
November 10, 2011 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2011/20111110.html

- **Webcast**
  - **Part 1 of 5 – Welcome through Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections** from Leslie Burns, Bylaws and Nominations Committee Chair
  - **Part 2 of 5 – Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report** from Starr McMullen, IFS Senator
  - **Part 3 of 5 – Ecampus Task Force Report** from Dan Arp, Ecampus Task Force Chair
  - **Part 4 of 5 – 2011-2012 Budget Report** from Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President
  - **Part 5 of 5 – Executive Committee Update from Kevin Gable, Executive Committee, through end of meeting**

- **PowerPoint Presentations**
  - Ecampus Task Force
  - 2011-2012 Budget

- **Attachments and Links**
  - Ecampus Task Force Report
  - Ecampus Task Force Recommendations
December 8, 2011 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2011/20111208.html

- Webcast
  - Part 1 of 5 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 5 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A – ELECTION RESULTS
    - AGENDA ITEM B – ACTION ITEMS
      - 1. Executive Committee Election
      - 2. Category I Proposals
  - Part 2 of 5 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 5 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C SPECIAL REPORT – Athletic Budget. Mark Spencer, Senior Associate Athletic Director, Finance & Business Affairs, will clarify aspects of the Athletic budget that were included in the Provost’s November 10 Faculty Senate budget presentation.
  - Part 3 of 5 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 5 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D – FACULTY SENATE MATTERS ARISING
    - AGENDA ITEM E – INFORMATION ITEMS
      - 1. New Senator Orientation
      - 2. 2012 Faculty Senate Meetings. Please reserve the following dates for Faculty Senate meetings for the remainder of the academic year; check your monthly agenda to determine the location. All meetings are scheduled to begin at 3:00 PM: January 12, February 9, March 8, April 12, May 10 and June 7
      - 3. Category I Approval College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences (CEOAS)
  - Part 4 of 5 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 5 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM F – Report from and Dialogue with Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President
  - Part 5 of 5 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 5 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM G – Report from and Dialogue with Faculty Senate President Jack Higginbotham
  - AGENDA ITEM H – NEW BUSINESS

Full meeting, single audio file (no video link)

- PowerPoint Presentations
  - Category I Presentations
  - Athletics Budget Presentation
January 12, 2012 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/20120112.html](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/20120112.html)

**Webcast**
- Part 1 of 5 Webcast
- Part 1 of 5 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM A – Install Elected Officials Installation of President Hunter-Zaworski; President- Elect Kevin Gable; new Executive Committee members: Donna Champeau, Jon Dorbolo, Peg Herring and Janet Nishihara; Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator, Karen Hooker; and newly elected Faculty Senators.
  - AGENDA ITEM B – Approval of Michael Beachley as Faculty Senate Parliamentarian.
- Part 2 of 5 Webcast
- Part 2 of 5 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM C – COMMITTEE REPORTS
    - Promotion and Tenure Revisions
      - Michelle Kutzler, Promotion & Tenure Committee Chair, will present for discussion proposed revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. These revisions will be voted on at the February Faculty Senate meeting.
- Part 3 of 5 Webcast
- Part 3 of 5 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM C – COMMITTEE REPORTS
    - Baccalaureate Core Committee Update
      - Bill Bogley and Kerry Kincanon, Baccalaureate Core Committee co-chairs, will provide an update of the committee’s activities.
- Part 4 of 5 Webcast
- Part 4 of 5 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM D – Special Report
    - Electronic Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Update
      - Gita Ramaswamy, Director, Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation, will provide an update of the electronic SET implementation.
- Part 5 of 5 Webcast
- Part 5 of 5 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM E – INFORMATION ITEMS
    - New Senator Orientation
    - Faculty Senate Handbook
  - AGENDA ITEM F - Report from the dialog with the Provost
  - AGENDA ITEM G - Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President President Kate Hunter-Zaworski
  - AGENDA ITEM H - NEW BUSINESS

Full meeting, single audio file (no video link)

**PowerPoint Presentations**
- E-Student Evaluation of Teaching Presentation
- BCC: Vitalization Agenda Update Presentation
Proposed Revisions to the Procedural Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
February 9, 2012 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/20120209.html](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/20120209.html)

- **Webcast**
    - AGENDA ITEM A:1 – ACTION ITEM – Promotion and Tenure Revisions
      Michelle Kutzler, Promotion & Tenure Committee chair, presents proposed revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. These revisions were initially discussed at the January Faculty Senate meeting.
    - AGENDA ITEM B - COMMITTEE REPORTS
      - Item 1 - Research Council
        Ricardo Letelier, Research Council Chair, provides a report of the committee’s activities.
      - Item 2 - Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee
        Dave Berger, Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee Chair, provides a report of the committee’s activities and current solicitation for award nominees.
    - AGENDA ITEM B - COMMITTEE REPORTS
      - Item 3 - Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force
        Bill Loges, member, provides an update on the progress of the task force.
    - AGENDA ITEM C - INFORMATION ITEMS
      1. Awards Solicitation. The Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee is accepting nominations for the awards listed below; information regarding these awards is online; nominations will be accepted through April 6, 2012. For further information, contact Vickie Nunnemaker.
        - Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award
        - International Service Award
        - D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award
        - OSU Academic Advising Award
        - OSU Alumni Association Distinguished Professor Award
        - OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award
        - OSU Impact Award for Outstanding Scholarship
        - OSU Professional Faculty Excellence Award
        - Outstanding Faculty Research Assistant Award
        - Promising Scholar Award
        - Dar Reese Excellence in Advising Award
        - Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award
        - Student Learning and Success Teamwork Award

2. Diversity and Higher Education Lecture. The President's Commission on the Status of Women (PCOSW) and the Office of Equity and Inclusion have collaborated to bring Daryl Smith, professor at Claremont, to present practical and meaningful approaches to integrating diversity into the fabric of higher education. Her work presents an informed framework for considering diversity in terms of the context of individual institutions. The free lecture will take place February 16th, 7:00 – 8:30 PM in Room 155 of the International Living-Learning Center. Become part of our own yearlong visioning process, and see where it takes your thinking!

3. Category I Approval The campus community should take appropriate action to update their records to reflect approval of the following OSU Category I proposal on February 2, 2012 and will be available fall quarter, 2012.

- Master of Business Administration and Accountancy (MBAA). This graduate degree program at Oregon State University has been designed to create a seamless and integrated program that will allow accounting students to receive an undergraduate degree and a master's degree during their five years of university study required to become a CPA. The MBAA is unique among Oregon Colleges and Universities.

AGENDA ITEM D - REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST
Becky Warner, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs

- Part 5 of 5 Webcast
- Part 5 of 5 MP3 Audio

AGENDA ITEM E - REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT
President Kate Hunter-Zaworski

Full meeting, single audio file (no video link)

Related materials:
- Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Proposed Revisions
- Research Council PowerPoint
- Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Task Force PowerPoint
March 8, 2012 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/20120308.html

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:1 – ACTION ITEM – *Category I Proposal*
      Mike Bailey, Curriculum Council Chair, presents for approval the following Category I proposal: [Undergraduate Certificate in Food in Culture and Social Justice (Category I: New Undergraduate Certificate Program)] – CPS #81331
  - Part 2 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B1 – *University Relations and Marketing*
      Steve Clark, Vice President for University Relations and Marketing, outlines his role and the activities of the units reporting to him.
  - Part 3 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B2 – *Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics Report*
      Andy Ungerer provides a report on the recent COIA annual meeting.
  - Part 4 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B3 – *University Ombuds*
      Sue Theiss, University Ombuds, provides an overview of her position.
  - Part 5 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C – *INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE REPORT*
      Kate Hunter–Zaworski will present a recap of the March IFS meeting
    - AGENDA ITEM D – *INFORMATION ITEMS Awards Solicitation*
  - Part 6 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM E – *REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST*
      Becky Warner, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs
  - Part 7 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 7 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM F – *REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT*
      President Kate Hunter–Zaworski

- **Full meeting, single audio file (no video link)**

Related Materials:
- [Undergraduate Certificate in Food in Culture and Social Justice (Category I: New Undergraduate Certificate Program)] CPS #81331
- [University Relations and Marketing]
- Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics Report
  - COIA Steering Committee Policy Recommendations
  - Knight Commission Report
- University Ombuds
April 12, 2012 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/20120412.html

- Webcast
  - Part 1 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:1 - ACTION ITEM - *Category I Proposal* for a B.A., B.S., in Social Science with Option in Community Development and Leadership (OSU-Cascades)
  - Part 2 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:2 - *Academic Regulations Proposed Revisions*
      - AR 1.a.-c. – Admission for Nondegree Students
      - AR 12 – Withdrawal from Individual Courses
      - AR 17 - Grades
      - AR 25.h. – Institutional Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees
  - Part 3 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:3 - *Standing Rules Proposed Revisions*
  - Part 4 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B - *Special Report*
      - Review of Selected OSU Intercollegiate Athletics Compensation Practices
  - Part 5 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C - *Committee Report*
      - ESET Pilot Project
  - Part 6 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D - *Discussion Item*
      - Faculty Ranks
  - Part 7 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 7 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM F - *Report from and Dialog with the Provost*
      - Sabah Randhawa, Provost & Executive Vice President
  - Part 8 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 8 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM E - *Information Items*
    - AGENDA ITEM G - *Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President*
      - Kate Hunter-Zaworski, Faculty Senate President
    - AGENDA ITEM H - *New Business*
May 10, 2012 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/0510/.

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:1 – ACTION ITEM – *Category I Proposals*
  - Part 2 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:2 – *Proposed Revisions to the Graduate Options Regulations*
    - AGENDA ITEM A:3 – *Proposed New Faculty Ranks*
  - Part 3 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B – *Proposed Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*
  - Part 4 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C:1 – *Commencement Report*
      Chris Bell, Chief Marshal
  - Part 5 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C:2 – *Report from Athletics and the Faculty Athletics Representative*
      Bob DeCarolis, Athletic Director, and Joey Spatafora, Faculty Athletics Representative
  - Part 6 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM E – *Report from and Dialog with the Provost*
      Sabah Randhawa, Provost & Executive Vice President
  - Part 7 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 7 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D – *Information Items*
    - AGENDA ITEM F – *Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President*
      Kate Hunter-Zaworski, Faculty Senate President
    - AGENDA ITEM G – *New Business*

- **Full meeting, single audio file (no video link)**

Related Materials:
- **Category I Proposals**
  - PowerPoint
    - Merging Animal Sciences with Rangeland Ecology and Management #81305
      - Online version
      - PDF version
  - Graduate Certificate in Public Health #82511
Online version
  - PDF version
- College of Education Reorganization and Department of Science and Mathematics Education Merger #82222
  - Online version
  - PDF version
- Innovation Management, BS/BA, Double Degree (New Degree) #82725
  - Online version
  - PDF version
- Graphic Design BFA (New Degree) #82870
  - Online version
  - PDF version
- Establishment of a New Department/School Proposal – School of Design and Human Environment #83339
  - Online version
  - PDF version

- Proposed Revisions to the Graduate Options Regulations
  - PowerPoint
  - Graduate Options Regulations Proposed Revisions
  - Letter of support from the Graduate School Dean

- Proposed New Faculty Ranks
  - PowerPoint
  - Proposed changes to OAR 580-020-0005 – December 2, 2011
  - Report on revisions to the OAR for Faculty Ranks – February 2, 2012
  - Motions on Faculty Ranks for consideration by the Faculty Senate on May 10, 2012

- Proposed Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
  - Conflict of Interest
  - Research

- Commencement Report
June 14, 2012 Webcast

Please access the June 14 Faculty Senate webcast at http://live.oregonstate.edu/.

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 9 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 9 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:1 – ACTION ITEM
      - Category I Proposals
        - Renaming an Academic Program Proposal – Energy Systems Engineering #83990
        - New Degree Program Proposal – Environmental Engineering #82814
        - Termination of an Academic Program Proposal – Construction Engineering Management – MBE #83272
        - Merge Academic Units Proposal – Merge No Department with No Department (CLA Omnibus) #83297
  - Part 2 of 9 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 9 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:2
      - Standing Rules Revisions
        - Bill Loges, Committee on Committees Chair, will present for approval proposed Standing Rules revisions for the Promotion & Tenure Committee.
  - Part 3 of 9 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 9 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:3
      - Proposed Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
        - Henri Jansen, Promotion and Tenure Committee member, will present for approval proposed revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. These revisions were discussed at the May 10 Faculty Senate meeting.
  - Part 4 of 9 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 9 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A:4
      - Consideration of Degree Candidates
        - Kent Kuo, Registrar, will present the recommended lists of degree candidates for Senior Honors, Baccalaureate Degree Candidates, and Advanced Degrees. The Faculty Senate is asked to approve these candidates on behalf of the Faculty of the University. These candidates have been certified by the appropriate academic units, committees, and councils. Attached is the Registrar’s Memorandum outlining the policies and procedures for the review and approval of degree candidates.
  - Part 5 of 9 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 9 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B – Commencement
  - Part 6 of 9 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 9 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C – Executive Committee Report
AGENDA ITEM D – COMMITTEE REPORT

Student Evaluation of Teaching Faculty Forum Recap
Kate Hunter-Zaworski will provide a brief recap of the May 31 Student Evaluation of Teaching Faculty Forum. The forum webcast and related materials are online at http://oregonstate.edu/senate/webcast/set/.

AGENDA ITEM G – New Business

Full meeting, single audio file (no video link)

Related Materials:

Category I Proposals

Renaming an Academic Program Proposal – Energy Systems Engineering #83990
  - Online version
  - PDF version

New Degree Program Proposal – Environmental Engineering #82814
  - Online version
  - PDF version

Termination of an Academic Program Proposal – Construction Engineering Management – MBE #83272
  - Online version
  - PDF version

Merge Academic Units Proposal – Merge No Department with No Department (CLA Omnibus) #83297
  - Online version
  - PDF version

Standing Rules Revisions

Proposed Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Consideration of Degree Candidates
October 11, 2012 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/1011/

- Webcast
  - Part 1 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A - Welcome from the Faculty Senate President

  - Part 2 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B - Action Items
      - Category I Proposals
        - Mike Bailey, Curriculum Council Chair, will present for approval the below Category I proposals:
          - Renaming an Academic Program Proposal from Fisheries & Wildlife to Fisheries and Wildlife Sciences – BS, CRED, HBS – CPS #84735
          - New Certificate Program Proposal College and University Teaching – CPS #83870
        - Proposed Revisions to the Perspectives Category
          - Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi, Baccalaureate Core Committee Co-chairs, will present for approval proposed revisions to the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives Category.

  - Part 3 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C - Discussion Items
      - Proposed Revisions to the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines
        - Henri Jansen, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, will present for approval proposed revisions to the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines. These revisions will be discussed at the October Faculty Senate meeting and, potentially, will be voted on at the November 7 Faculty Senate meeting
      - eSET Framework
        - Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director for Assessment, will discuss three eSET topics: (1) minimum class size for evaluation; (2) report structure for combined/slash courses; and (3) a pilot test for eSET closing timing. A vote is anticipated during the November 8 Faculty Senate meeting on the first two issues.

  - Part 4 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D Part 1 - State of the University Address by President Edward J. Ray

  - Part 5 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D Part 2 - OSU President Edward J. Ray discusses the State of the University in a question-and-answer session.

  - Part 6 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM E - Information Items
MANDATORY Open Enrollment for 2013 PEBB Health Insurance
SB242 Health & Welfare and Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) Employee Information Sessions
NWCCU Site Visit
Open Access
Faculty Senate Calendar
Religious Accommodation of Students Policy
Faculty Senate Elections – Faculty with Split Appointments
Restrictions on Political Activity
Faculty on 1039-Hour Appointments
Faculty Senate Webcast
Category I Approvals

AGENDA ITEM F - New Business

FULL MEETING
- Video
- MP3 Audio

Related Materials:
- Links
  - Category I Proposals:
    - Renaming an Academic Program Proposal from Fisheries & Wildlife to Fisheries and Wildlife Sciences - BS, CRED, HBS – CPS #84735
      - Online version
      - PDF version
    - New Certificate Program Proposal College and University Teaching – CPS #83870
      - Online version
      - PDF version
  - Proposed Revisions to the Perspectives Category
    - PowerPoint
    - Proposed Revisions
  - Proposed Revisions to the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines
    - Proposed Revisions
    - Post-Tenure Review Guidelines
  - eSET Framework
    - eSET: Combined Versus Uncombined Reports
    - Pilot Test for eSET Closing Timing
  - State of the University Speech ‘Seeing the Landscape’
November 8, 2012 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/1108/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/1108/)

- **Webcast**
  - [Part 1 of 5 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 1 of 5 MP3 Audio](#)
    - AGENDA ITEM A1
      - Approval of the 2012 Apportionment Table
        The 2012 Faculty Senate Apportionment Table (consisting of OSU FTE in the ranks of Instructor and above, including Professional Faculty and Faculty Research Assistants and Associates) will be presented for approval.
    - AGENDA ITEM A2
      - Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections
        Jack Higginbotham, Bylaws and Nominations Committee chair, will present for approval the 2012 Slate of Candidates for: Senate President-Elect, three new members of the Executive Committee (EC), and one Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Senator. The President-Elect serves for one year, and then automatically assumes the presidency of the Faculty Senate; EC members serve two-year terms; and IFS is three-year terms. Nominations will be taken from the floor; however, the nominator must obtain, in advance, the nominee's willingness to serve if elected.
    - AGENDA ITEM A3
      - Category I Proposal
        Mike Bailey, Curriculum Council Chair, will present for approval the below Category I proposal:
        - Rename Air Force Studies to Department of Aerospace Studies (AFROTC) CPS #83185
    - AGENDA ITEM A4
      - Proposed Revisions to the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines
        Henri Jansen, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, will present for approval proposed revisions to the Post Tenure Review Guidelines. The proposed revisions were discussed at the October Faculty Senate meeting.
  - [Part 2 of 5 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 2 of 5 MP3 Audio](#)
    - AGENDA ITEM A5
      - eSET Framework
        Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director for Assessment, will present for approval two eSET topics: (1) minimum class size for evaluation, and (2) report structure for combined/slash courses. These proposals were discussed at the October Faculty Senate meeting.
  - [Part 3 of 5 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 3 of 5 MP3 Audio](#)
    - AGENDA ITEM B1
      - Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) Review Committee Update
        Larry Curtis, ORP Review Committee member, will present an update of the work of the ORP Review Committee.
AGENDA ITEM B2
Youth Program Safety Policies and Criminal History Checks
Kyle Cole, Precollege Programs, will explain the new youth program safety policies and the changes to the criminal history check policy.

AGENDA ITEM C - Information Items
- President-Elect, Executive Committee and IFS Elections
- Instructions for Nomination and Election of Faculty Senators
- Faculty Senate Retirements and 1039-Hour Appointments

AGENDA ITEM D - Report from and Dialog with the Provost and 2012-2013 Budget Report

AGENDA ITEM E - Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President

AGENDA ITEM F - New Business

FULL MEETING
- Video
- MP3 Audio

Related Materials:
- Links
  - Slate of Candidates
  - Category I Proposal – Rename Air Force Studies to Department of Aerospace Studies (AFROTC) CPS #83185
    - PowerPoint
    - Online version
    - PDF version
  - Post-Tenure Review Proposed Revisions
  - eSET Framework
    - Report structure for combined/slash courses
  - Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) Review Committee Update
  - Youth Program Safety Policies and Criminal History Checks
  - 2012-2013 Budget
December 6, 2012 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/1206/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2012/1206/)

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A
      - **Election Results**
        President Kate Hunter-Zaworski will announce the results of the President-Elect, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and Executive Committee elections.
    - AGENDA ITEM C
      - **Executive Committee Run-off Election**
        If necessary, a run-off ballot will be distributed during the meeting to determine a tie for Executive Committee. See attached biographical sketches for the Executive Committee candidates. Voting will take place during the meeting by Senators, proxies, and ex-officio members only. Continuing Executive Committee members and their apportionment units are: Donna Champeau, Public Health & Human Sciences; Peg Herring, Agricultural Sciences; and Janet Nishihara, Associated Faculty.
  - Part 2 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B – **Report from the OUS Chancellor**
  - Part 3 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D1
      - **Background Check Policy**
        Becca Gose, Associate General Counsel, will present an update on the revised background check policy for OSU employees and volunteers.
  - Part 4 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D2
      - **Time and Attendance Reporting**
        Aaron Howell, Assistant Vice President and Controller, and David Blake, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, will outline the new Time and Attendance Reporting process.
  - Part 5 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D3
      - **City of Corvallis-OSU Collaboration Project Update**
        Steve Clark, Vice President for University Relations and Marketing, will present an update of the City of Corvallis-OSU Collaboration Project activities.
  - Part 6 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM E
Executive Committee Report
Jon Dorbolo, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Member, will report on recent Executive Committee activities.

- Part 7 of 8 Webcast
- Part 7 of 8 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM F
    - Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report
      Bob Mason, Senior OSU IFS Senator and IFS President, will report on the November Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting.

- Part 8 of 8 Webcast
- Part 8 of 8 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEMS G – Information Items
    - New Senator Orientation
    - 2013 Faculty Senate Meetings
    - Faculty Senate Retirements and 1039-Hour Appointments
  - AGENDA ITEMS H – Report from and Dialog with the Provost
  - AGENDA ITEMS I – Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President
  - AGENDA ITEMS J – New Business

• FULL MEETING
  - Video
  - MP3 Audio

Related Materials:
- Links
  - John Maul
  - Time and Attendance Reporting
  - City of Corvallis-OSU Collaboration Project Update
  - Executive Committee Report
January 10, 2013 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0110/

- **Webcast**
  - [Part 1 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - **AGENDA ITEM A**
      - *Install Elected Officials*
        - Installation of President Kevin Gable; President-Elect Dan Edge; new Executive Committee members: Mike Bailey, Donna Chastain, Andy Karplus; Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator, Mary Cluskey; and newly elected Faculty Senators.
    - **AGENDA ITEM B**
      - *Approval of Parliamentarian*
        - Approval of Michael Beachley as Faculty Senate Parliamentarian.
  - [Part 2 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - **AGENDA ITEM C-1**
      - *Smoke-Free Implementation Update*
        - Lisa Hoogesteger, Healthy Campus Initiatives Director, will provide an OSU Smoke-Free Implementation update.
    - **AGENDA ITEM C-2**
      - *Morrill Land-Grant Act*
        - Peg Herring, Executive Committee member, will explain the Morrill Act which allowed for the creation of land-grant colleges.
  - [Part 3 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - **AGENDA ITEM C-3**
      - *Legislative Issues*
        - Bob Mason, Senior Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, and Jock Mills, Director of Government Relations, will outline legislative issues that may affect OSU.
  - [Part 4 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - **AGENDA ITEM D – Committee Report**
      - *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*
        - The current definitions of "assigned duties" and "scholarship and creative activities" in the promotion and tenure guidelines create ambiguities that affect decisions on promotion and tenure. Before proposing changes in the guidelines, Henri Jansen, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, will present a possible solution; feedback is requested through the Faculty Senate comments box.
  - [Part 5 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 5 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
AGENDA ITEM E – Information Items
- New Senator Orientation
- 2012 Faculty Senate Meetings
- Faculty Senate Handbook

- Part 7 of 7 Webcast
- Part 7 of 7 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM G – Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President
  - AGENDA ITEM H – New Business

FULL MEETING
- Video
- MP3 Audio

Related Materials:
- Links
  - Smoke-Free Implementation Update
  - Morrill Land-Grant Act
  - Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
  - Assigned Work
February 14, 2013 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0214/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0214/)

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A-1
      - *Category I Proposals*
        - Renaming an Academic Program from Women Studies Program to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies #84962
    - AGENDA ITEM A-2
      - *Graduate Council Recommendations*
        - Graduate Admissions GPA Requirements
        - International Student English Language Requirements
  - Part 2 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B-1
      - *Proposed Civility Policy*
        - Richard Fields, Office of Equity and Inclusion, will present information related to a proposed civility policy.
  - Part 3 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B-2
      - *Mandatory Reporting of Child Abuse Training*
        - Dave Blake, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, will outline training opportunities related to the mandatory reporting of child abuse by OSU employees.
  - Part 4 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C-1
      - *SafeAssign*
        - Stefanie Buck, Computing Resources Committee Chair, and Lynn Greenough, Technology Across the Curriculum, will present information related to implementation of the Blackboard plagiarism prevention tool, SafeAssign. Please review the below materials in preparation of the presentation.
        - Plagiarism Mitigation Taskforce Update
        - Academic Integrity FAQs
        - Academic Integrity Rollout Timeline
  - Part 5 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C-2
      - *Open Access Policy*
        - Marit Bovbjerg and Rich Carter, Library Committee members, will present information related to a proposed Open Access policy and respond to inquiries from Senators.
Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report
Bob Mason, OSU Interinstitutional Faculty Senate senior Senator and IFS President, will briefly recap the January IFS meeting which was held in Corvallis.

- Part 6 of 6 Webcast
- Part 6 of 6 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM E – Information Item
  - Category I Approval
  - AGENDA ITEM F – Report from and Dialog with the Provost
  - AGENDA ITEM G – Report from and Dialog with the Faculty President
  - AGENDA ITEM H – New Business

FULL MEETING
- Video
- MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

- Links
  - Category I Proposal – Renaming an Academic Program from Women Studies Program to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies #84962
    - Online version
    - PDF version
    - PowerPoint
  - Graduate Council Recommendations
    - Graduate Admissions GPA Requirements
    - International Student English Requirements
    - PowerPoint
  - Proposed Civility Policy
    - OSU's Current Discrimination Policy
    - Proposed OSU Civility Policy Language 11/29/2012
    - PowerPoint
  - Mandatory Reporting of Child Abuse Training
    - PowerPoint
  - SafeAssign
    - Plagiarism Mitigation Taskforce Update
    - Academic Integrity FAQs
    - Academic Intergirty Rollout Timeline
    - PowerPoint
  - Open Access Policy
    - PowerPoint
March 14, 2013 Webcast, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0314/

- Webcast
  - Part 1 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A-1
      - Category I Proposals
        - New MOU Proposal – BS in Computer Science with an Applied Option #85405
        - New Degree Program Proposal – PhD in Business Administration #85547
  - Part 2 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B-1
      - Faculty Ranks
        - Henri Jansen, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, and Tony Wilcox, Faculty Status Committee Chair, will discuss position descriptions in conjunction with the Professor of Practice rank and advancement to Senior Instructor II. It is anticipated that these two issues will be presented as Action Items during the April Faculty Senate meeting. Senators are expected to discuss these proposals with their constituents.
  - Part 3 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B-2
      - Executive Committee Report
        - Peg Herring, Executive Committee member, will briefly describe recent issues considered or acted upon by the Executive Committee.
  - Part 4 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C-1
      - Equity, Inclusion and Diversity at Oregon State University – Defining the Path Forward
        - Angelo Gomez and Susan Capalbo, will present the results of the university's self-study on equity and inclusion and the external review, and will discuss how to implement the findings thereof.
  - Part 5 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C-2
      - Federal Sequestration
        - Rick Spinrad, Vice President for Research, will outline issues related to the federal sequestration which became effective on March 1.
  - Part 6 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D – Report from and Dialog with the Provost
March 14, 2013 Webcast, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

- Part 7 of 7 Webcast
- Part 7 of 7 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM E – Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President
  - AGENDA ITEM F – New Business

- FULL MEETING
  - Video
  - MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

- Category I Proposal
  - PowerPoint
  - New MOU Proposal – BS in Computer Science with an Applied Option #85405
    - Online version
    - PDF version
  - New Degree Program Proposal – PhD in Business Administration #85547
    - Online version
    - PDF version

- Faculty Ranks
  - Guidelines for Professor of Practice Appointments and Promotion
  - Proposed Criteria for Promotion of Senior Instructors and FRAs to Senior II
  - Revised Faculty Ranks to include Clinical & Professor of Practice; Senior II levels
  - Powerpoint

- Executive Committee Report
- Equity, Inclusion and Diversity at Oregon State University – Defining the Path Forward
  - University’s self-study on equity and inclusion and the external review
  - Powerpoint

- Federal Sequestration

- Report from and Dialog with the Provost
  - Salary Compression 2013
April 11, 2013 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0411/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0411/)

### Webcast
- **Part 1 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEMS A-1 – *MOU Proposals*
    - MFA in Creative Writing #83436
    - Accountancy Major #85404
- **Part 2 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEM A-2
    - *Academic Regulations Revisions*
      Joanne Sorte, Academic Regulations Committee Chair, will present for approval proposed revisions to AR 25 and AR12, and a proposal to award Veteran and Military Service Recognition Cords.
- **Part 3 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEM A-3
    - *Faculty Ranks*
      Henri Jansen, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, and Tony Wilcox, Faculty Status Committee Co-Chair, will present for approval guidelines for the Professor of Practice faculty rank and criteria for advancement to the Senior II promotion level for Instructors and Faculty Research Assistants. These issues were discussed during the March Faculty Senate meeting and are now being presented for a vote. Senators were previously requested to discuss these proposals with their constituents.
- **Part 4 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEM A-4
    - *New Template Reporting Form for Program Assessment*
      Stefani Dawn (Assistant Director of Assessment) and Bill Bogley (Director of Academic Programs, Assessment, & Accreditation) will present and explain a proposed template to guide and assist units in reporting assessment of learning outcomes. Both the Curriculum Council and Faculty Senate Executive Committee support this proposed template.
- **Part 5 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 5 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEMS B-1
    - *eSET Close Timing*
      Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Assessment, will report on the Electronic Student Evaluation of Teaching Close Timing Study Results.
NCAA Certification Outcomes and Athletics Strategic Plan
Bob DeCarolis (Athletic Director) and Marianne Vydra (Senior Associate Athletic Director) will summarize outcomes of the 2010 NCAA certification and how that is informing development of a strategic plan for the Department of Athletics.

- Part 7 of 7 Webcast
- Part 7 of 7 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM B-3
    - Brown Bag Sessions Dan Edge, Faculty Senate President-Elect, will report on upcoming Brown Bag sessions.
  - AGENDA ITEM C – Proposed Guidelines for Faculty and Professional Staff Regarding Student Bereavement
  - AGENDA ITEM D – Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report
  - AGENDA ITEM E – Information Items
    - Awards Solicitation
    - Faculty Session with President Ray
    - Senate Webcast
    - MOU Approval
  - AGENDA ITEM F – Reporting from and Dialog with the Provost
  - AGENDA ITEM G – Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President
  - AGENDA ITEM H – New Business

FULL MEETING
- Video
- MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

- Action Items
  - MOU Proposals
    - MFA in Creative Writing #83436
      - Online version
      - PDF version
    - Accountancy Major #85404
      - Online version
      - PDF version
  - Academic Regulations Revisions
    - AR12
    - AR25
    - Veteran and Military Service Recognition Cords
  - Faculty Ranks
    - Guidelines for Professor of Practice Appointments and Promotion
    - Proposed Criteria for Promotion of Senior Instructors and FRAs to Senior II
    - Revised Faculty Ranks to include Clinical & Professor of Practice; Senior II levels
    - Criteria for Promotion of Clinical, Practice, Research, Fixed Term Extension and Courtesy Faculty
      - Powerpoint
  - New Template Reporting Form for Program Assessment
    - Powerpoint

- Special Reports
  - Summary of the eSET close timing study results
    - Powerpoint
NCAA Certification Outcomes and Athletics Strategic Plan

- Powerpoint

- Committee Report
  - Proposed Guidelines for Faculty and Professional Staff Regarding Student Bereavement

- Information Items
  - Awards Solicitation online
  - Faculty Session with President Ray registration
  - March Faculty Senate Webcast online
May 9, 2013 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0509/

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEMS A-1 – *Category I Proposals*
      - Rename an Academic Program Proposal – BS in Forest Management to BS in Forestry #85162
      - Renaming an Academic Unit – Applied Economics #82674
  - Part 2 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A-2
      - **Electronic Student Evaluation of Teaching (eSET)**
        Kevin Gable will present for approval an eSET motion from the Executive Committee.
  - Part 3 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B-1
      - **Proposed Guidelines for Faculty and Professional Staff Regarding Student Bereavement**
        Carey Hilbert, Academic Advising Council Chair, will present information related to proposed bereavement guidelines.
  - Part 4 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B-2
      - **Graduate Council Issues**
        Sunil Khanna, Associate Provost for International Programs, Bob Gilmour, INTO OSU Director of Academic Programs, and Sabah Randhawa, Provost, will provide informational data related to INTO OSU.
  - Part 5 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEMS C-1
      - **First-Year Experience Initiative**
        Susie Brubaker-Cole and Mark Hoffman, First Year Experience Initiative Co-chairs, will present information and gather feedback.
  - Part 6 of 8 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 8 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C-2
      - **INTO OSU**
        Sunil Khanna, Associate Provost for International Programs, Bob Gilmour, INTO OSU Director of Academic Programs, and Sabah Randhawa, Provost, will provide informational data related to INTO OSU.
AGENDA ITEM C-4

State Level Governance Issues
OSU President Ed Ray will lead a discussion related to governance issues, including the potential of creating an institutional board.

AGENDA ITEM C-3 – Strategic Plan 3.0
AGENDA ITEM D – Information Items
OSU Open Access Policy
Committee Interest Form – due May 13 at Noon
PEBB Board Chair to visit OSU Campus – May 14
Small Group Sessions with President Ray
Baccalaureate Core Category Review Workshop – May 24
Executive Committee Brown-bag Session – Professional Faculty Issues – May 31
Senate Bill 270 – Establishes Process for Establishing OUS Institutional Boards
MOU/Category I Approvals
AGENDA ITEM E – Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President
AGENDA ITEM F – New Business

FULL MEETING
Video
MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

Action Items
Category I Proposals
Powerpoint
Rename an Academic Program Proposal – BS in Forest Management to BS in Forestry #85162
Online version
PDF version
Renaming an Academic Unit – Applied Economics #82674
Online version
PDF version

Committee Reports
Proposed Guidelines for Faculty and Professional Staff Regarding Student Bereavement
Graduate Council Issues
Graduate Program Review Guidelines
Graduate Level Assessment Process

Special Reports
First-Year Experience Initiative
Final Report of the First-Year Experience Task Force
FYE
INTO OSU
Informational data
Powerpoint

Information Items
OSU Open Access Policy
Committee Interest Form due – May 13 at Noon
Solicitation Letter
May 9, 2013 Webcast, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

- Online Form
  - Small Group Sessions with President Ray
  - Register
- Senate Bill 270 – Establishes Process for Establishing OUS Institutional Boards
  - SB270
  - Letter to Rep. Michael Dembrow from President Kevin Gable
  - Register-Guard background article
The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0613/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/0613/)

- **Webcast**
  - [Part 1 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - AGENDA ITEMS A-1
      - **Consideration of Degree Candidates**
        Rebecca Mathern, Registrar, will present the recommended lists of degree candidates for Senior Honors, Baccalaureate Degree Candidates, and Advanced Degrees. The Faculty Senate is asked to approve these candidates on behalf of the Faculty of the University. These candidates have been certified by the appropriate academic units, committees, and councils. Attached is the Registrar's Memorandum outlining the policies and procedures for the review and approval of degree candidates.
  - [Part 2 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - AGENDA ITEM A-2
      - **Open Access Policy**
        Marit Bovbjerg and Rich Carter, Library Committee members, will present for approval a proposed Open Access Policy. This proposed policy was first discussed with the Faculty Senate in February, and the Library Committee has been gathering feedback during the interim.
  - [Part 3 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - AGENDA ITEM A-3 and A4.1
      - **Proposed Standing Rules Revisions**
        David Craig, Committee on Committees Chair, will present for approval proposed Standing Rules revisions for the Baccalaureate Core Committee.
      - **Category I Proposals**
        MS, PhD in Comparative Health Sciences #84096
  - [Part 4 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - AGENDA ITEM A-4.2
      - **Category I Proposals**
        Merge Academic Units Proposal Merge a Department/School with another Department/School (School of Life Sciences) #84452
  - [Part 5 of 7 Webcast](#)
  - [Part 5 of 7 MP3 Audio](#)
    - AGENDA ITEMS B
      - **Tiered Parking**
        Steve Clark, Vice President for University Relations and Marketing, and Brian Thorsness, Executive Director of Campus Operations, will discuss strategies and next steps in implementing a tiered-pricing parking plan and improved transit shuttle services for the Corvallis campus.
      - **Governance Issues**
Kevin Gable, Faculty Senate President, will present a brief governance report.

- **Part 6 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 6 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEM C
    - **Reserve Credits**
      - Jim Coakley, Graduate Council Chair, will report on approved revisions related to Reserve Credits.
    - **Executive Committee Report**
      - Janet Nishihara will report on issues considered by the Executive Committee during spring term.
    - **Diversity Council Survey**
      - Dwaine Plaza and Evviva Weinraub, Diversity Council members, will briefly explain the purpose and intended outcomes related to a diversity issues survey that will be distributed in Fall 2013.

- **Part 7 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 7 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEM D through G
  - INFORMATION ITEMS
    - Annual Reports
    - Vacancies
    - Faculty Senate Calendar
    - eProcurement Initiative Survey
    - MOOC Faculty Forum
    - Professional Faculty Issues Brown-bag Session
    - Extending Programs to OSU-Cascades
  - REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST
  - REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT
  - NEW BUSINESS

- FULL MEETING
  - Video
  - MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

- Action Items
  - Consideration of Degree Candidates
    - Registrar's Memorandum

- **Open Access Policy**
  - Powerpoint

- Proposed Standing Rules Revision - Baccalaureate Core Committee

- Category I Proposals
  - Powerpoint
  - MS, PhD in Comparative Health Sciences #84096
    - Online version
    - PDF version

  - Merge Academic Units Proposal Merge a Department/School with another Department/School (School of Life Sciences) #84452
    - Online version
    - PDF version

- Committee Reports
- Reserve Credits
  - Background and revisions
  - PowerPoint
- Diversity Council Survey
  - PowerPoint

- Information Items
  - eProcurement Initiative Survey
    - Online Survey
    - Feedback Form
  - MOOC Faculty Forum
    - Webcast and Materials Presented During the Forum
  - Extending Programs to OSU-Cascades
    - Bachelor of Science (BS) in Accountancy – CPS #85404
    - Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Creative Writing – CPS #83436
Faculty Senate

October 10, 2013 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/1010/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/1010/)

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A
      - In Memoria
  - Part 2 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B
      - State of the University Address
        Oregon State University President Edward J. Ray will present his State of the University Address titled "Choosing to Change."
  - Part 3 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C
      - Category I Proposal
        Merge Academic Units Proposal Merge a Department/School with another Department/School (School of Life Sciences) #84452
  - Part 4 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D-1
      - Update on the Google Apps Project
        Lois Brooks, Information Services Vice Provost, and Lucas Turpin, Associate Director of Technology Support Services, will outline the Google Apps implementation for OSU
  - Part 5 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D-2
      - Open Enrollment and PERS/ORP Legislation Updates
        Donna Chastain, Associate Director, Center for HR Innovation, Strategy & Planning, will provide information related to Open Enrollment and recent PERS/ORP legislation. If you are unable to attend the Senate meeting, additional information related to Open Enrollment appears below in section E.1.
  - Part 6 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM E to Adjournment
      - Open Enrollment and 2014 HEM Health Assessment: Two-Step Process
      - Football Game Parking – November 1, OSU vs. USC
      - Faculty Senate Calendar
      - Vacancies
      - Faculty Senate Elections – Faculty with Split Appointments
      - Faculty Senate Elections – Opportunity to Decline Senator Nomination
Faculty on 1039-Hour Appointments  
Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics  
Faculty Senate Webcast

- FULL MEETING
  - Video
  - MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

- Action Item
  - In Memoriam
  - Category I Proposal – School of Life Sciences
    - Recap of Proposal and Actions
    - Input regarding the proposed School of Life Sciences
    - Departmental Name Change Justification

- Special Reports
  - Update on the Google Apps Project Link
    - Google Apps Handout
    - Powerpoint presentation
  - Open Enrollment and PERS/ORP Legislation Updates
November 14, 2013 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/1114/

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A1
      - **Approval of the 2014 Apportionment Table**
        The 2014 Faculty Senate Apportionment Table (consisting of OSU FTE in the ranks of Instructor and above, including Professional Faculty and Faculty Research Assistants and Associates) will be distributed separately and presented for approval during the meeting.
    - AGENDA ITEM A2
      - **Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections**
        Kate Hunter-Zaworski, Bylaws and Nominations Committee chair, will present for approval the 2013 Slate of Candidates for: Senate President-Elect, three new members of the Executive Committee (EC), and one Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Senator. The President-Elect serves for one year, and then automatically assumes the presidency of the Faculty Senate; EC members serve two-year terms; and IFS is three-year terms. Nominations will be taken from the floor; however, the nominator must obtain, in advance, the nominee's willingness to serve if elected.
  - Part 2 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A3
      - **Curricular Proposals**
        Richard Nafshun, Curriculum Council member, will present for approval the below curricular proposals:
        - Masters in Counseling [Rename an Existing Master of Science (MS) in Counseling Program to Master of Counseling (MCoun)] #86455
        - BS in Natural Resources; Urban Forest Landscape Option (to be Extended to Distant Locations Online by OSU’s Extended Campus)
        - BS in Sustainability [Existing Undergraduate Double Degree Program Proposed to be Offered Online by Extended Campus]
  - Part 3 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B1
      - **Writing Report**
        Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi, former Baccalaureate Core Committee co-chairs, will report on the results of a Writing Report.
  - Part 4 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B2
      - **Post-Doctoral Policies**
        Barbara Bond will inform the Senate regarding proposed policies concerning salary structure and professional development for post-doctoral scholars.
AGENDA ITEM C
OSU Divest

Cora Borradaile, Richard Clinton, Mike O’Malley, and Ken Winograd are presenting a draft resolution to request that the OSU Foundation divest from companies investing in fossil fuel exploration and development.

AGENDA ITEM E – Report From and Dialog With The Provost

AGENDA ITEM F to Adjournment – Report From and Dialog With The Faculty Senate President

FULL MEETING

Video
MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

Action Items

Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections
- Motion on Senate Elections
- Slate of Candidates

Curricular Proposals
- Masters in Counseling [Rename an Existing Master of Science (MS) in Counseling Program to Master of Counseling (MCoun)] #86455
  - Online version
  - PDF version
  - Powerpoint
- BS in Natural Resources; Urban Forest Landscape Option (to be Extended to Distant Locations Online by OSU’s Extended Campus)
- Course Offerings – Urban Forest Landscapes Option – Natural Resources Program
- Request to offer the option via Ecampus
- Memo referring the proposal to the Curriculum Council
- BS in Sustainability [Existing Undergraduate Double Degree Program Proposed to be Offered Online by Extended Campus]
- Ecampus Sustainability Double Degree Program Proposal
- Memo referring the proposal to the Curriculum Council
- Memo of support from OSU-Cascades

Special Reports

Writing Report
- Executive Summary
- Recommendations
- Final Report from the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core – AY 2011-2012
- Powerpoint

Post-Doctoral Policies
- Proposed Policies
- PowerPoint

Discussion Item
OSU Divest

- Resolution Calling Upon OSU Foundation to Divest Fossil Fuel Companies from its Investment Portfolio
December 12, 2013 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/1212/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/1212/)

- Webcast
  - Part 1 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B2
      - Curricular Proposals
        - New Graduate Certificate Program Proposal – Graduate Certificate in Wildlife Management #86051
        - Renaming an Academic Program Proposal – Pharmaceutical Sciences – MS, PhD. #87166
  - Part 2 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A
      - Election Results
        - President Kevin Gable will announce the results of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and Executive Committee elections.
    - AGENDA ITEM B1
      - President-Elect Nominations and Elections
        - Kate Hunter-Zaworski, Bylaws and Nominations Committee chair, will present for approval the 2013 Senate President-Elect slate. The President-Elect serves for one year, and then automatically assumes the presidency of the Faculty Senate. Nominations will be taken from the floor; however, the nominator must obtain, in advance, the nominee’s willingness to serve if elected.
  - Part 3 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM B3
      - OSU Divest
        - Ken Winograd will present for approval a [resolution](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/1212/) to request that the OSU Foundation divest from companies investing in fossil fuel exploration and development. Please note that the red text in the resolution indicates revisions from the version presented to the Faculty Senate in November.
  - Part 4 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C1
      - Smoke Free OSU Survey Data
        - Lisa Hoogesteger, Healthy Campus Initiatives Director, Marc Braverman, and Jessica Johnson will present survey data and report on Year One of Smoke Free OSU.
  - Part 5 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C3
      - OSU Budget
        - Sherm Bloomer, Director of Budget and Fiscal Planning, and Sabah Randhawa, Provost, will summarize and explain the [Fiscal Year 2014 budget](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2013/1212/), and how it will be...
used to support strategic initiatives.

- **Part 6 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 6 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEM E
    - *Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report*
      Bob Mason, Senior OSU IFS Senator and IFS President, will report on the November Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting.

- **Part 7 of 7 Webcast**
- **Part 7 of 7 MP3 Audio**
  - AGENDA ITEM F to Adjournment
    - New Senator Orientation
    - 2014 Faculty Senate Meetings
    - Faculty Senate Retirements and 1039-Hour Appointments
    - Faculty Senate Webcast
    - Report From And Dialog With The Provost
    - Report From And Dialog With The Faculty Senate President
    - New Business

- **FULL MEETING**
  - Video
  - MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

- **Action Items**
  - Curricular Proposals
    - New Graduate Certificate Program Proposal – Graduate Certificate in Wildlife Management #86051
      - Online Version
      - PDF Version
    - Renaming an Academic Program Proposal – Pharmaceutical Sciences – MS, PhD. #87166
      - Online Version
      - PDF Version
  - OSU Divest
    - Resolution

- **Special Reports**
  - Smoke-free OSU Survey Data
    - Smokefree OSU: A Snapshot of the First Year of the Policy
    - Smokefree OSU (Powerpoint projected during the meeting)
  - Strategic Plan 3.0
  - OSU Budget
January 9, 2014 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0109/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0109/)

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - Outgoing President's Remarks
  - Part 2 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM A
      - *Install Elected Officials*
        Installation of President Dan Edge new Executive Committee members: Chris Bell, Alix Gitelman, and Bernadine Strik; Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senator, Jay Noller; and newly elected Faculty Senators.
    - AGENDA ITEM B
      - *Approval of Parliamentarian*
        Approval of Michael Beachley as Faculty Senate Parliamentarian.
  - Part 3 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM E
      - *Faculty Senate Function*
        Kevin Gable, Faculty Senate President-Elect, will lead a discussion on how to improve engagement with issues in front of the Senate
  - Part 4 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C
      - *Unit Restructuring and Professional Faculty Job Category and Compensation Program Update*
        David Blake, Assistant Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer, will outline recent restructuring within the division of Human Resources, as well as provide an update of the Professional Faculty Job Category and Compensation Program
  - Part 5 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D
      - *Executive Committee Report*
        Dan Edge, Faculty Senate President, will report on fall term Executive Committee activities.
  - Part 6 of 7 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 7 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM G
      - Report From And Dialog With The Provost
  - Part 7 of 7 Webcast
Part 7 of 7 MP3 Audio

- AGENDA ITEM H to Adjournment
  - Report From And Dialog With The Faculty Senate President
  - New Business

FULL MEETING
- Video
- MP3 Audio

Related Materials:

- Special Reports
  - Unit Restructuring and Professional Faculty Job Category and Compensation Program Update
    - Professional Faculty – Job Structure and Compensation Program Design
    - OSU Office of Human Resources Organizational Chart – November 2013
February 13, 2014 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0213/

- **Webcast**
  - **Part 1 of 8 Webcast**
  - **Part 1 of 8 MP3 Audio**
    - AGENDA ITEM A
      - *Installations*
        - Installation of President-Elect Mike Bailey.
        - Installation of Executive Committee member Nell Winokur O’Malley.
    - AGENDA ITEM B
      - *Action Item*
        - Curricular Proposal
  - **Part 2 of 8 Webcast**
  - **Part 2 of 8 MP3 Audio**
    - AGENDA ITEM C
      - *Veterans Day*
        - Dan Edge, Faculty Senate President, will discuss a proposal to close the university on Veterans Day, and ask for feedback from Senators and a Sense of the Senate vote.
  - **Part 3 of 8 Webcast**
  - **Part 3 of 8 MP3 Audio**
    - AGENDA ITEM D
      - Report and Dialog with the Provost
  - **Part 4 of 8 Webcast**
  - **Part 4 of 8 MP3 Audio**
    - AGENDA ITEM E-1
      - *Report on Progress Toward University Goals for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity*
        - Angelo Gomez, Executive Director of Equity and Inclusion, and Susana Rivera-Mills, Executive Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Professor of Spanish Linguistics and Diversity Advancement, will outline efforts to advance the institution toward realization of the objectives of the self-study and an overview of the Leadership Council.
  - **Part 5 of 8 Webcast**
  - **Part 5 of 8 MP3 Audio**
    - AGENDA ITEM E-2
      - *Finance & Administration Unit Restructuring*
        - Glenn Ford, Vice President of Finance and Administration, will outline recent restructuring within the division of Finance and Administration.
  - **Part 6 of 8 Webcast**
  - **Part 6 of 8 MP3 Audio**
    - AGENDA ITEM E-3
ASOSU Voter Registration
Matt Perez, ASOSU Director of Government Relations and Ben Katz, will address the importance of voter registration and why ASOSU needs the support of faculty.

- Part 7 of 8 Webcast
- Part 7 of 8 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM F
    - Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report
- Part 8 of 8 Webcast
- Part 8 of 8 MP3 Audio
  - AGENDA ITEM G to Adjournment
    - Faculty Sessions with President Ray
    - Faculty Senate Webcast
    - Forum on Learning Management System
    - Curricular Proposal Approvals

- FULL MEETING
  - Video
  - MP3 Audio

Related Materials:
- Action Item
  - Curricular Proposal - New MOU Proposal – Post Bacc Certificate in Accounting – Extend to OSU-Cascades
    - Online version
    - PDF version
    - Powerpoint projected during the meeting
- Discussion Item – Veterans Day
  - Oregon Senate Bill 1
  - Veterans Day Discussion (PowerPoint projected during the meeting)
- Special Reports
  - Progress Toward University Goals for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity (PowerPoint projected during the meeting)
    - Background materials:
      - Self-study process and reports
      - March 13, 2013 presentation to Faculty Senate
      - Leadership Council for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
      - Comprehensive Accessibility Plan for the Built Environment
      - Climate Survey
      - 2014-15 Provost Initiative Hiring Program
- Finance & Administration Unit Restructuring
  - Division of Finance & Administration Reorganization (PowerPoint projected during the meeting)
  - Division of Finance & Administration Organizational Chart
AGENDA ITEM A
Mike Bailey, Curriculum Council co-chair, will present for approval the below Category I proposals:
- New Degree Program Proposal – PhD, MS, MEng in Robotics
- New Certificate Program Proposal – Graduate Certificate in Urban Forestry

AGENDA ITEM B
Non-Tenure Track Faculty Survey Results

AGENDA ITEM C-1
Strategic Plan 3.0 Update
Susan Capalbo, Strategic Plan 3.0 Steering Committee Chair, will report on updates to the Strategic Plan 3.0.

AGENDA ITEM C-2
Learning Management System Evaluation
Lynn Greenough, Technology Across the Curriculum, will outline the evaluation process for the new Learning Management System.

AGENDA ITEM C-3
Implementation of Parking Restructuring
Steve Clark (Vice President, URM & Co-Chair, Transportation Solutions Task Force), Kavinda Arthenayake (Director, University Conference Services, Transportation Solutions, Printing & Mailing & Co-Chair, Transportation Solutions Task Force), and Meredith Williams (Associate Director, Transportation Solutions) will present information related to the implementation of parking restructuring.

AGENDA ITEM D-F and Adjournment
Report From and Dialog with the Provost
Report From and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President
New Business
• **FULL MEETING**
  - Video
  - MP3 Audio

Related Materials:
• Action Items
  - New Degree Program Proposal – PhD, MS, MEng in Robotics
    - Online version
    - PDF version
  - New Certificate Program Proposal – Graduate Certificate in Urban Forestry
    - Online version
    - PDF version
  - [PowerPoint](#) projected during the meeting

• Committee Report
  - Non-Tenure Track Faculty Survey Results – [PowerPoint](#) projected during the meeting

• Special Reports
  - Strategic Plan 3.0 Update
    - [Message from the Provost](#)
    - [Strategic Plan – Phase III](#)
  - [PowerPoint](#) projected during the meeting
  - Implementation of Parking Restructuring – [PowerPoint](#) projected during the meeting
April 10, 2014 Webcast

The agenda is linked from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0410](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0410)

- **Webcast**
  - Part 1 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 1 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEMS A and B
      - Resolution of Sympathy
      - First-Year Experience Initiative
        - Susie Brubaker-Cole (Associate Provost for Academic Success and Engagement) and Mark Hoffman (Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, PHHS) will outline the [First-Year Experience Initiative](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0410), including: advantages of early student engagement, the initiative timeline, enhancements, curriculum, and future directions.
  - Part 2 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 2 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM C
      - Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)
        - Bruce Dugger, OSU’s COIA representative, will report on the COIA annual meeting.
  - Part 3 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 3 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D-1
      - Bylaws Proposed Revisions
        - Kate Hunter-Zaworski, Bylaws and Nominations Committee Chair, will present for discussion [proposed Bylaws revisions](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0410). It is anticipated that these revisions will be voted on May 8.
  - Part 4 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 4 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D-2
      - Executive Committee Report
        - Andy Karplus, Executive Committee member, will report on Executive Committee activities.
  - Part 5 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 5 of 6 MP3 Audio
    - AGENDA ITEM D-3
      - Promotion and Tenure Proposed Revisions
        - Henri Jansen, Promotion & Tenure Committee chair, will present [proposed revisions](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0410) to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. These revisions will be presented and discussed in April, and likely will be voted on in May.
  - Part 6 of 6 Webcast
  - Part 6 of 6 MP3 Audio
AGENDA ITEM E through Adjournment

- Faculty Sessions with President Ray
- Message and Straw Poll to all OSU Faculty Regarding Potential Veterans Day Closure and Starting Fall Term Early
- Follow the Faculty Senate on Twitter - #OSUFacsen
- Learning Management System Blog and Sandbox Sites
- Senate Webcast
- Report from and Dialog with the Provost
- Report from and Dialog with the Faculty Senate President
- New Business

- FULL MEETING
  - Video
  - MP3 Audio

Related Materials:
- Resolution of Sympathy
- Discussion Item
  - First Year Experience
    - Winter Quarter Progress Report
    - Fall Quarter Progress Report
    - PowerPoint
- Special Report
  - Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)
    - Report on the COIA 2014 Annual Meeting
    - Report to the Membership
      - PowerPoint
- Committee Reports
  - Bylaws Proposed Revisions
  - Promotion and Tenure Proposed Revisions
    - PowerPoint
May 8, 2014 Webcast

The agenda is linked from http://oregonstate.edu/senate/agen/2014/0508

Related Materials:
- Action Items
  - Graduate Council Proposed Revisions
    - Graduate Student Teaching Policy
    - Powerpoint
  - Proposed Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
  - Proposed Bylaws Revisions
    - Proposed Bylaws Revisions (initially discussed April 10, 2014)
    - New Proposed Revisions (initially discussed May 8, 2014)
- Special Reports
  - Open Access Textbook Initiative Pilot
    - The Affordable College Textbook Act
    - Oregon State University Open Textbook Request for Proposal
    - Open Textbook Workshop for OSU Faculty
    - Powerpoint
  - Cooperative Open Reporting Environment (CORE)
- Information Items
  - Faculty Sessions with President Ray Registration
  - Open Access Textbook Initiative Pilot Workshop Application
  - April Faculty Senate Webcast
Report of the Special (UBC/BFP) Task Force on Presentation by Bunsis

W. Loveland
Provost’s Charge and Task Force Actions

• Determine major points of Bunsis presentation related to OSU.
• Using resources of OSU Budget Office, determine which points are true, and which points, if any, are possibly misleading or even false.
• Task Force met twice, once to examine main points and data provided by Budget Office and to make additional data requests and then to draft final report.
Task Force Report

• Detailed report has been furnished to you. I am happy to go over any aspect.
• “Hot Button” Items

• OSU Faculty Salaries Are LOW (compared to peer institutions). Salary compression is a serious problem. Comparison with UO not encouraging. Provost says

“Faculty salaries remain a top priority for us and we would like to have a strong salary increase package for the 2011-13 biennium. The outcome depends on the results of the legislative process. Salary equity, including compression, remains an important element of the salary package. To ensure that we also include merit increases in the salary package, salary compression can realistically only be addressed incrementally over time.”
Faculty Furloughs

• In hindsight, faculty furloughs were unnecessary.
• Based upon uncertain fiscal climate and desire for solidarity with classified staff.
Athletics

- OSU is 4th in the PAC-10 in expenditures/UG FTE.
- ~4M$ from President’s Office is funneled to Athletics and ~3.6M$ comes back in scholarships.
- Lack of transparency in Athletics budgets; should be in “Orange Book” along with SWPS.
- Task Force asked Provost to inquire about gender inequity in salaries of assistant coaches.
Accounting “Tricks” and “Facts”

• OSU has large reserves and is in good shape financially
• It is misleading to mix Research and Auxiliaries into overall budgets.

QUESTIONS?
Proposed Revisions to the:
PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Proposed Revisions:

With respect to professional relationships, if anyone involved in the P&T evaluation process has a professional relationship with a candidate under consideration, he or she must declare the nature of the professional relationship before any discussion takes place. In addition, the specific nature of the relationship should be noted in any written evaluation. If, after consultation, the unit P&T committee chair or the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs feels determines that the process would be compromised by the participation of any that individual, that faculty member must recuse him or herself from any discussion or voting on that particular case.

In some cases, the candidate’s supervisor will participate in the preliminary discussions of the unit P&T committee in order to provide information on process prior to deliberations. However, the supervisor may participate only if invited by the unit committee and must not be present for the deliberations. Supervisors who have a past or current personal or professional relationship with the candidate that might compromise the evaluation process (example: former advisee undergoing evaluation) must either recuse themselves from the process and find a substitute, or state the nature of the relationship at the beginning of the evaluation letter. In no case will they participate in the voting as a member of the committee. This includes cases such as department unit heads serving on College level P&T committees. In such cases, department unit heads must recuse themselves from the discussion and voting on any case related to their own department unit.

College Review Policy approved by President Ray on September 11, 2009.
College Review and Recommendation

Proposed Revision:

The college faculty committee review letter shall provide: (i) an independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate as presented in the dossier, (ii) an opinion as to whether the departmental-level letters of evaluation fairly and uniformly assess the merits of the candidate’s performance as documented in the dossier, and (iii) an assessment of the consistency of standards applied to all candidates in the college. In addition, the committee should check that each dossier has been properly prepared.
Executive Summary

At the time the article by Cashin (1999) was be prepared, the ERIC database indicated 2,175 articles on Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET). Two general themes, or camps, rose from these articles. The first camp argues that SET forms (or Student Assessment of Teaching (SAT) forms) can provide reliable information regarding the effectiveness of teaching IF the items posed are valid and reliable. Literature in the second camp repeatedly demonstrates, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, that SET responses can be swayed by more than just the effectiveness of teaching. However, in many of these second camp articles, the forms used to assess teaching performance may have lacked the necessary proof of validity or reliability. In fact, those in the first camp, by their caveat clearly recognize that poorly developed tools lead to poorly correlated results. Obviously, there are many implications to using assessment/evaluation tools of indeterminate validity and/or reliability. The concerns are exacerbated if, as reported extensively in the literature to be the situation at many institutions of higher learning, that teaching performance is either weighed solely, or very heavily, on responses to these flawed tools. If comparisons are made to college averages, this could lead to perverse incentives and/or discourage innovation in teaching. Neither are ideal for student learning.

So, has Oregon State University’s SET been demonstrated to be valid and reliable? If not, should it be tested? If tested and deemed invalid, should a new SET form be developed? These were primary concerns of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that commissioned the Student Evaluation of Evaluation Task Force. However, before thaw questions could be properly answered, the Task Force identified a few other issues to be considered.

The first issue, based on a general agreement in the literature, is that evaluation of teaching should be a final step of a problem conducted by a supervisor and based upon multiple forms of input. Therefore, student input (as with peer input) should be based upon an assessment of teaching, not an evaluation of teaching. What is the difference? In broad terms, an assessment consists of responding to an item with answers such as strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree. Evaluation asks for ratings such as excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, fair, poor. The problem with evaluations is a difference in value construct among the different parties (student, faculty and administrators) as well as different value constructs within a party (i.e. between different students in the same class).

The second issue is the timeframe that the current evaluations are conducted. Because the current SET forms are administered at the end of the term, students are asked to provide input that will have little or nothing bearing on them. By design, OSU’s current SET
forms provide summative information, not formative information. Formative information is gained at least once during the term so that faculty can make timely changes to their courses, when the students still can benefit from such changes.

The third issue stems from the wide variety in disciplines (e.g. engineering, language, women studies, etc.) and in the types of classes/courses (e.g. lecture, laboratory, seminars, online) offered at OSU. How, given the diversity of the programs, faculty and students, could a single form with a fixed set of items be an ideal tool to aid faculty in improving their teaching?

Members of the task force, with a membership composed of administrators, faculty, instructors, and students, met essentially weekly for over two years to develop a tool to improve student learning by providing faculty with input necessary to improve their teaching. Although membership has changed over the two-year period, there has been continued consensus of the Task Force to develop a tool based on assessment rather than evaluation, formative rather than summative, and flexible rather than constrained. Starting with an idea of what measures of teaching and learning the committee felt that faculty and students deemed appropriate, a bank of items were identified from a catalog of proven student rating items provided in Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System, by Raoul A. Arreola (2007). Because all items were presented in a summative fashion, many items were reworded to make them formative in nature. Each item, located under one of five major categories, was then subcategorized. To allow flexibility in what is to be measured, the faculty member identifies the items under the various categories to pose. As the formative assessment is to be conducted online, a textbox will be made available to the student to provide context to their rating of a particular item. It is the ultimate goal of this proposed tool to provide each faculty member with a menu of items from which they pick to gain the feedback most valuable for them to improve the course they are currently teaching.

The proposal of the SET Task Force is to implement a flexible, formative student assessment of teaching tool (SAT) in place of the current summative student evaluation of teaching form (SET), with the idea that a more comprehensive, diverse, summative evaluation of teaching be implemented as part of the annual review process. As part of the annual review process faculty would be expected to discuss the frequency and type of formative assessments conducted in each class as well as what actions were taken to improve their teaching. As a final note of critical importance, because formative assessments identify deficiencies in classroom instruction, responses should be solely under the control of faculty. However, to prove that assessments were in fact conducted, it is recommended by the SET Task Force that administrators have access to a list of the items used in each assessment and the timeline/frequency that the assessment were conducted.
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1. Charge for SET Task Force

Charge: Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force

Background/Context: For a majority of OSU faculty members who have teaching responsibilities, annual performance evaluations, promotion and tenure decisions, and post-tenure reviews are based, in part, on an evaluation of their teaching. As required by OAR 580-021-0135, “appropriate student input” shall be included in the evaluation process. The current student evaluation of teaching (SET) form is one means of input. The SET form provides a measurement (numeric data) from which supervisors and P&T committees make an evaluation or judgment about teaching effectiveness. Since the currently employed SET forms were enacted, additional research has been conducted on the purpose, validity, and reliability of these types of assessment tools. Therefore, to assure that OSU’s process and approved forms for student input on teaching are the most current and most effective, a review of our current form and processes is in order.

Task Force Charge:

• Identify the university values in teaching expectations.
• Compare and contrast the advantages and disadvantages of the student assessments of teaching (SAT) and student evaluations of teaching (SET) as a means of acquiring student input.
• If SET forms are deemed most appropriate, assess, using informed psychometrics, the validity and reliability of the current SET form and recommend changes as needed.
• If SAT forms are deemed most appropriate, consider new forms and provide recommendations.
• Assess the role of student input forms on teaching effectiveness and make recommendations for consistent use of the form in teaching evaluations across academic units.

Items to be considered:

• Identify any correlation between the current SET scores with expected and received grades or with other inherent biases.
• Survey students to determine their perceived use and value of the SET form.
• Identify factors to be considered in using student input scores, such as number of years of teaching experience, size of class, type of class, level of class, etc.
• Involve a consultant experienced in faculty assessments early in the process
• Identify possible coordination or links between the SET or SAT and the Learning Outcomes Assessment process of the academic units.

Committee composition and Timeline: The task force will consist of the Director of Academic Planning and Assessment, one member selected by the Provost, and four committee members selected by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee from volunteers of the teaching faculty. The committee’s findings will be presented at the December 2009 Faculty Senate meeting. The committee’s recommendations will provide guidance for (1) potentially updating or replacing the existing student input forms and (2) developing guidelines for use of the student input forms in annual performance and post-tenure review of faculty and in the tenure and promotion process.
2. Presentation to Faculty Senate

Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force

Final Report and Proposal

Presented to OSU Faculty Senate

February 9, 2012

Why Conduct SET?

- Improve both teaching and learning
- Provide students a voice in assessment of instruction/faculty
- Meet state OAR 580-021-0135 (3) requirements, which do not specify the current format:

  "Specific provision shall be made for appropriate student input into the data accumulated as the basis for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, and for post-tenure review. Sources of such input shall include, but need not be limited to, solicitation of student comments, student evaluations of instructors and opportunities for participation by students in personnel committee deliberations."

SET Role in Faculty Review

Charge for SET Task Force

- Evaluate current SET system
- Recommend changes aimed at the improvement of teaching

Additional Items to be Considered

- Survey students
- Identify inherent biases
- Identify mitigating factors (years of teaching experience, size of class, type of class, level of class, etc.)
- Identify links between SET ratings and Learning Outcomes Assessment

Problems with Current SET Form

- Summative feedback comes too late
- Require value constructs (excellent, etc.), which tend to vary between students
- Global/overall ratings (#1 and #2) ignore complexity of teaching
- May be influenced by situational factors
  - Inherent bias (diversity and legal implications)
  - Reduces correlation with learning
- Inconsistent use in faculty evaluation
  - Discourages innovation
  - Creates perverse incentives
Task Force’s Goals for Assessment Tool
- Focus on improving teaching
- Focus on elements that affect student learning
- Employ a formative approach
- Allow for evaluation of diverse teaching methods and philosophies
- Provide a flexible system that faculty can adapt to their course

An Assessment Tool Should . . .
- Permit feedback during the term, when it’s helpful to the class
- Allow instructors to choose items
- Limit access to the data to discourage misleading and invidious comparisons
- Address factors that affect learning (e.g., course design, classroom environment, materials)

What the Task Force Learned
- From students:
  - Expect confidentiality
  - Like the idea of formative feedback
  - Don’t know why student evaluations of teaching are conducted or how information is used
- From administrators:
  - Express a need for summative information

What the Task Force Learned
- From faculty:
  - Worry about inconsistent use of scores in current system
  - Have concerns about variability in value constructs
  - Doubt the validity of a single instrument for such a wide range of class types
  - Appreciate customization of proposed feedback

Proposed Formative Categories
- Instructional design
  - Objectives
  - Exams and assignments
  - Materials and resources
- Engaging learning
  - Learning activities
  - Classroom environment
  - Extended engagement
- Instructional assessment
  - Fairness
  - Helpfulness
  - Opportunity to demonstrate knowledge

Proposed Formative Categories
- Self-reported course impact on the student
  - Motivation
  - Cognitive expansion
  - Skill development
- Alternative and supplemental teaching/learning environment
  - Laboratory and discussion
  - Clinical
  - Seminars
  - Team teaching
  - Field trips
  - Studio
Options for Current Items #1 & #2

- Summative in nature
- Would not be mandated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Item</th>
<th>Available Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The course as a whole was... (poor, fair, ... excellent)</td>
<td>I would recommend this course. (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor’s contribution to the course was...</td>
<td>I would recommend this teacher to a fellow student.**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Formative item is under >Self-reported impact on the student>Motivation>item #1
** Formative item is under >Self-reported impact on the student>Motivation>item #14

Proposal
- Change to a formative assessment tool
- Create a fully customizable instrument
- Rename “Student Assessment of Teaching” (SAT)
- Deploy online
- Allow teachers control of items used, timing/frequency, and access to data
- Report which items were used and when to administrators, but not results
- Include discussion of how faculty respond to SAT data to improve teaching in Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF) process

The SET Task Force Membership

- Members (2009-present)
  - Henri Jansen (Science)
  - William Loges (Liberal Arts)
  - Deborah Pence, Chair (Engineering)
  - Juan Trujillo (Liberal Arts)
  - Beth Valentine (Veterinary Medicine)
  - Kenneth Winograd (Education)
  - Christopher Wolsko (Cascades Campus)

- Members (2010-present)
  - LJ Duey, Undergraduate student (University Exploratory Studies)
  - Mario E. Magaña (Engineering)
  - Glia N. Ramaswamy (Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation)
  - Marc Schure, Graduate student (Public Health)

- Members (2009-2010 and 2010-2011)
  - Joshua Kealy, Undergraduate student (Business)
  - Susie Leslie (Academic Planning and Assessment)
  - Travis Hargreaves, Graduate student (Liberal Arts)
  - Peter Saunders (Center for Teaching and Learning)
  - Nancy Staton Barbour, Graduate student (Women Studies)

Acknowledgements
- Faculty Senate Presidents and Executive Committees (2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012)
- Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee (2010-2011)
- CollegeNET
- Vickie Nunnemaker (Faculty Senate)
- Catherine Williams (Enterprise Computing Services)
- Angelo Gomez & Anne Gillies (Office of Equity and Inclusion)
- Sue Helback (College of Education)
- Faculty, staff and students for their input
3. Proposed Formative Assessment Items

Below is an outline of the categories (A, B, C) and subcategories of items (i, ii, iii) to help faculty/teachers identify items useful for gaining student feedback. Following the outline of categories is a categorized list of items proposed for use by faculty/teachers.

Rather than relying on responses from students with different value constructs (excellent, very good, etc.), students will respond to the proposed items with one of four assessments: Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree. Because the tool is, by design, flexible and formative the need for a neutral or not applicable assessment should no longer apply.

It is envisioned by the Task Force that students will be able activate, from a dropdown menu, a text box to provide comments regarding their assessment of a particular item. Such an option was assured by a team from CollegeNET, the service provider for the current online SET forms.

It is proposed that faculty would conduct at least one assessment per course per term. Based on conversations with a team from CollegeNET, once a set of items has been selected for a particular course, it could be saved for use in future courses and/or terms.

A. Instructional Design
   i. Learning Objectives
   ii. Assignments and Exams
   iii. Resources and Materials

B. Engaging Learning
   i. Learning Activities
   ii. Classroom Environment
   iii. Extended Engagement

C. Instructional Assessment
   i. Fairness
   ii. Helpfulness
   iii. Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge

D. Self-reported Course Impact on the Student
   i. Motivation
   ii. Cognitive Expansion
   iii. Skill Development

E. Alternative and Supplementary Teaching/Learning Environment
   i. Laboratory and Recitation
   ii. Clinical and Professional Training
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A. Instructional Design

Learning Objectives
1. The teacher makes me aware of the current problems in this field.
2. The course adapts according to student needs.
3. I have been informed of the direction the course is taking.
4. The teacher does NOT provide a sufficient variety of topics.
5. Too much material is covered in this course.
6. The teacher does NOT combine theory and practical applications.
7. Relationships between course concepts are made clear.
8. Course concepts are communicated in a logical manner.
9. Course objectives are clear.
10. The teacher defined realistic objectives for the student.
11. Objectives have been stated for each unit in the course.
12. The objectives of this course should be modified.
13. The teacher’s expectations have NOT been clearly defined.

Assignments and Exams
1. The ________ [assignment] should be modified.
2. The assignments are too challenging.
3. The assignments expose me to diverse approaches to solving problems.
4. The assignments provide an opportunity to show what I have learned.
5. The exams provide an opportunity to show what I have learned.
6. The assignments are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
7. The exams are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
8. There are too many assignments.
9. There are too many exams.
10. There is too much material covered on exams.
11. The exams occur at appropriate intervals.
12. I have enough time to complete assignments.
13. I have enough time to complete exams.
14. I learn from doing the assignments.
15. Directions for the assignments are clear.

Resources and Materials
1. I have the academic preparation to understand the course material.
2. The course materials are understandable.
3. The course materials expose me to diverse approaches to solving problems.
4. The course content is up-to-date.
5. The course materials are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
6. I am able to keep up with the amount of course material.
7. I find the assigned readings too difficult.
8. The course resources made available help me meet the aims and objectives of the course.
9. The course materials are easy to understand.
10. The course materials stimulate critical thinking.
11. The ________________ [course materials] provide useful background for the lectures.
12. The course would be improved by adding a laboratory/recitation section.
B. Engaging Learning

Learning Activities
1. The teacher clarifies complex sections of the material.
2. The ____________ [assignment/activity] stimulated my thinking.
3. The teacher’s teaching methods are effective.
4. The teacher emphasizes fundamental concepts in the course material.
5. The ____________ [teaching method] is effective.
6. The audio/visual aids (charts, movies, slides, etc.) used are effective in helping me learn.
7. The teacher is attempting to cover too much material.
8. The teacher emphasizes the importance of understanding course concepts.
9. The teacher stresses important points in discussion.
10. Teacher presentations are well organized.

Classroom Environment
1. The teacher motivates me to do my best work.
2. The teacher stimulates class engagement.
3. The teacher is concerned with whether or not I learn the material.
4. The teacher gives clear explanations of concepts.
5. The teacher’s answers to students’ questions are helpful.
6. The teacher seems genuinely interested in what he/she is teaching.
7. The teacher provides examples that relate to my experiences.
8. The teacher treats students fairly regardless of their background or identity.
9. The teacher treats students fairly regardless of their academic background.
10. The teacher provides me with a safe environment in which to speak.
11. This course accommodates the needs of students with disabilities.
12. The teacher treats students with respect.
13. The teacher invites student viewpoints.
14. The teacher is knowledgeable about the subject.
15. The teacher is fair to students.
16. The teacher is well prepared for each class.
17. The teacher did NOT welcome impromptu class discussions.
18. Students have an opportunity to ask questions.
19. The teacher is enthusiastic about the course material.
20. The teacher does NOT pay attention to the students while lecturing.
21. The teacher does NOT write legibly on the blackboard, papers, etc.
22. I was unable to understand the teacher.
23. The teacher is audible.
24. The teacher fails to address the relevance of ____________ [assignment/activity] to people like me.

Extended Engagement
1. The ____________ [assignment/activity] stimulated my thinking outside of the classroom.
2. The teacher encourages independent thought.
3. The teacher demonstrates how the course is related to real life situations.
4. The teacher stimulates intellectual curiosity.
5. My experiences in the classroom pique my interest in the subject.
C. Instructional Assessment

**Fairness**
1. The teacher clearly explained the grading system.
2. The procedure for grading is fair.
3. Laboratory work is given appropriate weight in calculation of my final grade.
4. The teacher’s evaluation of my performance is fair.
5. My grades accurately reflect my performance in the course.
6. Exams are appropriate for the amount of time allotted to complete them.

**Helpfulness**
1. Results of the exams allow me to assess my understanding.
2. Results of the assessment activities allow me to assess my understanding. The teacher’s evaluation of my performance is helpful.
3. Assessment activities clearly address course learning outcomes.
4. Exams clearly address course learning outcomes.
5. The most recent exam was worded clearly.
6. The most recent assessment activity was worded clearly.
7. The teacher provides helpful critiques of my written work.
8. The teacher returns assignments quickly enough to benefit me.
9. The teacher does NOT provide sufficient opportunities for self-evaluation.
10. The teacher offers specific suggestions for improving my work.
11. The teacher informs me of my progress.
12. Course objectives are reflected in the assignments and exams.

**Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge**
1. Success on the exams requires conceptual understanding of the material.
2. Success on the assessment activities requires conceptual understanding of the material.
3. Exams require understanding rather than memorization.
4. Assessment activities require understanding rather than memorization.
5. Exams allow me to demonstrate my ability to reason.
6. Assessment activities allow me to demonstrate my ability to reason.
7. Exams reward original thought.
8. Assessment activities reward original thought.
9. The course activities provide me an opportunity to demonstrate what I have learned.
10. I liked the combination of different types of questions on the most recent exam.
D. Self-Reported Course Impact on Student

Motivation
1. I would recommend this course.
2. I discussed course related topics outside of class.
3. I participate in class discussions.
4. I am performing to my potential.
5. I will seek extra help from the teacher if I need it.
6. This course makes me look forward to taking additional courses in this field.
7. I hesitate to ask questions in this course.
8. I am more motivated to take responsibility for addressing problems within this field.
9. I am motivated to read more on the subject.
10. I am becoming more interested in the subject matter of this course.
11. I am developing skills needed by professionals in this field.
12. I am having trouble remaining attentive in this class.
13. I enjoy coming to class.
14. I would recommend this teacher to a fellow student.

Cognitive Expansion
1. This course challenges me intellectually.
2. The course helps me to become a more critical thinker.
3. I am learning how to identify central issues in this field.
4. I exercised analytical thinking on ________ [assignment/activity].
5. The course is helping me to think more creatively.
6. I am developing a better understanding of multiple perspectives on the ideas in this course.
7. I am developing a greater awareness of problems within society.
8. I am able to apply the concepts in this course to other situations.
9. I am developing an understanding of concepts in this field.
10. Attending this class is important to my understanding of the material.
11. For this course, I use my available study time effectively.

Skill Development
1. I am developing the ability to solve problems in this field.
2. I have become more competent in __________ [learning outcome].
3. I am improving my ability to communicate clearly about the subject.
4. I now feel able to communicate course material to others.
5. The course gives me skills that will be directly applicable to my career.
6. I am developing an ability to evaluate new work in this field.
F. Alternative and Supplementary Teaching/Learning

**Laboratory and Recitation**
1. The laboratory has adequate facilities.
2. The laboratory/recitation teacher adequately prepares me for the material covered.
3. The laboratory increases my laboratory skills.
4. The laboratory/recitation section is a valuable part of this course.
5. The laboratory/recitation teacher is available during the entire laboratory/recitation period.
6. The laboratory/recitation teacher helps me apply theory to solve problems.
7. The laboratory/recitation teacher uses the lab/discussion time effectively.
8. The laboratory/recitation teacher is prepared.
9. The laboratory/recitation teacher clearly explains the experiments and assignments.
10. The laboratory/recitation quizzes cover material appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
11. The laboratory equipment was ready for me to use.
12. The laboratory equipment is reliable.
13. The laboratory/recitation section is well integrated with the course.
14. My laboratory/recitation work is given appropriate weight in the formulation of final grades.
15. There is ample opportunity to ask questions in the laboratory/discussion section.
16. The laboratory/recitation section clarifies lecture material.
17. The laboratory section covers more activities than can be completed.
18. The laboratory teacher relates lecture material to practical situations.
19. The laboratory objectives relate the material to practical situations.
20. The laboratory/recitation teacher deals fairly with students.
21. The laboratory/recitation teacher evaluates my work quickly enough to benefit me.
22. The laboratory experiments are effective in helping me learn the material.

**Clinical and Professional Training**
1. The clinical setting is a valuable part of this course.
2. The instructor helps me develop good clinical techniques.
3. The instructor provides useful feedback regarding my techniques of physical examination.
4. My university supervisor provides useful feedback regarding my teaching.
5. The university supervisor is NOT helpful when I have questions about my teaching.
6. The university supervisor has adequate background knowledge.
7. The instructor provides useful feedback regarding my clinical interactions.
8. The instructor is NOT helpful when I have questions concerning patient care.
9. The instructor is NOT helpful when I have questions concerning client care.
10. The instructor's questions in clinical discussions are thought provoking.
11. The instructor provides useful feedback regarding my interviewing skills.

**Seminars**
1. The seminar is an environment that allows me to learn from other students.
2. The seminar leader facilitates inquiry.
3. The seminar leader invites everyone’s views in the discussion.
4. The seminar enhances my critical thinking.
5. The seminar enhances my communication skills.
6. I think about the course concepts outside of seminar.
7. I do NOT adequately prepare for this class.
Team Teaching (serial as well as collegial team environments)

1. Instruction is well coordinated among the team members.
2. Team teaching in this course helps me meet the course’s objectives.
3. Team teaching in this course is effective for me.
4. Team teaching in this course results in too much repetition.
5. Team teaching in this course results in too much contradictory information.
6. The team of teachers respects one another.
7. Team teaching in this course provides me with different perspectives into course material.
8. The team members demonstrate how to discuss academic differences respectfully.

Field Trips

1. The field trips were well planned.
2. The field trips fit in with the course objectives.
3. The field trips offer insights beyond what the lectures and/or readings provide.
4. The course would benefit from the inclusion of a field trip.
5. The field trips provide useful learning experiences.
6. The timing of the field trips was good.
7. The field trips were worth their cost.

Studio

1. The studio has adequate facilities.
2. Working in the studio increases my skills.
3. Work in the studio is a valuable part of this course.
4. The instructor clearly explains studio assignments.
5. The studio equipment is ready for me to use.
6. The studio equipment is reliable.
7. The work I do in the studio is given appropriate weight in the formulation of final grades.
8. There is ample opportunity to ask questions in the studio.
9. There is not enough time to do all the studio work this course requires.
10. The studio instructor deals fairly with students.
11. The studio instructor evaluates my work quickly enough to benefit me.
12. The studio assignments are effective in helping me learn the course material.
13. My responsibility for maintaining the studio and its equipment is clearly explained.
14. The hours the studio is available are sufficient for me to complete my assignments.
4. Proposal to Faculty Senate

In lieu of the current Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) form, a new Student Assessment of Teaching (SAT) tool is proposed.

The advantages of the SAT over the SET are:

i. **Formative:** feedback is solicited during the term when it is most helpful to both students and faculty

ii. **Flexible:** no longer one size fits all, items can be tailored to the wide range of courses and pedagogies offered at OSU

iii. **Learning focused:** items are designed to gauge what is and what is not working for the students

The following is proposed for use of SAT in Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF) process:

i. **Teachers:** formative assessments identify deficiencies in the classroom; therefore teachers must have sole access to, and control of, SAT results

ii. **Administrators:** a list of items and the frequency of SAT assessments will be sent to administrators to ensure faculty participation

iii. **Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF):** a discussion of how faculty respond to SAT data in an effort to improve teaching must be part of the PROF process
5. SET Task Force Membership

- Members (2009 – present)
  - Henri Jansen (Science)
  - William Loges (Liberal Arts)
  - Deborah Pence, Chair (Engineering)
  - Juan Trujillo (Liberal Arts)
  - Beth Valentine (Veterinary Medicine)
  - Kenneth Winograd (Education)
  - Christopher Wolsko (Cascades Campus)
- Members (2010 – present)
  - LJ Duey, Undergraduate student (University Exploratory Studies)
  - Mario E. Magaña (Engineering)
  - Gita Ramaswamy (Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation)
  - Marc Schure, Graduate student (Public Health)
- Members (2010 – 2011)
  - Nancy Staton Barbour, Graduate student (Women Studies)
- Members (2009 – 2010)
  - Joshua Keady, Undergraduate student (Business)
  - Susie Leslie (Academic Planning and Assessment)
  - Travis Margoni, Graduate student (Liberal Arts)
  - Peter Saunders (Center for Teaching and Learning)
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The estimated start time for the event (time when the first graduates enter Reser stadium) on June 17 is 3:30 p.m. We expect 3,500 to 4,000 students to participate and about 35,000 guests to attend the ceremony.

The 2012 graduation will be a ticketed event for “spectators”. However, as in previous commencements, faculty may participate in the 2012 commencement ceremony by serving as a Ph.D. Escort, Faculty Representative, or Marshal. Faculty who wish to participate in one of these roles must register or volunteer in advance.

- **Faculty Escorts** who plan to accompany doctoral candidates will receive a memo from the Graduate School toward the end of May.
- **Faculty Representatives** dress in academic regalia and participate in the processional across campus and into Reser Stadium where they will be seated as a group for the ceremony. There will be approx 100 seats available on the stadium floor for Faculty Representatives; specific information regarding volunteering to be a faculty representative will be posted on the Commencement website in the near future.
- **Faculty Marshals** dress in academic regalia and are responsible for lining up the graduates for the procession, seating at the stadium and for the diploma distribution. Chris Bell, Chief Marshal has been working with each college to staff marshals. There are still some positions available – please contact Chris is you would like to volunteer: [Chris.A.Bell@Oregonstate.edu](mailto:Chris.A.Bell@Oregonstate.edu)

Faculty and staff have also volunteered to greet ticketed guests, distribute programs, etc. The response has been very strong – at this time no additional volunteers are needed. Please see the website in case extra volunteers are needed as we near June 17.

**Tickets:** After accommodating family and friends of our graduates, a limited number of admission tickets (no charge but this is a ticketed event) available in the general audience for students, faculty and staff. Information regarding ticket availability is provided on the Commencement website: [http://oregonstate.edu/events/commencement/](http://oregonstate.edu/events/commencement/)

**TIMELINE FOR SUNDAY, JUNE 17:**
- 13:15 Faculty Marshals gather in the MU and Library Quads
- 13:30 Graduates assemble in the quads
- 13:45 Faculty Escorts and Faculty Representatives assemble in the Library Quad
- 14:30 Final line-up for the Procession
- 14:45 Procession starts
- 15:30 Procession enters Reser Stadium
- 16:30 Seating of the Graduates is completed; Platform Party enters
- 16:40 Start of Ceremony
- 18:15 Diploma Distribution begins (complete by ~19:30)

Chris Bell
Chief Marshal
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Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) – May 31, 2012

- [Webcast](#)
- [Student Evaluation of Teaching: Challenges and Solutions](#) – Kevin Gable, Faculty Senate President-Elect
- [eSET](#) – Stefani Dawn. Assistant Director of Assessment
  - [Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force – Final Report Powerpoint](#)
Elements of assigned work.

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES

January 7, 2013

1. Framework.

There are three basic areas of assigned work that cover almost all employees at OSU, faculty as well as classified staff. They relate directly to the fact that OSU is a land grant university. Not all employees are assigned tasks in all areas. Specific job classifications exist and position descriptions are used to define the job categories in more detail.

The general categories are given here. They are organized by the main role of interaction with others. After that there will be examples of assignments in these categories. That list is not intended to limit the job categories, and examples can be added at all times.

Instruction and advising. Employees interact with learners to help them gain knowledge or acquire skills. The learners can be traditional students in a classroom, students taking courses that are delivered electronically, private sector business people located anywhere across the state or around the world, children participating in 4H programs, adults in Master Gardener or other adult learner/volunteer programs, or anybody who wants to learn something by interacting with an OSU employee. Instruction can be paid for directly through tuition or indirectly via extension support. It can be free as part of outreach. Employees may directly advise students as part of their assigned duties and often are mentors for undergraduates, graduate students, or adult learners.

Scholarship and creative activities. Employees interact with people in their field of expertise with the goal of creating new knowledge or developing new skills. This job category includes traditional research in which peer reviewed dissemination is essential; however, the review can take different forms depending on the nature of the assignment. Scholarship incorporates this extended perspective on review, but for the purposes of this document in all cases some form of feedback from peers is required in this category. Results should also be presented in professional meetings, symposia, and conferences or equivalent venues, and in venues appropriate for other audiences/clientele.

Service and leadership. Employees keep OSU, their professional societies and in some cases their communities running. This category includes service both to OSU and to the field of expertise. Leadership is a form of service in which individuals have a higher level of decision power. In basic service roles employees perform assigned tasks, possibly with the freedom of choosing the methods to use in execution of the work. In leadership the individual creates tasks, often to be performed by others.
2. Activities that cross boundaries.

In most cases, the category of an assigned duty in the position description is clear. In some cases, one can argue for two categories, but in a position description one has to make a choice, in order to avoid “conflicts of interest.” The need for making this choice is a consequence of the fact that for personnel decisions, the position description is used as a basis for judgment. For example, one might pioneer new methods of managing people. This can be part of a leadership assignment, in which case a person is judged by how well the new methods are implemented and working. It can also be part of scholarship, in which case a critical analysis of the new methods is required. If the activity would count as both leadership and scholarship, the scholarship part could be compromised, because the leadership part requires a positive outcome. It is difficult to be a critical scholar if one’s livelihood is involved. The same is true for mixing teaching and scholarship. Even though topics for scholarship can be found in instruction or service, one should never be the subject of one’s own research unless strict third-party review mechanisms are in place.

There is also a question for activities that could be either instruction or service. One possible suggestion to differentiate in this case is by considering the motivation of the learners. If attending an activity in which learning can take place is part of a program for which the learner has volunteered, it could be called instruction. If the learners are required to participate in a program and the activity is part of that program, it could be called service. For example, teaching a required mathematics class is instruction, because students chose the program of their major. Participating in a Discovery Day activity is service, because the school children attending the activity have no choice but to go. The potential conflict of interest is much smaller in this case. There is possibly a difference in objectives. In instruction one wants to ensure that students learn maximally, in service one wants to ensure that students appreciate the material maximally. But these two aspects are strongly related, so a distinction is not clear.

3. Examples.

Instruction and advising.

- Lecture presentations to traditional students and other learner audiences
- TA and volunteer leader supervision and mentoring
- Timely grading of assignments
- Timely grading of exams
- Making class and/or other learning information available through the web
- Holding regular office hours
- Directing undergraduate and graduate research and theses
- Service on master and doctoral committees
- Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral associates
- Curricular development (course or youth/adult learning module improvement or creation)
- General advising of students
- Creating effective learning venues for non-campus based youth and adult learners
- Mentoring of youth and adult learners
Scholarship and creative activities.

- Research leading towards the increase of knowledge in the field of expertise
- Research leading towards the improvement of teaching techniques and methodologies, and towards curriculum reform
- Research leading towards the improvement of service work and leadership techniques
- Synthesis of existing information into formats useful to peers or clientele groups
- Obtain grant and contract funding in order to support a research program
- Effective management of research personnel and resources
- Publication of refereed papers
- Publication of non-refereed papers as appropriate
- Web publications
- Publication of books and book chapters
- Other forms of research communication as appropriate (newsletters, radio shows, TV shows, participation in juried or non-juried art or literature presentations, etc.)
- Patent and plant patent awards
- Inventions
- Licensing of products

Service and leadership.

- Service on departmental, college and university committees
- Service on professional association/society committees
- Holding offices in professional organizations
- Participation on research, Extension or instructional professional advisory or review panels
- Serve as editor for professional publications
- Review manuscripts for journals or other publications
- Organization of conferences
- Chairing conference sessions
- Serving as a technical advisor for city, county, state, regional or federal government organizations and agencies and non-profits
- As time allows, serve in other community service roles

Unresolved Issues.

- Where do REU, IGERTS fall – instruction, scholarship or service – may vary based on specific grant – will vary
- Student club advising – instruction or service – will vary as in some classes actual workshops or informal classes are held as part of the activity – could be both with a listings specific to what is done
- The business side of research – is this included under scholarship, as now shown, or a separate category – all other scholarship types are an output of some type including successful fund raising. These business activities are unique. Some faculty can be successful scholars but miserable managers
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Program Type: Undergraduate Major
Current Program Name: Women Studies - BA, BS, CRED, HBA, HBS
New Program Name: Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Women Studies Program proposes to rename the Program and its undergraduate major, undergraduate minor, undergraduate certificate, graduate minor, and MA to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. This change reflects growth in the program as well as national trends in the field. With the addition of new faculty and courses, the Program is now able to offer a breadth of courses in these areas. This name change is enthusiastically supported by our faculty and students and should enhance our ability to recruit for our various degree programs.
The Women Studies Program proposes to rename the Program and its undergraduate major, undergraduate minor, undergraduate certificate, graduate minor, and MA to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. This change reflects growth in the program as well as national trends in the field. With the addition of new faculty and courses, the Program is now able to offer a breadth of courses in these areas. This name change is enthusiastically supported by our faculty and students and should enhance our ability to recruit for our various degree programs.
BA, BS, MA IN WOMEN, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY STUDIES
PROPOSAL TO RENAME THE WOMEN STUDIES PROGRAM,
UNDERGRADUATE MINOR, UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR,
AND MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE

Oregon State University
College of Liberal Arts
School of Language, Culture, and Society
Women Studies Program

CIP Number 050207

Date of Proposal: May 30, 2012
Proposed Effective Date: January 1, 2013
CPS Proposal Number:

1. Title of the proposed instructional, research, or public service unit. For name changes, give both the current and proposed names. Describe the reason(s) for the proposed change.

CIP # 050207

Title: Women’s Studies.

Definition: A program that focuses on the history, sociology, politics, culture, and economics of women, and the development of modern feminism in relation to the roles played by women in different periods and locations in North America and the world. Programs may focus on literature, philosophy, and the arts as much as on social studies and policy. Illustrative examples: Women’s and Gender Studies.


Currently, the program is “Women Studies.” We propose to change the name to “Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.” We also propose to change the name of our undergraduate minor, undergraduate major, and MA degree programs to “Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.” The name change reflects both changes in the discipline nationally and the addition of faculty in the School of Language, Culture, and Society (SLCS) who can provide courses in sexuality and gender studies that will complement the current offerings in Women Studies.

As the discipline has grown from its roots in the Women’s Movement of the late 1960 and early 1970s, it has become more diverse and inclusive, reflecting the intersections of gender, race, and sexual identity and has called into question essential categories of gender and sexuality reflected in binary labels such as “women,” “men,” “heterosexual,” and “homosexual.” Many institutions across the country have changed their program or department names to “Women and Gender Studies” or “Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies” to reflect this shift toward inclusivity and the disruption of binaries. We have chosen to maintain “Women” in the name and have intentionally placed it first in the list as both an acknowledgement of our history and as way to maintain the visibility of women. While we understand that “woman” is a constructed category, we also note the material reality that
individuals who are included in the category experience systematic and institutionalized
discrimination based on their inclusion in that category. Therefore, maintaining the visibility
of women even as we question the category itself is essential.

Our proposal is also driven by changes in our faculty. As the SLCS has added faculty
members, we now have a line devoted to Queer Studies, and we have faculty members who
have areas of specialization in gender studies, as well as men and masculinity studies, and
indigenous and transnational sexualities studies. So the name change reflects our ability to
offer a full curriculum across the spectrum of women, gender, and sexuality studies. Finally,
the name change reflects the interests and desires of our students and will likely attract a
wider audience for our courses and degree programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RENAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Type: Abbreviated Category I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS #: XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals/view/82222">https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals/view/82222</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP #: 050207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS #: BA,BS 867; MA 8670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA, BS in Women Studies to BA, BS in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (CIP # 050207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Types: Bachelor of Arts (BA) and Bachelor of Science (BS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Level: Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Home: School of Language, Culture, and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Options: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Minor: Women Studies to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Designator: WGSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Mode and Location: On-Campus / OSU-Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Admission Requirements: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Limitations: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Start Date: Winter Term 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA in Women Studies to MA in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (CIP # 050207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Types: Master of Arts (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Level: Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Home: School of Language, Culture, and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Options: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Concentration: Unchanged (5 existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Minor: Women Studies to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Designator: WGSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Mode and Location: On-Campus / OSU-Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Admission Requirements: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Limitations: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Start Date: Winter Term 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Location within the institution's organizational structure.** Include "before" and "after" organizational charts (show reporting lines all the way up to the Provost).

   No change.

3. **Objectives, functions (e.g., instruction, research, public service), and activities of the proposed unit.**
   
a. **Explain how the program or unit's current objectives, functions, and/or activities will be changed.** Where applicable, address issues such as course offerings, program requirements, admission requirements, student learning outcomes and experiences, and advising structure and availability. How will the reorganized program be stronger than the existing program?

   The name change will actually reflect changes already underway in the program. We had already developed some courses in gender and sexuality studies, and now we have expanded those options with the addition of new faculty members. In essence, the name change will be catching up with changes that have already happened.

   Because Women Studies works from feminist intersectional frameworks, the program has always addressed issues of the social construction of gender and its impact on men as well as women, and we have integrated examination of sexualities throughout our curriculum. The name change reflects the new degree to which we are able to do these things with additional coursework in specialized areas. Our new Queer Studies professor will be developing an entire slate of courses in the area to accompany our existing courses in Queer Theories and Women and Sexuality (soon to be renamed Feminisms and Sexualities). Another professor will be developing a new course in Men and Masculinities. In recent years, we have also added to our curriculum WS 325 Disney: Gender, Race, and Empire; WS 585 Transnational Feminisms; WS 320 Gender and Technology; and WS 340 Gender and Science. We are currently working on proposals for 4/500 courses in Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Health and Fat Studies. These courses should be submitted through the curricular proposal process during the 2012-2013 academic year. The name change reflects what we have already done in our learning outcomes for the undergraduate and graduate degree programs by emphasizing intersections and inclusivity, and so the name change will not change our existing learning outcomes.

   The name change will strengthen the program by offering a more accurate reflection of what we do and providing a wider appeal to diverse students.

b. **Explain how outcomes in the newly organized program or unit will be assessed.**

   We intend to maintain our previously approved BA (CIP#050207) and MA (CIP #050207) outcomes and assessment metrics. These outcomes already reflect the varied emphases of the new name.
4. **Resources needed, if any: personnel, FTE academic, FTE classified, facilities and equipment.**
   a. Identify the staffing and resource needs for the proposed program or unit. Note any impact on the budgets of affected programs or units. Provide an analysis of how the resulting programs or units will be adequately staffed and funded.

   No impact on staffing will occur. Initially, we will need about $500 to change business cards and letterhead.

   b. Explain the extent to which affected faculty and personnel support this change.

   All of the Women Studies faculty members enthusiastically support this change.

5. **Funding sources: state sources (institutional funds - state general fund, tuition and fees, indirect cost recoveries), federal funds, other funds as specified.**
   a. Identify the revenue and funding sources for the proposed program or unit (i.e., federal, state, other funding sources).

   Funding for new business cards and letterheads will come from the existing services and supplies budget (i.e., internal reallocation of existing resources).

   b. If new resources will be required (e.g., for new faculty positions, graduate research/teaching assistants, facilities, equipment), explain where these resources will be coming from. Specify whether internal reallocation, college, institution, federal, state, private, or other funding sources. [Note: Deans/chairs/heads/directors of units committed to providing additional resources will be required to sign the proposal.]

   N/A

   c. Provide an estimated annual budget for the proposed program or unit (see Appendices).

   The only expense will be in the first year changing business cards and letterhead.

6. **Relationship of the proposed unit to the institutional mission.**
   a. How will the proposed program or unit support OSU's mission and goals?

   The name change will undergird OSU’s stated commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The new name will offer increased visibility for the program and should attract greater interest across a wide variety of current and prospective students.

   b. Describe potential positive and negative impact of the proposed change on the program(s) or unit(s) involved. Identify other OSU programs or units which may be affected, and describe the potential positive and negative impact on their mission and activities.

   N/A
7. **Long-range goals and plans for the unit (including a statement as to anticipated funding sources for any projected growth in funding needs).**

As part of the School of Language, Culture, and Society, we are involved in developing a new slate of courses in Queer Studies. That position is funded through the Provost’s Initiative. These courses will be a central part of the Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies degree programs.

8. **Relationship of the proposed unit to programs at other institutions in the state.**
   a. What is the current relationship of the proposed program or unit to OUS and other higher education institutions in the state? Describe how this relationship might be altered based on the proposed change.

   We are involved with the Northwest Women’s Studies Association and through that with other OUS institutions. Those relationships will not be affected by this change.

   b. Describe how the proposed change will affect other constituencies outside of OUS.

   The only likely effect will be a wider and more inclusive pool of applicants for our degree programs, particularly the MA.

9. **If the program is professionally accredited, identify the accrediting body and discuss how the proposed change may affect accreditation.**

**Appendices:**

- **Transmittal Sheet**

- **Budget Table** (attach current budget and proposed budget)

- **Library Evaluation** (attach library evaluation if the proposal involves an academic program that is substantially changed or expanded)

- **Liaison** (attach all liaison correspondence, both internal to the college/school and with all affected, or potentially affected, academic units and institutions within or outside of OSU)
From: Sally McWilliams [mailto:mcwil@pdx.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 29, 2012 9:33 AM
To: Shaw, Susan
Subject: Re: a favor

Susan, I am happy to hear that OSU is considering a name change from Women's Studies to Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies. Such a change speaks to the historical roots of our work (with its focus on women) and to the new directions in which the field has expanded. When we undertook this change at PSU a few years ago, it was for those very reasons. Nomenclature is important as it signifies the scope of the academic work of the unit, but it also connotes some of the underlying philosophy that supports our educational endeavors. On a national level new scholarship into gender, gender expressions, sexuality, and systems of power, to name only a few, is expanding the issues scholars and educators are theorizing and investigating. Our curriculum at PSU was developing similarly. For example, the Program launched a new Sexuality, Gender, and Queer Studies minor, thereby expanding the scope and type of courses we offer. We also have faculty whose scholarship and teaching has moved to include more emphasis on gender and sexuality within a global frame. It was also important for the name to reflect the history of our program in honoring and studying the contributions of women to society and how gendered systems of power impact women. Having seen your proposal for your new MA program and speaking with you, I know that your WS program has developed in similar ways. I hope your proposed name change comes about soon. Please feel free to use my email as part of your supporting documentation for your proposal (or I can also write something on official letterhead if needed). All the best! Sally

On Wed, Aug 29, 2012 at 8:51 AM, Shaw, Susan <sshaw@oregonstate.edu> wrote:
Hi, Sally. We’re changing our name to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, and I’m working on the Abbreviated Category I proposal for that. Would you be willing to send me a short email outlining your support for the name change, perhaps with reference to the reasons PSU changed to that name? Thanks!
Susan

Susan M. Shaw, Ph.D.
Professor of Women Studies
Transitional Director of the School of Language, Culture, and Society
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
541-737-3082

--

Sally McWilliams, PhD
Professor & Chair
Department of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland OR 97207-0751
ph. (503) 725-8476
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities and mandates the provision of reasonable accommodations to ensure access to programs and services. Oregon State University is committed to providing equal opportunity to higher education for academically qualified students without regard to a disability.

For questions and assistance with addressing access, please contact the Office of Disability and Access Services (737-4098) or the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity (737-3556)

Title of Proposal: Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Effective Date: Jan 1, 2013

Department/Program: Women Studies

College: Liberal Arts

☐ Faculty Guidelines (http://ds.oregonstate.edu/facultystaff.aspx?Title=ResponsibilitiesFacultyStaff)

☐ Information Technology Guidelines (http://oregonstate.edu/accessibility/)

By signing this form, we affirm that at we have reviewed the listed documents and will apply a good faith effort to ensure accessibility in curricular design, delivery, and supporting information.

Sign (Dept Chair/Head; Director)  Date  Print (Department Chair/Head; Director)
Women Studies (WS) Undergraduate Courses
to be Changed to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) Courses

WS 199 SPECIAL STUDIES (1-3)
Special topics of contemporary relevance to research of women and gender role issues. For students who seek an elementary introduction to a specific realm of women studies. May be repeated for credit when topic varies. This course is repeatable for a maximum of 9 credits.

WS 223 WOMEN: SELF AND SOCIETY (3) Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course Multidisciplinary introduction to women studies. Focuses on the lives and status of women in society and explores ways institutions such as family, work, media, law and religion affect different groups of women. Explores issues of gender, race, class, age, sexual orientation, size and ability. (SS) (Bacc Core Course)

WS 223H WOMEN: SELF AND SOCIETY (3) Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course Multidisciplinary introduction to women studies. Focuses on the lives and status of women in society and explores ways institutions such as family, work, media, law and religion affect different groups of women. Explores issues of gender, race, class, age, sexual orientation, size and ability. (SS) (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: Honors College approval required.

WS 224 WOMEN: PERSONAL AND SOCIAL CHANGE (3) Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course Examines the way the questioning of traditional gender roles and their accompanying power structures can lead to change in women's personal and public lives. Explores women's heritage and contributions and focuses on issues of self-growth and social movements for change. (SS) (Bacc Core Course)

WS 230 WOMEN IN THE MOVIES (3) Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course Examines ways women are depicted in the movies and how those depictions are created by and create larger social constructions of women. Special attention is given to the intersections of race, class, sexual identity, and age with gender. (Bacc Core Course)

WS 235 GLOBAL WOMEN IN THE MOVIES (3) Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course Explores constructions and practices of gender in a transnational, multi-religious, and global framework by examining a wide variety of films about women around the world. (Bacc Core Course)

WS 235H GLOBAL WOMEN IN THE MOVIES (3) Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course Explores constructions and practices of gender in a transnational, multi-religious, and global framework by examining a wide variety of films about women around the world. (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: Honors College approval required.

WS 240 WOMEN IN SPORT (3) Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course Focuses on the influence of sport, a gendered institution, on women from cultural, psychosocial, and political perspectives, as well as how influential women can be in redefining sport to be more socially inclusive. Examines intersections of gender with age, social class, income status, race and ethnicity and politics. (Bacc Core Course)
WS 270 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN (3)  Offered in current or future terms
Addresses issues of domestic violence, rape, dating violence, as well as contemporary social debates about pornography and the media's impact on increasing violence against women. (SS)

WS 280 GLOBAL WOMEN (3)  Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course
Focuses on women's experiences throughout the world and examines women's issues and status cross-culturally. (Bacc Core Course)

WS 280H GLOBAL WOMEN (3)  Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course
Focuses on women's experiences throughout the world and examines women's issues and status cross-culturally. (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: Honors College approval required.

WS 299 TOPICS IN WOMEN STUDIES (1-6)  Offered in current or future terms
Current topics related to women. Description and analysis of different realms of knowledge about gender issues. This course is repeatable for a maximum of 12 credits.

WS 320 GENDER AND TECHNOLOGY (3)  Baccalaureate Core Course
Explores women's contributions and focuses in technology fields. Analyzes gendered nature of technology. Theory and practice of technologies. (Bacc Core Course)

WS 325 DISNEY: GENDER, RACE, EMPIRE (3)  Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course
Explores constructions of gender, race, class, sexuality, and nation in the animated films of Walt Disney, introduces concepts in film theory and criticism, and develops analyses of the politics of representation. (Bacc Core Course)

WS 340 GENDER AND SCIENCE (3)  Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course
Analyzes the relationship between society and science by explaining technology and science as gendered practices and bodies of knowledge. Focuses on the ways the making of women and men affect the making of science and explores the roles of women in scientific pursuits. (SS) (Bacc Core Course)

WS 380 MUSLIM WOMEN (3)  Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course
Examines the lives and experiences of Muslim women in Islamic communities around the world from a variety of perspectives in order to highlight issues significant for contemporary Muslim women: family, education, work, politics, health, marriage, divorce, war, and violence. (Bacc Core Course)

WS 399 TOPICS IN WOMEN STUDIES (1-6)  Offered in current or future terms
Current topics on women and gender role issues. May be repeated for credit when topic varies. This course is repeatable for a maximum of 12 credits.

WS 399H TOPICS IN WOMEN STUDIES (1-6)
This course is repeatable for a maximum of 12 credits. PREREQS: Honors College approval required.

WS 402 INDEPENDENT STUDY (1-16)  Offered in current or future terms
This course is repeatable for a maximum of 16 credits. PREREQS: Departmental approval required.

WS 406 PROJECTS (1-16)  Offered in current or future terms
This course is repeatable for a maximum of 16 credits. PREREQS: Departmental approval required.
WS 407 SEMINAR (3)
This course is repeatable for a maximum of 9 credits.

WS 410 INTERNSHIP (1-16)  Offered in current or future terms
The internship experience provides the opportunity to gain experience within an off-campus private, public, or community agency or organization which has as one of its goals the improvement of the status of women in society. Students work with an on-site mentor who guides their field experience in collaboration with the internship coordinator in the WS program. Only 6 credits will count toward the Women Studies major. This course is repeatable for a maximum of 16 credits. PREREQS: Departmental approval required.

WS 414 SYSTEMS OF OPPRESSION IN WOMEN'S LIVES (3)  Offered in current or future terms
Baccalaureate Core Course
Explores the ways different systems of oppression and discrimination impact women's lives. Examines sexism, classism, racism, and anti-Jewish oppression, as well as discrimination against lesbians, older women, and those who differ in ability and appearance. (SS) (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: WS 223 and /or instructor approval required.

WS 414H SYSTEMS OF OPPRESSION IN WOMEN'S LIVES (3)  Baccalaureate Core Course
Explores the ways different systems of oppression and discrimination impact women's lives. Examines sexism, classism, racism, and anti-Jewish oppression, as well as discrimination against lesbians, older women, and those who differ in ability and appearance. (SS) (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: WS 223 and Honors College approval required or instructor approval required.

WS 416 THEORIES OF FEMINISM (3)  Offered in current or future terms
Explores feminist conceptions about the nature of the world, women's reality and visions for change. Analyzes major issues raised by the women's movement and the development of feminist ideas, as well as provides a critical examination of feminist thought and different theories which comprise it. PREREQS: (WS 223 or WS 224) and /or instructor approval required.

WS 417 FEMINIST PHILOSOPHIES (3)
Diverse forms of feminist philosophy, including a variety of critiques, especially those based on race and class, with in-depth consideration of selected social issues, such as rape and pornography. CROSSLISTED as PHL 417/PHL 517. PREREQS: 6 credits of philosophy or upper-division standing.

WS 420 HATE, RESISTANCE, AND RECONCILIATION (3)  Baccalaureate Core Course
Examines hate movements, hate-related activities, and resistant acts and movements. Special attention is given to the role of gender. (Bacc Core Course)

WS 420H HATE, RESISTANCE, AND RECONCILIATION (3)  Baccalaureate Core Course
Examines hate movements, hate-related activities, and resistant acts and movements. Special attention is given to the role of gender. (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: Honors College approval required.

WS 430 WOMEN OF COLOR IN THE U.S. (3)  Offered in current or future terms
Explore the contemporary experiences of women of color in the U.S. Develops a framework for analyzing history and experience through the lens of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and national belonging, and examines particular areas of women's lives. PREREQS: WS 223
WS 440 WOMEN AND NATURAL RESOURCES (3) Baccalaureate Core Course
Explores the relationship between women and natural resources. In particular, the course examines the roles of policy, technology, culture, and management in women's use and control of natural resources. (Bacc Core Course)

WS 450 ECOFEMINISM (3) Baccalaureate Core Course
Focuses on the ecological and feminist principles that mediate humanity's relationship with nature. (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: Upper-division standing.

WS 460 WOMEN AND SEXUALITY (3) Offered in current or future terms WIC Core Course
Explores the historical, theoretical, and political dimensions of female sexuality. The course also examines the basic assumptions about the meaning of female sexuality, how it has been shaped and controlled, and why women's sexuality has been/is a source of both women's liberation and subjugation. (SS) (Writing Intensive Course) PREREQS: (WS 223 or WS 224) and /or instructor approval required.

WS 462 INTRODUCTION TO QUEER STUDIES (3) Baccalaureate Core Course
Introduces key themes and critical frameworks in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, and Queer (LGBTQ) Studies. Topics include histories of sexuality; forms of oppression including heterosexism, homophobia, and transphobia; resistance to oppression; violence against LGBTQ people; queer activism; diverse experiences of sexuality; and representations in literature, art, and popular media. (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224 or instructor permission.

WS 465 WOMEN, WEIGHT, AND BODY IMAGE (3)
Focuses on women's increasing struggles with weight, eating disorders, and broader body image issues in contemporary society. Explores how social institutions such as media, medicine, government contribute to weight bias and unhealthy standards for appearance. Examines weightism as a system of oppression that intersects with other systems of oppression including sexism, racism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, and ageism. PREREQS: (WS 223 or WS 224)

WS 480 INTERNATIONAL WOMEN (3) Offered in current or future terms Baccalaureate Core Course
Examines the lives and experiences of women in different parts of the world, looking at work, education, the family, the arts and social movements. Explores the comparative realities of various women's struggles for social injustice and studies key definitions and theoretical assumptions relevant to the subject of global feminism. (NC) (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: (WS 223 or WS 224) and /or instructor approval required.

WS 482 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON WOMEN'S HEALTH (3)
Women's health issues are examined from a global perspective in the context of a woman's life and through a feminist political lens. Central to our discussions will be an analysis of the interplay among race, class, and gender in shaping particular health care outcomes. The course stresses the potential for women's agency and autonomy with respect to improving their health and environments.

WS 486 GLOBAL EXPERIENCE I (1)
Prepares students to participate in a short-term study abroad experience that emphasizes volunteer experiences in women's organizations and analysis from transnational feminist perspectives.
WS 487 GLOBAL EXPERIENCE II (1)
Engages students in a short-term study abroad experience that emphasizes volunteer experiences in women's organizations and analysis from transnational feminist perspectives. PREREQS: WS 486 or WS 586

WS 488 GLOBAL EXPERIENCE III (1)
Students reflect on their short-term study abroad experience by engaging in in-depth transnational feminist analysis of particular aspects of the study abroad experience. PREREQS: (WS 486 and WS 487)

WS 490 SELF-ESTEEM AND PERSONAL POWER (3)
Explores ways to improve self-esteem and develop personal power. Focuses on issues of self and identify, contextualizing these in the ways gender is constructed in society. (SS) PREREQS: Upper-division standing.

WS 495 GLOBAL FEMINIST THEOLOGIES (3)  Baccalaureate Core Course
Explores the connections between women's religious experiences around the world and the global problems addressed by feminist theology and spirituality. (Bacc Core Course) PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224 and junior standing

WS 498 SENIOR SEMINAR (3)
For graduating seniors in women studies. Building on knowledge and experiences acquired in required and elective women studies courses, it focuses on central questions for feminist research. In particular, the course helps students identify their approaches to women's studies scholarship and develop deeper understandings of the process of generating feminist knowledge, especially in relation to gender, race, class, sexuality, and national belonging. PREREQS: (WS 414 and WS 416)

WS 499 TOPICS (1-6)  Offered in current or future terms
Topics on contemporary research on women and related public policies. May be repeated for credit when topic varies. This course is repeatable for a maximum of 12 credits. PREREQS: Upper-division standing.

Women Studies (WS) Graduate Courses
to be Changed to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS)Courses

WS 501 RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP (1-16)  Offered in current or future terms
This course is repeatable for a maximum of 16 credits.

WS 502 INDEPENDENT STUDY (1-16)  Offered in current or future terms
This course is repeatable for a maximum of 16 credits. PREREQS: Departmental approval required.

WS 503 THESIS (1-16)  Offered in current or future terms
This course is repeatable for a maximum of 16 credits.

WS 506 PROJECTS (1-16)  Offered in current or future terms
This course is repeatable for a maximum of 16 credits. PREREQS: Departmental approval required.
WS 510 INTERNSHIP (1-16) Offered in current or future terms
The internship experience provides the opportunity to gain experience within an off-campus private, public, or community agency or organization which has as one of its goals the improvement of the status of women in society. Students work with an on-site mentor who guides their field experience in collaboration with the internship coordinator in the WS program. This course is repeatable for a maximum of 16 credits. PREREQS: Departmental approval required.

WS 511 ORIENTATION AND PROFESSIONALIZATION I (1) Offered in current or future terms
The WS 511, 512, 513 sequence prepares Women Studies graduate student to succeed in their courses of study and in their chosen profession. WS 511 provides knowledge about Women Studies as a discipline and as a course of study that helps students manage the transition to graduate school. Graded P/N.

WS 512 ORIENTATION AND PROFESSIONALIZATION II (1) Offered in current or future terms
The WS 511, 512, 513 sequence prepares Women Studies graduate student to succeed in their courses of study and in their chosen profession. WS 512 guides students in the development of an intellectual life with a focus on thriving and surviving as scholar in Women Studies. Graded P/N.

WS 513 ORIENTATION AND PROFESSIONALIZATION III (1)
The WS 511, 512, 513 sequence prepares Women Studies graduate student to succeed in their courses of study and in their chosen profession. WS 513 focuses on helping students shape a future that utilizes the graduate degree in Women Studies. It helps students manage the transition of life after the Women Studies Master's program at OSU. Graded P/N.

WS 514 SYSTEMS OF OPPRESSION IN WOMEN'S LIVES (3) Offered in current or future terms
Explores the ways different systems of oppression and discrimination impact women's lives. Examines sexism, classism, racism, and anti-Jewish oppression, as well as discrimination against lesbians, older women, and those who differ in ability and appearance. PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224 or instructor approval required.

WS 516 THEORIES OF FEMINISM (3) Offered in current or future terms
Explores feminist conceptions about the nature of the world, women's reality and visions for change. Analyzes major issues raised by the women's movement and the development of feminist ideas, as well as provides a critical examination of feminist thought and different theories which comprise it. PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224 or instructor approval required.

WS 517 FEMINIST PHILOSOPHIES (3)
Diverse forms of feminist philosophy, including a variety of critiques, especially those based on race and class, with in-depth consideration of selected social issues, such as rape and pornography. CROSSLISTED as PHL 417/PHL 517. PREREQS: 6 credits of philosophy or upper-division standing.

WS 518 FEMINIST RESEARCH (4)
Explores the socio-political and historical context out of which traditional research methodologies emerge and the relationship of gender to scientific pursuits. Teaches what it means to do emancipatory anti-sexist and participatory research.
WS 520 HATE, RESISTANCE, AND RECONCILIATION (3)
Examines hate movements, hate-related activities, and resistant acts and movements. Special attention is given to the role of gender.

WS 521 FEMINIST LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT (3) Offered in current or future terms
Consideration of leadership and management through a feminist lens. Through this course participants will explore and develop their own leadership style and examine various contexts in which leadership can occur. This course will also examine principles of effective management within organizations.

WS 522 GRANT WRITING AND DEVELOPMENT FOR FEMINIST ORGANIZATIONS (1) Offered in current or future terms
Provides students with the skills needed to be successful in grant-writing and fund-raising for feminist organizations.

WS 523 COMMUNITY ORGANIZING AND COLLECTIVE ACTION (2)
Addresses relationships between theory and action in feminist context. Explores both social change activism in terms of individual and collective action strategies and social movement theory in historical and contemporary perspectives.

WS 525 GENDER AND TECHNOLOGY (3)
Explores women's contributions and focuses in technology fields. Analyzes gendered nature of technology. Theory and practice of technologies for change and activism.

WS 530 WOMEN OF COLOR IN THE U.S. (3) Offered in current or future terms
Explore the contemporary experiences of women of color in the U.S. Develops a framework for analyzing history and experience through the lens of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual identity, and national belonging, and examines particular areas of women's lives. PREREQS: WS 223

WS 535 FEMINIST TEACHING AND LEARNING (3) Offered in current or future terms
Focuses on the experiences and practices of the feminist classroom. Key components of the class include issues associated with the identity and development of the teacher as well as the development of skills to help facilitate understanding, empowerment, and the personal and social agency of students.

WS 540 WOMEN AND NATURAL RESOURCES (3)
Explores the relationship between women and natural resources. In particular, the course examines the roles of policy, technology, culture, and management in women's use and control of natural resources.

WS 550 ECOFEMINISM (3)
Focuses on the ecological and feminist principles that mediate humanity's relationship with nature. PREREQS: Upper-division standing.

WS 560 WOMEN AND SEXUALITY (3) Offered in current or future terms
Explores the historical, theoretical, and political dimensions of female sexuality. The course also examines the basic assumptions about the meaning of female sexuality, how it has been shaped and controlled, and why women's sexuality has been/is a source of both women's liberation and subjugation. PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224 or instructor approval required.
WS 562 INTRODUCTION TO Queer Studies (3)
Introduces key themes and critical frameworks in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, and Queer (LGBTQ) Studies. Topics include histories of sexuality; forms of oppression including heterosexism, homophobia, and transphobia; resistance to oppression; violence against LGBTQ people; queer activism; diverse experiences of sexuality; and representations in literature, art, and popular media. PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224, or instructor permission.

WS 565 Women, Weight, and Body Image (3)
Focuses on women's increasing struggles with weight, eating disorders, and broader body image issues in contemporary society. Explores how social institutions such as media, medicine, government contribute to weight bias and unhealthy standards for appearance. Examines weightism as a system of oppression that intersects with other systems of oppression including sexism, racism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, and ageism. PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224

WS 580 International Women (3) Offered in current or future terms
Examines the lives and experiences of women in different parts of the world, looking at work, education, the family, the arts and social movements. Explores the comparative realities of various women's struggles for social injustice and studies key definitions and theoretical assumptions relevant to the subject of global feminism. PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224 or instructor approval required.

WS 582 Global Perspectives on Women's Health (3)
Women's health issues are examined from a global perspective in the context of a woman's life and through a feminist political lens. Central to our discussions will be an analysis of the interplay among race, class, and gender in shaping particular health care outcomes. The course stresses the potential for women's agency and autonomy with respect to improving their health and environments.

WS 585 Transnational Feminisms (3)
In this interdisciplinary graduate seminar, students will be introduced to themes and theoretical principles of transnational feminisms, with special emphasis placed on feminist movements of the global South. We will explore colonialism, globalization, nation-building, representation, global economies, militarism, human rights, and politics of gender, race, class, sexuality, and nation.

WS 586 Global Experience I (1) Offered in current or future terms
Prepares students to participate in a short-term study abroad experience that emphasizes volunteer experiences in women's organizations and analysis from transnational feminist perspectives.

WS 587 Global Experience II (1) Offered in current or future terms
Engages students in a short-term study abroad experience that emphasizes volunteer experiences in women's organizations and analysis from transnational feminist perspectives. PREREQS: WS 486 or WS 586

WS 588 Global Experience III (1) Offered in current or future terms
Students reflect on their short-term study abroad experience by engaging in in-depth transnational feminist analysis of particular aspects of the study abroad experience. PREREQS: (WS 586 and WS 587)
WS 590 SELF-ESTEEM AND PERSONAL POWER (3)
Explores ways to improve self-esteem and develop personal power. Focuses on issues of self and identify, contextualizing these in the ways gender is constructed in society. PREREQS: Upper-division standing.

WS 595 GLOBAL FEMINIST THEOLOGIES (3)
Explores the connections between women's religious experiences around the world and the global problems addressed by feminist theology and spirituality. PREREQS: WS 223 or WS 224 and junior standing

WS 599 TOPICS (1-6) Offered in current or future terms
Topics on contemporary research on women and related public policies. May be repeated for credit when topic varies. This course is repeatable for a maximum of 12 credits. PREREQS: Upper-division standing.
MOOCs – Massive Open Online Courses

May 24, 2013

Dave King and Lisa Templeton, from Extended Campus, and Kevin Gable, Faculty Senate President, facilitated a discussion related to Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). What are they, where are they coming from, and most importantly, how should OSU faculty respond to them? They explored many of the factors relating to how MOOCs have affected higher education and where the topic is likely to take us.

Faculty were asked to forward suggestions or comments to the Faculty Senate Office (faculty.senate@oregonstate.edu) relating to the following:

- What the university should be doing related to MOOCs.
- How the university should be setting policies related to MOOCs.
- How the Faculty Senate and its committees should be considering some of the ramifications of anything that we might do related to MOOCs.

Resources:

- Webcast
- Powerpoint presented during the Faculty Forum
- Overview of MOOCs At Peer Institutions
- MOOCs at Oregon State – DRAFT Policy Outline v. 5.1.13
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Google Apps
Implementation for OSU
October 2013

Lois Brooks, CIO & Vice Provost for Information Services
Lucas Turpin, Director of IT for College of Agricultural Sciences
Why Change?

Empower **anytime, anywhere** access

Enhance collaboration among students, faculty, and external partners

Enable future growth and capabilities

Lower the cost of IT
Why Google

Device friendly
Secure
Inexpensive - $0 annual cost
Already in use

OSU Student Email Forwards
Higher Ed Student Email Hosting
Essentials of Google

- Drive (file space), mail, calendar and apps
- Everyone has access to Google Apps through their ONID ID
  - Student email moved to OSU Google Mail
  - Employee use is optional
  - No effect to non-ONID email (Outlook …)
- 30 GB storage for Mail & Drive
- Training (In Person, Online, Recorded)
  - Google Essentials
  - Google Drive & Sites
  - Google Calendaring (do’s/don’ts, how to)
  - Google Apps for Instructors - Basics
Security & Google

● Google has very strong security practices
● Rules for using the Core Apps (Mail, Calendar, Contacts, Drive, and Sites) are almost the same as if using an OSU server.
  ○ It’s okay to do normal work using the Google services: teaching, collaboration, management activities, information sharing

Info Prohibited from Google storage
  ○ Personally Identifiable Information (PII)
  ○ Export controlled information
The Future

Continue to identify modern alternatives to legacy services

Have a single user name for each person to access all online tools, and move to name@oregonstate.edu across the university

Determine direction for employee email (Google Mail for all or hosted Exchange)
Questions?

http://oregonstate.edu/google
COMMUNICATION PROCESS

Phase 1 – August/September 2013
• Communication to all professional faculty by their supervisor to discuss placement in the structure – Job Family, Job Level, and Position Profile, with opportunity for review

Phase 2 – October/November 2013
• Communication to all professional faculty by their supervisor to receive notification of the assigned Salary Grade in the Compensation Structure for their Position Profile
RESULTS

- 1711 Professional Faculty Positions assigned into 408 Position Profiles
- 131 Professional Faculty employees received increases to bring them to the minimum of the assigned salary range on December 1, 2013
- No employees are below assigned salary range; 23 employees are above assigned salary range
- Program transparency - Complete website with all program elements available to all employees
NEXT STEPS

• Completion of Administrative Guidelines with Policy Team
• On-going maintenance and review of salary structure and benchmarks

Phase 3 Communication and Training – March 2014

• Managing Pay within the Salary Ranges
• Setting Starting Salaries
The Affordable College Textbook Act
S. 1704 (Durbin-Franken) and H.R. 3538 (Hinojosa-Miller)

Background: Higher education is essential to the future of our workforce, economy and citizenry, yet many college students today are unable to access their required course materials due to rapidly rising costs. Textbook prices jumped 82% between 2002 and 2012, and the average student budget for books and supplies has grown to $1,207 annually. Even cost-cutting measures like renting and used books are becoming too expensive, and major publishers are using digital technology to further restrict, rather than improve, access for students. The result is that textbook costs have become simply unaffordable for too many students, and in some cases a barrier to academic success.

Congress took an initial step to address this issue in 2008 with provisions in the Higher Education Opportunity Act to improve textbook price transparency. But a recent GAO report (June 2013) concluded that while somewhat successful in helping students to achieve incremental savings, these changes did not solve the underlying problem and costs continue to rise.

The solution to skyrocketing textbook prices is to leverage today's technology to reduce costs and expand access. The most effective path forward is Open Educational Resources (OERs), which are free, online academic materials that are released under a license permitting everyone to use, adapt, and share the content. OER textbooks, or "open textbooks," are available online at no cost and in print at a low cost. Using these materials in place of expensive textbooks can dramatically reduce costs while enabling the full benefits of digital technology for students.

The Affordable College Textbook Act seeks to expand the use of open textbooks on college campuses, providing affordable alternatives to traditional textbooks and keeping prices lower. The bill:

- Creates a grant program to support pilot programs at colleges and universities to create and expand the use of open textbooks with priority for those programs that will achieve the highest savings for students.
- Ensures that any open textbooks or educational materials created using program funds will be freely and easily accessible to the public.
- Requires entities who receive funds to complete a report on the effectiveness of the program in achieving savings for students.
- Improves existing requirements for publishers to make all textbooks and other educational materials available for sale individually rather than as a bundle.
- Requires the Government Accountability Office to provide an updated report on the price trends of college textbooks to Congress by 2017.

Supporters: SPARC, U.S. PIRG, National Association of College Stores, National Association of Graduate and Professional Students, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Association of Community Colleges, Association of Community College Trustees, OUR TIME, Creative Commons, OpenCourseWare Consortium.
Why Open Textbooks?

- Open textbooks are the most effective way to reduce textbook costs. While the existing marketplace offers discounted options such as renting and used books, the savings are incremental and do not extend to every student. In contrast, using open textbooks reduces course material costs for students by 80% - and in some cases eliminates it entirely.3

- Open textbooks are easy to access in a variety of formats – a critical feature in the digital age that traditionally-published e-books have yet to offer.4 Students can freely access open textbooks anytime, anywhere, either online or by downloading to a laptop, tablet, or smartphone. Students can keep digital versions permanently, and also can print or purchase hardcopies, typically for $20-40. Studies have found that students using open textbooks tend to have higher grades and lower course dropout rates, likely due to better access to the text.5

- Professors can tailor open textbooks to align with course needs. This includes mixing and matching chapters from multiple open texts, incorporating multimedia components, and adding current events and locally relevant perspectives. This flexibility is also beneficial beyond the college setting for parents, teachers, and self-learners.

- Supporting the creation and adoption of open textbooks produces a significant return on investment. Unlike traditional e-texts, which are typically "leased," once created open textbooks are free for everyone – so the savings grow over time. For example, a Washington state program saved students three times the project's cost in the first two years alone.6

Why the Affordable College Textbook Act?

The U.S. college textbook market remains dominated by traditional publishing firms that make it difficult for open textbooks to gain visibility – despite the potential benefits and growing international movement for OERs. While enough professors are using open textbooks to suggest marketplace demand for such materials, the current rate of adoption is too slow when so many students are struggling with textbook costs. Federal intervention is necessary to help open textbooks gain a foothold faster, which would provide much-needed financial relief and raise the bar for digital materials to ensure students receive the full benefits of today's technology.

The Affordable College Textbook Act seeks to proliferate the most successful open textbook efforts to date: local programs at colleges and universities that provide support for creating and adopting open textbooks and other OERs. By providing resources and incentives through a grant program, the bill would expand the impact of open textbooks to more campuses in more states, helping to stimulate the marketplace and to generate evidence for the most effective models.

---

3 http://www.studentpigs.org/reports/cover-cover-solution
4 http://www.studentpigs.org/reports/course-correction
6 http://www.studentpigs.org/resources/updated-cost-analysis-open-course-library
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Open Textbook Workshop for OSU faculty

May 21, 2014

OSU Libraries and Press invites OSU faculty members to learn how open textbooks can benefit their students in the classroom and in the pocketbook. This two-hour workshop will introduce you to the concept of open textbooks, their benefits, and how to find and incorporate them into your courses. As part of this exploration, faculty members will review one open textbook in the Open Textbook Library after the workshop, and receive a $200 stipend for their review.

Did You Know...

- The College Board estimates that the average student can expect to pay $1200 for textbooks and supplies in 2013-2014.
- The cost of textbooks is rising at a rate of 4 times inflation.
- 7 out of 10 students do not purchase a required textbook during their academic career because of cost.

Open textbooks can lower student costs without compromising their learning

- Open textbooks are freely available online, and can be used in whole or part at no cost to students.
- Open textbooks are often written by professors and other scholars in their fields of expertise.
- Open textbooks are often published with the same editorial rigor as commercial textbooks.
- The number of open textbooks is increasing across a variety of subject areas.

Where: Valley Library, Willamette Room

When: Wednesday, May 21, 2014, 2:00-4:00 PM

Workshop Application

Please RSVP by May 14, 2014. Capacity is limited. Please note that if there is not a textbook in the Open Textbook Library in an appropriate subject area for you to review, you are welcome to attend the workshop but will not be required to write a review and will not receive the $200 review stipend. We will work with faculty to determine if an appropriate title is available for review.

Questions about the workshop can be sent to Shan Sutton, Associate University Librarian for Research and Scholarly Communication: shan.sutton@oregonstate.edu

This workshop is sponsored by OSU Libraries and Press in partnership with the University of Minnesota Libraries, the University of Minnesota College of Education and Human Development, and the Hewlett Foundation.
Executive Summary

At the time the article by Cashin (1999) was be prepared, the ERIC database indicated 2,175 articles on Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET). Two general themes, or camps, rose from these articles. The first camp argues that SET forms (or Student Assessment of Teaching (SAT) forms) can provide reliable information regarding the effectiveness of teaching IF the items posed are valid and reliable. Literature in the second camp repeatedly demonstrates, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, that SET responses can be swayed by more than just the effectiveness of teaching. However, in many of these second camp articles, the forms used to assess teaching performance may have lacked the necessary proof of validity or reliability. In fact, those in the first camp, by their caveat clearly recognize that poorly developed tools lead to poorly correlated results. Obviously, there are many implications to using assessment/evaluation tools of indeterminate validity and/or reliability. The concerns are exacerbated if, as reported extensively in the literature to be the situation at many institutions of higher learning, that teaching performance is either weighed solely, or very heavily, on responses to these flawed tools. If comparisons are made to college averages, this could lead to perverse incentives and/or discourage innovation in teaching. Neither are ideal for student learning.

So, has Oregon State University's SET been demonstrated to be valid and reliable? If not, should it be tested? If tested and deemed invalid, should a new SET form be developed? These were primary concerns of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that commissioned the Student Evaluation of Evaluation Task Force. However, before thaw questions could be properly answered, the Task Force identified a few other issues to be considered.

The first issue, based on a general agreement in the literature, is that evaluation of teaching should be a final step of a problem conducted by a supervisor and based upon multiple forms of input. Therefore, student input (as with peer input) should be based upon an assessment of teaching, not an evaluation of teaching. What is the difference? In broad terms, an assessment consists of responding to an item with answers such as strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree. Evaluation asks for ratings such as excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, fair, poor. The problem with evaluations is a difference in value construct among the different parties (student, faculty and administrators) as well as different value constructs within a party (i.e. between different students in the same class).

The second issue is the timeframe that the current evaluations are conducted. Because the current SET forms are administered at the end of the term, students are asked to provide input that will have little or nothing bearing on them. By design, OSU’s current SET
forms provide summative information, not formative information. Formative information is gained at least once during the term so that faculty can make timely changes to their courses, when the students still can benefit from such changes.

The third issue stems from the wide variety in disciplines (e.g. engineering, language, women studies, etc.) and in the types of classes/courses (e.g. lecture, laboratory, seminars, online) offered at OSU. How, given the diversity of the programs, faculty and students, could a single form with a fixed set of items be an ideal tool to aid faculty in improving their teaching?

Members of the task force, with a membership composed of administrators, faculty, instructors, and students, met essentially weekly for over two years to develop a tool to improve student learning by providing faculty with input necessary to improve their teaching. Although membership has changed over the two-year period, there has been continued consensus of the Task Force to develop a tool based on assessment rather than evaluation, formative rather than summative, and flexible rather than constrained. Starting with an idea of what measures of teaching and learning the committee felt that faculty and students deemed appropriate, a bank of items were identified from a catalog of proven student rating items provided in Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System, by Raoul A. Arreola (2007). Because all items were presented in a summative fashion, many items were reworded to make them formative in nature. Each item, located under one of five major categories, was then subcategorized. To allow flexibility in what is to be measured, the faculty member identifies the items under the various categories to pose. As the formative assessment is to be conducted online, a textbox will be made available to the student to provide context to their rating of a particular item. It is the ultimate goal of this proposed tool to provide each faculty member with a menu of items from which they pick to gain the feedback most valuable for them to improve the course they are currently teaching.

The proposal of the SET Task Force is to implement a flexible, formative student assessment of teaching tool (SAT) in place of the current summative student evaluation of teaching form (SET), with the idea that a more comprehensive, diverse, summative evaluation of teaching be implemented as part of the annual review process. As part of the annual review process faculty would be expected to discuss the frequency and type of formative assessments conducted in each class as well as what actions were taken to improve their teaching. As a final note of critical importance, because formative assessments identify deficiencies in classroom instruction, responses should be solely under the control of faculty. However, to prove that assessments were in fact conducted, it is recommended by the SET Task Force that administrators have access to a list of the items used in each assessment and the timeline/frequency that the assessment were conducted.
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1. Charge for SET Task Force

Charge: Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force

Background/Context: For a majority of OSU faculty members who have teaching responsibilities, annual performance evaluations, promotion and tenure decisions, and post-tenure reviews are based, in part, on an evaluation of their teaching. As required by OAR 580-021-0135, “appropriate student input” shall be included in the evaluation process. The current student evaluation of teaching (SET) form is one means of input. The SET form provides a measurement (numeric data) from which supervisors and P&T committees make an evaluation or judgment about teaching effectiveness. Since the currently employed SET forms were enacted, additional research has been conducted on the purpose, validity, and reliability of these types of assessment tools. Therefore, to assure that OSU’s process and approved forms for student input on teaching are the most current and most effective, a review of our current form and processes is in order.

Task Force Charge:

• Identify the university values in teaching expectations.
• Compare and contrast the advantages and disadvantages of the student assessments of teaching (SAT) and student evaluations of teaching (SET) as a means of acquiring student input.
• If SET forms are deemed most appropriate, assess, using informed psychometrics, the validity and reliability of the current SET form and recommend changes as needed.
• If SAT forms are deemed most appropriate, consider new forms and provide recommendations.
• Assess the role of student input forms on teaching effectiveness and make recommendations for consistent use of the form in teaching evaluations across academic units.

Items to be considered:

• Identify any correlation between the current SET scores with expected and received grades or with other inherent biases.
• Survey students to determine their perceived use and value of the SET form.
• Identify factors to be considered in using student input scores, such as number of years of teaching experience, size of class, type of class, level of class, etc.
• Involve a consultant experienced in faculty assessments early in the process
• Identify possible coordination or links between the SET or SAT and the Learning Outcomes Assessment process of the academic units.

Committee composition and Timeline: The task force will consist of the Director of Academic Planning and Assessment, one member selected by the Provost, and four committee members selected by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee from volunteers of the teaching faculty. The committee’s findings will be presented at the December 2009 Faculty Senate meeting. The committee’s recommendations will provide guidance for (1) potentially updating or replacing the existing student input forms and (2) developing guidelines for use of the student input forms in annual performance and post-tenure review of faculty and in the tenure and promotion process.
2. Presentation to Faculty Senate

Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force

Final Report and Proposal
Presented to OSU Faculty Senate
February 9, 2012

Why Conduct SET?
- Improve both teaching and learning
- Provide students a voice in assessment of instruction/faculty
- Meet state OAR 580-021-0135 (3) requirements, which do not specify the current format:
  "Specific provision shall be made for appropriate student input into the data accumulated as the basis for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, and for post-tenure review. Sources of such input shall include, but need not be limited to, solicitation of student comments, student evaluations of instructors and opportunities for participation by students in personnel committee deliberations."

SET Role in Faculty Review

Charge for SET Task Force
- Evaluate current SET system
- Recommend changes aimed at the improvement of teaching

Additional Items to be Considered
- Survey students
- Identify inherent biases
- Identify mitigating factors (years of teaching experience, size of class, type of class, level of class, etc.)
- Identify links between SET ratings and Learning Outcomes Assessment

Problems with Current SET Form
- Summative feedback comes too late
- Require value constructs (excellent, etc.), which tend to vary between students
- Global/overall ratings (#1 and #2) ignore complexity of teaching
- May be influenced by situational factors
  - Inherent bias (diversity and legal implications)
  - Reduces correlation with learning
- Inconsistent use in faculty evaluation
  - Discourages innovation
  - Creates perverse incentives
Task Force’s Goals for Assessment Tool
- Focus on improving teaching
- Focus on elements that affect student learning
- Employ a formative approach
- Allow for evaluation of diverse teaching methods and philosophies
- Provide a flexible system that faculty can adapt to their course

An Assessment Tool Should . . .
- Permit feedback during the term, when it’s helpful to the class
- Allow instructors to choose items
- Limit access to the data to discourage misleading and invidious comparisons
- Address factors that affect learning (e.g., course design, classroom environment, materials)

What the Task Force Learned
- From students:
  - Expect confidentiality
  - Like the idea of formative feedback
  - Don’t know why student evaluations of teaching are conducted or how information is used
- From administrators:
  - Express a need for summative information

What the Task Force Learned
- From faculty:
  - Worry about inconsistent use of scores in current system
  - Have concerns about variability in value constructs
  - Doubt the validity of a single instrument for such a wide range of class types
  - Appreciate customization of proposed feedback

Proposed Formative Categories
- Instructional design
  - Objectives
  - Exams and assignments
  - Materials and resources
- Engaging learning
  - Learning activities
  - Classroom environment
  - Extended engagement
- Instructional assessment
  - Fairness
  - Helpfulness
  - Opportunity to demonstrate knowledge

Proposed Formative Categories
- Self-reported course impact on the student
  - Motivation
  - Cognitive expansion
  - Skill development
- Alternative and supplemental teaching/learning environment
  - Laboratory and discussion
  - Clinical
  - Seminars
  - Team teaching
  - Field trips
  - Studio
Proposal

- Change to a formative assessment tool
- Create a fully customizable instrument
- Rename “Student Assessment of Teaching” (SAT)
- Deploy online
- Allow teachers control of items used, timing/frequency, and access to data
- Report which items were used and when to administrators, but not results
- Include discussion of how faculty respond to SAT data to improve teaching in Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF) process

The SET Task Force Membership

- Members (2009-present)
  - Henri Jansen (Science)
  - William Loges (Liberal Arts)
  - Deborah Pence, Chair (Engineering)
  - Juan Trujillo (Liberal Arts)
  - Beth Valentine (Veterinary Medicine)
  - Kenneth Winograd (Education)
  - Christopher Wolsko (Cascades Campus)
- Members (2010-present)
  - LJ Duey, Undergraduate student (University Exploratory Studies)
  - Mario E. Magana (Engineering)
  - Gita N. Ramaswamy (Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation)
  - Marc Schure, Graduate student (Public Health)
  - Joshua Kealy, Undergraduate student (Business)
  - Sue Leslie (Academic Planning and Assessment)
  - Travis Margoni, Graduate student (Liberal Arts)
  - Peter Saunders (Center for Teaching and Learning)
  - Nancy Staton Barbour, Graduate student (Women Studies)
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- Vickie Nunnemaker (Faculty Senate)
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- Angelo Gomez & Anne Gillies (Office of Equity and Inclusion)
- Sue Helback (College of Education)
- Faculty, staff and students for their input
3. Proposed Formative Assessment Items

Below is an outline of the categories (A, B, C) and subcategories of items (i, ii, iii) to help faculty/teachers identify items useful for gaining student feedback. Following the outline of categories is a categorized list of items proposed for use by faculty/teachers.

Rather than relying on responses from students with different value constructs (excellent, very good, etc.), students will respond to the proposed items with one of four assessments: Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree. Because the tool is, by design, flexible and formative the need for a neutral or not applicable assessment should no longer apply.

It is envisioned by the Task Force that students will be able activate, from a dropdown menu, a text box to provide comments regarding their assessment of a particular item. Such an option was assured by a team from CollegeNET, the service provider for the current online SET forms.

It is proposed that faculty would conduct at least one assessment per course per term. Based on conversations with a team from CollegeNET, once a set of items has been selected for a particular course, it could be saved for use in future courses and/or terms.

A. Instructional Design
   i. Learning Objectives
   ii. Assignments and Exams
   iii. Resources and Materials

B. Engaging Learning
   i. Learning Activities
   ii. Classroom Environment
   iii. Extended Engagement

C. Instructional Assessment
   i. Fairness
   ii. Helpfulness
   iii. Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge

D. Self-reported Course Impact on the Student
   i. Motivation
   ii. Cognitive Expansion
   iii. Skill Development

E. Alternative and Supplementary Teaching/Learning Environment
   i. Laboratory and Recitation
   ii. Clinical and Professional Training
   iii. Seminars
   iv. Team teaching
   v. Field trips
   vi. Studio
A. Instructional Design

Learning Objectives
1. The teacher makes me aware of the current problems in this field.
2. The course adapts according to student needs.
3. I have been informed of the direction the course is taking.
4. The teacher does NOT provide a sufficient variety of topics.
5. Too much material is covered in this course.
6. The teacher does NOT combine theory and practical applications.
7. Relationships between course concepts are made clear.
8. Course concepts are communicated in a logical manner.
9. Course objectives are clear.
10. The teacher defined realistic objectives for the student.
11. Objectives have been stated for each unit in the course.
12. The objectives of this course should be modified.
13. The teacher’s expectations have NOT been clearly defined.

Assignments and Exams
1. The ________ [assignment] should be modified.
2. The assignments are too challenging.
3. The assignments expose me to diverse approaches to solving problems.
4. The assignments provide an opportunity to show what I have learned.
5. The exams provide an opportunity to show what I have learned.
6. The assignments are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
7. The exams are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
8. There are too many assignments.
9. There are too many exams.
10. There is too much material covered on exams.
11. The exams occur at appropriate intervals.
12. I have enough time to complete assignments.
13. I have enough time to complete exams.
14. I learn from doing the assignments.
15. Directions for the assignments are clear.

Resources and Materials
1. I have the academic preparation to understand the course material.
2. The course materials are understandable.
3. The course materials expose me to diverse approaches to solving problems.
4. The course content is up-to-date.
5. The course materials are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
6. I am able to keep up with the amount of course material.
7. I find the assigned readings too difficult.
8. The course resources made available help me meet the aims and objectives of the course.
9. The course materials are easy to understand.
10. The course materials stimulate critical thinking.
11. The _____________ [course materials] provide useful background for the lectures.
12. The course would be improved by adding a laboratory/recitation section.
B. Engaging Learning

Learning Activities
1. The teacher clarifies complex sections of the material.
2. The ____________________ [assignment/activity] stimulated my thinking.
3. The teacher’s teaching methods are effective.
4. The teacher emphasizes fundamental concepts in the course material.
5. The ____________________ [teaching method] is effective.
6. The audio/visual aids (charts, movies, slides, etc.) used are effective in helping me learn.
7. The teacher is attempting to cover too much material.
8. The teacher emphasizes the importance of understanding course concepts.
9. The teacher stresses important points in discussion.
10. Teacher presentations are well organized.

Classroom Environment
1. The teacher motivates me to do my best work.
2. The teacher stimulates class engagement.
3. The teacher is concerned with whether or not I learn the material.
4. The teacher gives clear explanations of concepts.
5. The teacher’s answers to students’ questions are helpful.
6. The teacher seems genuinely interested in what he/she is teaching.
7. The teacher provides examples that relate to my experiences.
8. The teacher treats students fairly regardless of their background or identity.
9. The teacher treats students fairly regardless of their academic background.
10. The teacher provides me with a safe environment in which to speak.
11. This course accommodates the needs of students with disabilities.
12. The teacher treats students with respect.
13. The teacher invites student viewpoints.
14. The teacher is knowledgeable about the subject.
15. The teacher is fair to students.
16. The teacher is well prepared for each class.
17. The teacher did NOT welcome impromptu class discussions.
18. Students have an opportunity to ask questions.
19. The teacher is enthusiastic about the course material.
20. The teacher does NOT pay attention to the students while lecturing.
21. The teacher does NOT write legibly on the blackboard, papers, etc.
22. I was unable to understand the teacher.
23. The teacher is audible.
24. The teacher fails to address the relevance of ____________________ [assignment/activity] to people like me.

Extended Engagement
1. The ____________________ [assignment/activity] stimulated my thinking outside of the classroom.
2. The teacher encourages independent thought.
3. The teacher demonstrates how the course is related to real life situations.
4. The teacher stimulates intellectual curiosity.
5. My experiences in the classroom pique my interest in the subject.
C. Instructional Assessment

Fairness
1. The teacher clearly explained the grading system.
2. The procedure for grading is fair.
3. Laboratory work is given appropriate weight in calculation of my final grade.
4. The teacher’s evaluation of my performance is fair.
5. My grades accurately reflect my performance in the course.
6. Exams are appropriate for the amount of time allotted to complete them.

Helpfulness
1. Results of the exams allow me to assess my understanding.
2. Results of the assessment activities allow me to assess my understanding. The teacher’s evaluation of my performance is helpful.
3. Assessment activities clearly address course learning outcomes.
4. Exams clearly address course learning outcomes.
5. The most recent exam was worded clearly.
6. The most recent assessment activity was worded clearly.
7. The teacher provides helpful critiques of my written work.
8. The teacher returns assignments quickly enough to benefit me.
9. The teacher does NOT provide sufficient opportunities for self-evaluation.
10. The teacher offers specific suggestions for improving my work.
11. The teacher informs me of my progress.
12. Course objectives are reflected in the assignments and exams.

Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge
1. Success on the exams requires conceptual understanding of the material.
2. Success on the assessment activities requires conceptual understanding of the material.
3. Exams require understanding rather than memorization.
4. Assessment activities require understanding rather than memorization.
5. Exams allow me to demonstrate my ability to reason.
6. Assessment activities allow me to demonstrate my ability to reason.
7. Exams reward original thought.
8. Assessment activities reward original thought.
9. The course activities provide me an opportunity to demonstrate what I have learned.
10. I liked the combination of different types of questions on the most recent exam.
D. Self-Reported Course Impact on Student

Motivation
1. I would recommend this course.
2. I discussed course related topics outside of class.
3. I participate in class discussions.
4. I am performing to my potential.
5. I will seek extra help from the teacher if I need it.
6. This course makes me look forward to taking additional courses in this field.
7. I hesitate to ask questions in this course.
8. I am more motivated to take responsibility for addressing problems within this field.
9. I am motivated to read more on the subject.
10. I am becoming more interested in the subject matter of this course.
11. I am developing skills needed by professionals in this field.
12. I am having trouble remaining attentive in this class.
13. I enjoy coming to class.
14. I would recommend this teacher to a fellow student.

Cognitive Expansion
1. This course challenges me intellectually.
2. The course helps me to become a more critical thinker.
3. I am learning how to identify central issues in this field.
4. I exercised analytical thinking on ___________[assignment/activity].
5. The course is helping me to think more creatively.
6. I am developing a better understanding of multiple perspectives on the ideas in this course.
7. I am developing a greater awareness of problems within society.
8. I am able to apply the concepts in this course to other situations.
9. I am developing an understanding of concepts in this field.
10. Attending this class is important to my understanding of the material.
11. For this course, I use my available study time effectively.

Skill Development
1. I am developing the ability to solve problems in this field.
2. I have become more competent in ___________[learning outcome].
3. I am improving my ability to communicate clearly about the subject.
4. I now feel able to communicate course material to others.
5. The course gives me skills that will be directly applicable to my career.
6. I am developing an ability to evaluate new work in this field.
F. Alternative and Supplementary Teaching/Learning

Laboratory and Recitation
1. The laboratory has adequate facilities.
2. The laboratory/recitation teacher adequately prepares me for the material covered.
3. The laboratory increases my laboratory skills.
4. The laboratory/recitation section is a valuable part of this course.
5. The laboratory/recitation teacher is available during the entire laboratory/recitation period.
6. The laboratory/recitation teacher helps me apply theory to solve problems.
7. The laboratory/recitation teacher uses the lab/discussion time effectively.
8. The laboratory/recitation teacher is prepared.
9. The laboratory/recitation teacher clearly explains the experiments and assignments.
10. The laboratory/recitation quizzes cover material appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
11. The laboratory equipment was ready for me to use.
12. The laboratory equipment is reliable.
13. The laboratory/recitation section is well integrated with the course.
14. My laboratory/recitation work is given appropriate weight in the formulation of final grades.
15. There is ample opportunity to ask questions in the laboratory/discussion section.
16. The laboratory/recitation section clarifies lecture material.
17. The laboratory section covers more activities than can be completed.
18. The laboratory teacher relates lecture material to practical situations.
19. The laboratory objectives relate the material to practical situations.
20. The laboratory/recitation teacher deals fairly with students.
21. The laboratory/recitation teacher evaluates my work quickly enough to benefit me.
22. The laboratory experiments are effective in helping me learn the material.

Clinical and Professional Training
1. The clinical setting is a valuable part of this course.
2. The instructor helps me develop good clinical techniques.
3. The instructor provides useful feedback regarding my techniques of physical examination.
4. My university supervisor provides useful feedback regarding my teaching.
5. The university supervisor is NOT helpful when I have questions about my teaching.
6. The university supervisor has adequate background knowledge.
7. The instructor provides useful feedback regarding my clinical interactions.
8. The instructor is NOT helpful when I have questions concerning patient care.
9. The instructor is NOT helpful when I have questions concerning client care.
10. The instructor's questions in clinical discussions are thought provoking.
11. The instructor provides useful feedback regarding my interviewing skills.

Seminars
1. The seminar is an environment that allows me to learn from other students.
2. The seminar leader facilitates inquiry.
3. The seminar leader invites everyone’s views in the discussion.
4. The seminar enhances my critical thinking.
5. The seminar enhances my communication skills.
6. I think about the course concepts outside of seminar.
7. I do NOT adequately prepare for this class.
Team Teaching (serial as well as collegial team environments)
   1. Instruction is well coordinated among the team members.
   2. Team teaching in this course helps me meet the course’s objectives.
   3. Team teaching in this course is effective for me.
   4. Team teaching in this course results in too much repetition.
   5. Team teaching in this course results in too much contradictory information.
   6. The team of teachers respects one another.
   7. Team teaching in this course provides me with different perspectives into course material.
   8. The team members demonstrate how to discuss academic differences respectfully.

Field Trips
   1. The field trips were well planned.
   2. The field trips fit in with the course objectives.
   3. The field trips offer insights beyond what the lectures and/or readings provide.
   4. The course would benefit from the inclusion of a field trip.
   5. The field trips provide useful learning experiences.
   6. The timing of the field trips was good.
   7. The field trips were worth their cost.

Studio
   1. The studio has adequate facilities.
   2. Working in the studio increases my skills.
   3. Work in the studio is a valuable part of this course.
   4. The instructor clearly explains studio assignments.
   5. The studio equipment is ready for me to use.
   6. The studio equipment is reliable.
   7. The work I do in the studio is given appropriate weight in the formulation of final grades.
   8. There is ample opportunity to ask questions in the studio.
   9. There is not enough time to do all the studio work this course requires.
  10. The studio instructor deals fairly with students.
  11. The studio instructor evaluates my work quickly enough to benefit me.
  12. The studio assignments are effective in helping me learn the course material.
  13. My responsibility for maintaining the studio and its equipment is clearly explained.
  14. The hours the studio is available are sufficient for me to complete my assignments.
4. Proposal to Faculty Senate

In lieu of the current Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) form, a new Student Assessment of Teaching (SAT) tool is proposed.

The advantages of the SAT over the SET are:

i. **Formative:** feedback is solicited during the term when it is most helpful to both students and faculty

ii. **Flexible:** no longer one size fits all, items can be tailored to the wide range of courses and pedagogies offered at OSU

iii. **Learning focused:** items are designed to gauge what is and what is not working for the students

The following is proposed for use of SAT in Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF) process:

i. **Teachers:** formative assessments identify deficiencies in the classroom; therefore teachers must have sole access to, and control of, SAT results

ii. **Administrators:** a list of items and the frequency of SAT assessments will be sent to administrators to ensure faculty participation

iii. **Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF):** a discussion of how faculty respond to SAT data in an effort to improve teaching must be part of the PROF process
5. SET Task Force Membership

- Members (2009 – present)
  - Henri Jansen (Science)
  - William Loges (Liberal Arts)
  - Deborah Pence, Chair (Engineering)
  - Juan Trujillo (Liberal Arts)
  - Beth Valentine (Veterinary Medicine)
  - Kenneth Winograd (Education)
  - Christopher Wolsko (Cascades Campus)

- Members (2010 – present)
  - LJ Duey, Undergraduate student (University Exploratory Studies)
  - Mario E. Magaña (Engineering)
  - Gita Ramaswamy (Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation)
  - Marc Schure, Graduate student (Public Health)

- Members (2010 – 2011)
  - Nancy Staton Barbour, Graduate student (Women Studies)

- Members (2009 – 2010)
  - Joshua Keady, Undergraduate student (Business)
  - Susie Leslie (Academic Planning and Assessment)
  - Travis Margoni, Graduate student (Liberal Arts)
  - Peter Saunders (Center for Teaching and Learning)
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UC Davis:
- UC Davis is currently exploring MOOCs. Numerous campus blogs about MOOCs, a campus visit from Daphne Koller, and discussed at various campus meetings.

Arizona State:
- ASU appears to be in the process of creating some kind of MOOC, either on their own or maybe for MOOC2Degree.
  - [http://www.mooc2degree.com/](http://www.mooc2degree.com/) First course in an online program is free.
  - Founding of MOOC2Degree: Academic Partnerships (AP) “helps universities convert their traditional degree programs into an online format, recruits qualified students and supports enrolled students through graduation. Serving more than 40 state institutions, AP is one of the largest representatives of public universities’ online learning in the United States.” Jeb Bush is prime spokesperson.
- Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University are working toward implementing MOOCs of their own. ASU is planning to debut a MOOC of its own in August, according to Phillip Regier, executive vice provost and dean of ASU Online.” It will be focused on helping people navigate major life decisions like going back to school, getting married or retiring.
- ASU plans to participate in MOOCs but will charge students who enroll there for credits earned in its MOOCs

University of Arizona
- Northern Arizona University and the University of Arizona (which offers a handful of courses via iTunes) have considered offering MOOCs of their own, but neither school currently has plans for the free online courses.

University of Illinois:
- Illinois joined Coursera in summer 2012, but says, “We may engage with other platform providers as well as offer our own MOOCs.”
- Four Illinois MOOCs are currently running on Coursera, and six more are soon to come. In addition to computer science, the courses include organic chemistry, economics and sustainability. Illinois is one of five universities piloting “signature track” courses in Coursera, in which identity is verified via photo IDs, webcams, and typing samples, and students receive a “verified certificate” of completion.
- Illinois has created a new competitive RFP process to determine which courses will be developed as MOOCs. All new MOOCs must be approved through this process. The first RFP was to fund the development of up to 10 MOOCs. The 3-stage evaluation process requires a pre-proposal, a teaching demo on video, then a detailed proposal.
- Illinois gives priority to courses that have highest likelihood of:
  - Enhancing Illinois’s reputation as a leader in online and blended instruction.
  - Attracting students to existing academic programs (online and residential; undergraduate, advanced certificate, graduate, professional) and new ones.
  - Containing significant elements that can be repurposed for use in credit-bearing (and, thus, revenue-generating) online and blended instruction.
  - Supporting research on discipline-specific online teaching and learning involving a diverse, global learning community.”
- Notably, Illinois at present doesn’t consider MOOC participants to be university students and thus they are not covered under FERPA. Illinois MOOCs are designed to be 4 to 8 weeks in duration.
• The university’s Office of Online & Continuing Education is providing faculty support for MOOC development. The university states the following amount of labor is needed for MOOC development:
  • “The typical online course requires 400-500 hours of instructional design support.
  • The typical online course requires 6-8 hours per week of the content expert’s time.
  • An online course can require anywhere from 20 to 1,000 hours of videography work (pre-production, recording, graphics, copyright, post-production, and archiving).”
• The university has a MOOCs@Illinois web site with resources for faculty, a “FAQ for Faculty” site (and a thorough “Guide to MOOCs at Illinois”)

University of Wisconsin-Madison:
• The University of Wisconsin Foundation is engaging with alumni and other donors for support and believes it is feasible to offer MOOCs with philanthropic support, thereby not diminishing funding for other educational innovations and campus activities."
• UW-Madison is a very recent (Feb. 2013) addition to Coursera, and has not yet offered courses. Initially, four courses (6 to 10 weeks in duration) are under development, including “Human Evolution” and “Globalizing Higher Education and Research for the Knowledge Economy.”
• UW-Madison will establish a committee to explore whether to offer MOOCs for credit in the future.
• The university’s rationale for choosing to partner with Coursera: “A large number of our peer institutions are already working with Coursera, thus Coursera offers an excellent alignment for delivery of our MOOCs. We will also be learning from our peers throughout this experiment. In addition, Coursera has stated that MOOCs will remain accessible at no charge and will be delivered without advertising. Finally, Coursera does not require an up-front institutional fee to join.”
• UW-Madison has a new MOOC web site and FAQs posted

Ohio State:
• Offering Calculus right now (Jan 2013 start date)
• Several more coming in September in Pharmacy and Science
• Using Coursera

Cornell:
• Cornell held faculty forum on MOOCs Oct. 2012
• With a $50,000 grant from Google, four Cornell professors will transform their class into a massive open online course, or MOOC, enabling them to offer the course to countless students worldwide for free, according to the University.
• Using their own tool, eCornell
• Students can earn a professional certificate
• Mini-Mooc in Nutrition (3800 students) in conjunction with UNICEF
MOOCs at Oregon State

DRAFT Policy Outline v. 5.1.13

For Oregon State University to develop and offer Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), there must be an intentional discussion about merit, rationale, faculty/learner impact, and fiscal issues.

Initial Factors:
To be successful at Oregon State MOOCs must include:
- Overall enhanced course design
- Student interaction
- Assessment of student progress
- Recognition that learners must be self-directed
- Embedded course analytics
- Recognition of added resources required
- Dedicated technical support

To become a successful MOOC provider, Oregon State must:
- Lead with signature areas of learning content
- Identify audience needs
- Recognize the amount of added effort required of faculty
- Align its MOOC activities with the Land-Grant mission
- Assess potential partnerships with Udacity, EdX, Coursera—or develop offerings on our own (or both)
- Develop a sustainable business model for MOOC design, development, promotion and maintenance. Business model will include:
  - Customer value proposition
  - Value chain
  - Profit/Cost Recovery formula
  - Competitive strategy
- Identify sources of revenue to support MOOC development and maintenance that don’t immediately require a return on investment
- Use an outcomes-based design approach to ensure learning activities are purposeful and measureable relative to student progress
- Recognize the value of improved teaching and learning that may come from deploying MOOCs
- Be more than just large “electronic lecture hall” experiences for learners
- Focus on establishing “communities” among learners
- Identify potential like-minded partners for development

Purpose:
MOOC development at Oregon State will serve the following purposes:
- Expand access to University knowledge
- Reduce cost of access to knowledge for learners
- Improve learner preparation for more advanced University courses
- Promote related degree and continuing education programs
• Improve teaching effectiveness
• Expand analysis and knowledge of the learning process
• Expand effective engagement with new and underserved audiences
• Introduce prospective students to OSU
• Strengthen OSU’s brand as a national leader in quality online education

Draft Policy:
• Oregon State University will explore the development of Massive Open Online Courses that complement current academic and outreach efforts. These efforts will improve learners’ access to OSU’s research and signature content areas in a cost effective fashion.
• Initial development efforts will rely on Open Educational Resource learning modules.
• Initial Open Online Course offerings will be noncredit and will help showcase other continuing education offerings at Oregon State University.
• Initial courses will be developed considering:
  o Current successful curricula
  o Targeted learner needs
  o Other potential partners in course development and marketing
  o Access to adequate funding to develop interactive tools that enhance learner experience
• Oregon State is committed to effective evaluation of the learner and faculty experience—before, during and after providing access
• Oregon State is committed to the full range of open access learning materials from full courses to open learning modules and textbooks.
• All open online course development will meet national standards for online learning.
• All initial MOOC course proposals (during the first year of presentation) will be reviewed for the above points by an advisory team made up of:
  o Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
  o Associate Provost for Outreach and Engagement
  o Chair (or designee) of the of the Faculty Senate Distance Education Committee
  o Chair (or designee) of Curriculum Council

Credit for Open Online Courses
• Oregon State University will continue to review possible options for which credit might be conferred after successful completion of an open online course from Oregon State as well as peer institutions and community colleges.
• Factors to be considered include:
  o Faculty input to the policy
  o Source and credibility of the credit
  o Business functions required for Oregon State to offer credit
  o Policies pursued by peer and competitor institutions