

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Committee on Committees](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 2004-2005

Committee on Committees

Annual Report, 2004-2005

July 10, 2005

1. The Committee on Committees (C on C) is charged with reviewing proposed Standing Rules changes. The Committee's recommendations are submitted to the Faculty Senate. During the 2004-2005 year, the C on C reviewed proposed changes to the Standing Rules of the Academic Requirements, Academic Standing, Curriculum Council, Faculty Recognition and Awards, Library and Undergraduate Standing committees to allow the possible membership of retired OSU employees who are still employed part time by the University on these committees. The C on Cs' recommendation to approve these changes was presented to the Faculty Senate on May 12, 2005. In addition the C on C reviewed additional proposed changes to the Standing Rules regarding the composition of the Curriculum Council and approved these changes.
2. The Committee on Committees is charged with reviewing all Faculty Senate Councils and Committees on a rotating basis; usually performing five reviews per year. The Committee on Committees was charged by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to begin a five-year review of the following Committees/Councils during 2004-2005 The reviews are attached to this report:
 - Advancement of Teaching Committee
 - Baccalaureate Core Committee
 - Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee
 - Bylaws and Nominations Committee
 - Committee on Committees
3. The Committee met once on December 15, 2004 to discuss the charge to the committee and to make assignments for the year. The bulk of the discussions and communications for the remainder of the year was conducted via e-mail.
4. Committee on Committees members for 2004-2005:

Darrel Ross, Forest Science
 Larry Flick, Science and Mathematics Education
 Michelle Inderbitzin, Sociology
 Donetta Sheffield, Information Services
 Sherri Willard Argyres, Agricultural Sciences
 Dominic Olvera, Student Member
 Sue Tornquist, Chair, Veterinary Medicine

Submitted by S. Tornquist, Chair, on behalf of the Committee

**Five-Year Review
 Advancement of Teaching Committee
 Faculty Senate Committee on Committees
 May 2005**

This review of the Advancement of Teaching Committee is submitted in accordance with the duties of the Committee on Committees to review each Faculty Senate Committee at five-year intervals, using the following five criteria established by the Faculty Senate:

1. Do the Standing Rules clearly reflect the function and composition of this Committee?
2. Have the Committee's actions/function, as reported in the annual reports and by consulting with the current Chair and Committee, been consistent with their Standing Rules?

3. Do the annual reports provide a memory of the issues this Committee addressed, their activities, and any outcomes?
4. What has been the role/benefit of student members?
5. What connection is there to the University's strategic goals?

The Committee on Committees reports that:

1. The Advancement of Teaching Committee's standing rules and membership were updated and adopted in March 2002. The Standing Rules state: The Advancement of Teaching Committee formulates and evaluates statements of policy that influence the teaching process, including (1) teaching effectiveness and efficiency, (2) support, (3) dissemination of information, (4) encouragement of innovation and experimentation, and (5) appropriate recognition of good teaching. The Committee seeks information and opinions from students, faculty, and administrators in formulating statements of policy, and presents to the Faculty Senate recommendations and perspectives useful to that body in determining appropriate actions and positions to be taken in support of the advancement of teaching. In addition, the Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the L. L. Stewart Faculty Development Award, the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee, or to other committees or individuals as designated, in the granting of awards in the field of teaching. The full committee shall participate in the review and recommendations relating to the L. L. Stewart Faculty Development Award. A member of the Committee shall participate in the selection of the Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award, the OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Awards, the OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, and the Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award. The Committee consists of five Teaching Faculty, three Students, one of whom must be a graduate student and one of whom must be an undergraduate student, and the Provost and Executive Vice President or designee, ex-officio. The Standing Rules for the Advancement of Teaching Committee accurately and clearly reflect the function and composition of the council.
2. The Advancement of Teaching Committee's actions are available in annual reports every year from 1997-1998 through from 2003-2004. The primary duty is to promote and reward teaching effectiveness and efficiency. Members of the committee made recommendations for funding L.L. Stewart Faculty Development Awards and served on committees for virtually all of the university's teaching awards. A large part of the committee's job over the past several years has been to examine and make recommendations about the revised Student Evaluation of Teaching forms. The Advancement of Teaching Committee is also working on revising the Extension based Evaluation of Teaching form, and creating a bank of questions for faculty to draw from in order to customize their SET forms. According to the annual reports and information from committee members, the committee has been meeting these functions.
3. The annual reports of the Advancement of Teaching Committee provide a relatively detailed memory of the issues the council addressed, their activities, and their outcomes. The Committee has also posted some agendas and detailed minutes from their meetings over the past five years (although the postings end in July 2004; the Committee reports the minutes from 2004-2005 will soon be posted). In addition, the Committee has archived the enormous amount of data they have gathered on the Student Evaluation of Teaching forms and revisions over the past several years. All things considered, there is a clear memory of the issues addressed and the activities of the Advancement of Teaching Committee.
4. There are currently two graduate student members on the Advancement of Teaching Committee and one unfilled spot for an undergraduate student. While they have had undergraduate student members in the past, the Committee reports that they have had some difficulty filling those spots and they actively recruit student members every year. Student members offer a useful perspective to the committee, and have been particularly helpful over the last three years as they have worked to revise the Student Evaluation of Teaching Forms.
5. The Advancement of Teaching Committee recognizes that strong teaching is critical to student success and retention. As such, the Advancement of Teaching Committee is closely connected to Goal 2 of Oregon State University's Strategic Plan, to "provide an excellent teaching and learning environment and achieve student access, persistence and success through graduation and beyond that matches the best land grant institutions in the country." The Advancement of Teaching Committee contributes to this goal through their work supporting and providing needed information to the units and individual instructors on campus.

Submitted by Michelle Inderbitzin, OSU Department of Sociology, for the Committee on Committees.

**Five-Year Review
Baccalaureate Core Committee
Faculty Senate Committee on Committees
March 14, 2005**

This review of the Baccalaureate Core Committee is submitted in accordance with the duties of the Committee on Committees to review each Faculty Senate Committee at five-year intervals, using the following five criteria established by the Faculty Senate:

1. Do the Standing Rules clearly reflect the function and composition of this committee?
2. Have the Committee's action or function, as reported in the annual reports and based on consultation with the current chair and committee, been consistent with their Standing Rules?
3. Do the annual reports provide a memory of the issues this committee addressed, their activities, and any outcomes?
4. What has been the role/benefit of student members?
5. What connection is there to the University's strategic goals?

The Committee on Committees reports that:

1. Overall the Standing Rules for the Baccalaureate Core Committee reflect the function and work of the committee and are written broadly enough to cover most changes that may occur in the future that would affect the baccalaureate core. However, there is one procedural change in the Standing Rules that needs revision and four areas that may affect the Standing Rules that committee needs to address. The process for handling baccalaureate core submission dealing with writing skills requires revision. The present process, A.4., states ***All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which consists of the English Department's Composition and Professional Writing Coordinators, and the Writing Lab Coordinator, and this Board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals.***

Four questions the committee needs to address this year that may affect the Standing Rules are as follows:

- a. Should the committee review preexisting baccalaureate core courses subsequently offered on line? Presently, the university does not require previously approved on-campus courses to undergo Category II Proposal review when they are revised for on line delivery.
 - b. To what extent should the committee work on a university initiative to assess learning objectives? The committee believes this is outside the charge of their committee and it would be more appropriate for the faculty to address the issue, with participation from the committee.
 - c. Should the committee review transfer course work or transfer "blocks" that may align with the DPD requirement in name and number but not in content?
 - d. Should there be a Cascades campus representative on the committee?
2. Annual reports are available on the Faculty Senate web site for each academic year since 1997-1998. The actions and functions reported in the annual reports are consistent with the committee's Standing Rules.
 3. The committee's annual reports outline the issues addressed by the committee and the committee's activities and outcomes. The reports also provide subsequent committees with information about broad, outstanding issues that the committee may choose to address. However, small pieces of unfinished work may or may not be included in the annual report. For this reason and for continuity, the chair recommends that the previous year's chair be allowed to continue on the committee an additional year even if his or her initial term of service has expired. The chair also recommends creating a mechanism for conveying to subsequent committees the committee's methods of operation. The committee might consider writing Guidelines for this purpose.
 4. The committee is already at a good size and has good balance. The only gap is student membership. Despite efforts to find student members for the committee, no students have come forward to serve. The committee is very active, has a significant workload, and meets every other week, which makes it difficult for students to serve. The committee chair doesn't perceive the absence of student members as a problem, but adds that one might not know what a student presence might bring to the committee.
 5. The committee's work is connected to Goal 2 of the university's Strategic Plan: ***Provide an excellent teaching and learning environment and achieve student access, persistence and success through graduation and beyond that matches the best land grant universities in the country.*** More specifically the work of the committee, the baccalaureate core, . . . ***promotes a diverse***

educational community . . . promotes student development, encourages a broad and diverse educational experience, and supports student success

**Five-Year Review
Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee
Faculty Senate Committee on Committees
February 2005**

I reviewed the standing rules, read the reports from Budgets & Fiscal Planning available on the Faculty Senate web site, and met with the chair, Mike Quinn, professor of computer science, to discuss how the committee is currently functioning.

Do the Standing Rules clearly reflect the function and composition of this Committee?

As indicated in the report below, several aspects of the Standing Rules either are not directly followed or that the operation of the university has changed.

Have the Committee's actions/function, as reported in the annual reports and by consulting with the current Chair and Committee, been consistent with their Standing Rules?

The reports are consistent with my discussion with the current chair. The primary function of the Committee is to (a) oversee the fiscal implications of programs and make sure the deans provide the appropriate resources and (b) explain budget matters to the faculty.

Do the annual reports provide a memory of the issues this Committee addressed, their activities, and any outcomes?

Again the annual reports are consistent across time. Issues that have been raised are (a) the effort to review Category I proposals takes considerable time and sometimes the Curriculum Council and Graduate Council have already approved the proposal therefore not benefiting from the review and (b) objection to the \$2000 fee being charged to the proposing unit and should be paid by the administration.

What has been the role/benefit of student members?

Student members do not attend meetings.

What connection is there to the University's strategic goals?

The chair commented that the Strategic Plan will begin having an effect on relative funding of academic units and this will be the source of future discussions within the Committee.

Report on Discussion with the Chair

The following is a discussion of the issues and observations that Mike raised concerning the standing rules shown in italics.

The Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee assists the Faculty Senate in development of recommendations to the President regarding the University's budget and fiscal priorities.

No recommendations are given to the President. This is done by the University Budget Committee.

The Committee reviews the adequacy of resources allocated to existing programs and the fiscal implications of proposed changes in programs, enrollment, and budgetary priorities and procedures.

Not done. This is done in periodic program reviews conducted by the Curriculum Council. However, one of the main functions of the Committee is to vet Category I proposals. The Committee sees its function as overseeing the fiscal implications of programs and making sure the deans provide the appropriate resources. The Committee advises the Provost to oversee programs after they have been implemented to assure that they are doing what they proposed to do.

The Committee participates in the facility planning process and reviews campus building priorities.

Not done. This is done by the Campus Planning Committee.

The Committee consults with administrative officers of the University and is empowered to make recommendations to them during the preparation of the Institution's budget.

The Committee does not deal directly with the administration. Instead the Committee gives recommendations to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and has the role of explaining budget matters to the faculty.

The Committee consists of six Faculty and three Student members, one of whom shall be a graduate student, and the Director of the Office of Budgets and Planning, ex-officio, non-voting.

Very difficult to get any student member to attend meetings. Having the Director of the Office of Budgets and Planning as an ex-officio member is critical to the Committee. This person brings a deep understanding of central administration.

A member of the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee, appointed by its Chair, shall be a liaison member, non-voting, on the Curriculum Council

This is done and is very useful.

Further, a member of the Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee, appointed by its Chair, shall be a liaison member, non-voting, on the Space Committee

The Committee is not even sure if the Space Committee exists. However they do have a representative on the Distance Education Committee.

The Chair of the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee shall serve as an observer on the University Budget Committee.

Yes, the chair has in fact been made a regular member of the University Budget Committee.

**Five-Year Review
Bylaws and Nominations Committee
Faculty Senate Committee on Committees
May 2005**

This review of the Bylaws and Nominations Committee is submitted in accordance with the duties of the Committee on Committees to review each Faculty Senate Committee at five-year intervals, using the following five criteria established by the Faculty Senate:

1. Do the standing rules clearly reflect the function and composition of this committee?
2. Have the committee's actions/function, as reported in the annual reports and by consulting with the current chair and committee, been consistent with their standing rules?
3. Do the annual reports provide a memory of the issues this committee addressed, their activities, and any outcomes?
4. What has been the role/benefit of student members?
5. What connection is there to the University's strategic goals?

The Committee on Committees reports that:

1. The standing rules for the Bylaws and Nominations Committee do accurately reflect the current function and composition of this committee. However, the Bylaws and Nominations Committee recommends that at least two of the members of this committee should have extensive historical and campus-wide knowledge of the Faculty Senate and OSU. Also, the Committee suggests that a statement be added to the standing rules to require an annual report be prepared each year.
2. Based on consultation with the Bylaws and Nominations Committee and review of the annual reports that are on file, the actions of this committee have been consistent with the standing rules. However, as noted below, there are no annual reports on the Faculty Senate website for this committee for the past two years.
3. Annual reports describing the actions of the Bylaws and Nominations Committee are available on the Faculty Senate website for the years 1998-1999, 1999-2000, 2000-2001, and 2001-2002. Apparently, no reports were prepared for the years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004. The annual reports that are on file do provide a thorough description of the issues addressed by this committee, their activities, and outcomes.
4. Student members are not included on the Bylaws and Nominations Committee.
5. The Bylaws and Nominations Committee monitors the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, reviews proposals for changes, and recommends amendments for changes. They also nominate candidates for Faculty Senate President-Elect, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate. By ensuring the relevance and integrity of the Faculty Senate this committee is connected to all three of the University's strategic goals - to create a compelling learning experience for our students, staff and faculty; to be recognized as a top-tier university on all scales of measurement; and to treat the State of Oregon as the campus of Oregon State University.

Submitted by Darrell Ross, OSU Department of Forest Science, for the Committee on Committees.

**Five-Year Review
Committee on Committees
Faculty Senate Committee on Committees
May 2005**

Standing Rules

The Committee on Committees maintains a continuing study of the structure and effectiveness of University councils and committees and of their relationship to responsibilities of the Faculty Senate; proposes and reviews proposals for new Senate standing committees; and makes recommendations on committee reorganization and functions to appropriate Senate and University officers.

The Chair of each Committee/Council of the Faculty Senate shall, at five-year intervals, report to the Committee on Committees about its activities. This report must demonstrate activities which have enhanced the functions and objectives of the Senate. When no clearly useful functions can be identified, the abolishment of the Committee/Council shall be recommended. The Committee is composed of six Faculty and the ASOSU Executive Director of Committees.

1. Do the Standing Rules clearly reflect the function and composition of this Committee?

The standing rules clearly state the composition of the committee, six faculty and the ASOSU Executive Director of Committees.

The function of the committee is not as clearly defined. The question is how does one maintain a continuing study of the structure and effectiveness of University councils and committees and of their relationship to responsibilities of the Faculty Senate?

The Committee's standing rules state the Committee on Committees proposes and reviews proposals for new Senate standing committees, and makes recommendations on committee reorganization and functions to appropriate Senate and University officers.

Currently, the Committee on Committees reviews the standing rules and functions of 5 standing committees each year. The review is based on annual reports and minutes of the committee as well as conversation with

the current and sometimes past committee chair as to the adherence of the committee function to the standing rules. While this provides a periodic review (roughly every 5 years) of each committee, it does not necessarily result in a coordinated review of the relationship of one committee to another. Some committees fail to post an annual report of committee work, and many lack meeting minutes. The C on C does review proposed changes to the standing rules of other committees.

In order to effectively perform the work suggested by the standing rules Committee members should have an orientation to the entire Faculty Senate structure and the purpose and relationship of each of the committees that they are charged to review. This is necessary because committee members do not necessarily have prior knowledge or experience of the Faculty Senate operation.

A review of committee reports this year, suggests that the structure and composition of the committee system may be larger than necessary due to changes in the structure and the lack of annual report information and minutes. Perhaps there should be guidelines for how many annual reports can be missed before the committee is removed from the roster. Also, each committee should be required to submit, at least, the minutes for one meeting each year.

2. Have the Committee's actions/functions, as reported in the annual reports and by consulting with the current Chair and Committee, been consistent with their Standing Rules?

The way the standing rules are written the answer to this question is yes.

3. Do the annual reports provide a memory of the issues this Committee addressed, their activities, and any outcomes?

The annual reports document the committees reviewed each year. The reports also list any changes suggested by the Committee on Committees, the membership of the committee and any other activities for the year.

4. What has been the role/benefit of the student members?

It is difficult to evaluate the role/benefit of the student members. The student member of the committee has not been active in the last few years. Although some have been initially enthusiastic, they do not participate in email discussions nor committee reviews.

For the most part, no mention is made of the member's individual work performed, or assignments, unless it is noted in the minutes. Only two years of minutes are posted for the Committee on Committees.

5. What connection is there to the University's strategic goals?

The three strategic goals adopted by Oregon State University are:

- To create a compelling learning experience for our students, staff and faculty;
- To be recognized as a top-tier university on all scales of measurement; and
- To treat the State of Oregon as the campus of Oregon State University.

The Committee on Committees works to continuously improve the committee structure of the Faculty Senate who in turn helps create and assure the students will have a compelling learning experience.

The work of the Faculty Senate, and all of its committees, should be performed with the goals of a compelling learning experience for everyone; having OSU be recognized as a top-tier university; and working for the entire State of Oregon.