

9/27/13

Kevin Gable
President, OSU Faculty Senate

Kevin:

The College of Agricultural Sciences, Academic Programs Office is responding to your July 28 request for additional input regarding the reorganization of several departments into a School of Life Sciences under the College of Science. The College of Agricultural Sciences has not changed our view of the proposal, as stated in our response posted in the Online Curriculum Proposal System November 15, 2012 (attached). A brief statement of our response to your specific questions is provided below.

- 1. a. Does the proposed structure for organizing departments and programs in the College of Science directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?*
- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?*

The College of Agricultural Sciences supports the formation of a School of Life Sciences and is strongly committed to the continued success of the Biology Program. We addressed our key issues with the proposal in our November letter (attached).

- 2. a. Proposal originators responded to requests from the Curriculum Council by proposing to change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Integrative Biology. Does this proposed change directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?*
- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?*

The proposed name change has potential to affect our faculty, students and program, especially if the use of “integrative biology” for this program implies an ownership of the word “integrative”. Programs in the College of Agricultural Sciences and other colleges on campus are also involved in “integrative biology” teaching and research and in some cases have considered including the word “integrative” or related terminology in new organizational structures. Therefore, we find it difficult to construct a response with regard to the effect of the name change in the absence of any detailed explanation of the name change purpose and intent with respect to other units on campus.

- 3. Are there other elements of the proposal that directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?*
- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?*

As our November letter details there are several elements of the current proposal which may negatively affect our programs and suggestions made for ameliorating the effects.

- 4. Do you have any other comments or information about which Senate should be apprised prior to voting on the proposal?*

We appreciate that this additional feedback will be shared with Senators and with proposal originators, and that there will be additional opportunity for them to review comments before voting.

Penelope L. Diebel
Assistant Dean
College of Agricultural Sciences

Dear Virginia,

RE: Category I to create a School of Life Sciences

On behalf of the College of Agricultural Sciences (CAS), we wish to enter the follow liaison comments into the record. When our initial liaison comments were submitted by the College of Agricultural Sciences, we believed that further conversations between the biological science units within the College of Science (COS) and the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology (BPP) would lead to some resolution of the issues we have raised. Whereas we have no objections to the creation of a School of Life Sciences, we have continued to raise concerns about the elimination of the biology program and the placement of those majors under the supervision of zoology. The liaison responses provided by you in late July (attached) do not address these concerns adequately. Since the subsequent conversations appear not to have changed the CAT I, we wish to add the following information to the record:

The College of Agricultural Sciences remains strongly committed to the continued success of the Biology Program which annually serves thousands of students including over 750 majors (2010-11). All colleges with undergraduate students utilize core biology courses offered by this program, and the number of colleges requiring strong plant science undergraduate training requires that the proposed School not exclude a mechanism by which additional FTE can be added in plant science.

We believe key issues with the current CAT I proposal need further addressing.

- Structure of proposed curriculum committee may appear to include a voice for Botany and Plant Pathology (BPP) but since staffing for the biological sciences is decided only by members of the COS units and approval of curriculum requires those same faculty vote, there remains a lack of opportunity for meaningful input by faculty outside of the school. This is especially critical for BPP faculty, who offer over 27% of the biology program SCH. Whereas you believe this has been addressed, as the number of biology majors increase, additional courses will be needed. At present, no process proposed would allow additional plant science FTE to be assigned to a department outside of the College of Science.
- Incongruence with the Provost's MOU (Aug 19, 2010) that moved BPP to CAS.
 - "Faculty expertise in biological sciences at OSU is distributed among many units and colleges. It is important that OSU brings together those resources effectively to provide teaching, mentoring and research opportunities for its undergraduate students, particularly in the collaborative, interdisciplinary environment that is central to its vision."
 - Your response that you intend to honor the MOU does not address our belief that moving the biology major to a department of zoology is not in the best interests of the students or the university.
- Based on data provided by Program director Bob Mason, in 2010-2011, 30,404 SCH were delivered by the biology program. Of those, 8,003 SCH were taught by BPP and 234 by crop and soil science (CSS). That represents 27% of the SCH offered. In addition, BPP faculty advise

undergraduate biology students and host dozens of others in research laboratories for undergraduate research experiences. Under the proposed changes, it is not clear how students would retain access to those opportunities.

- The proposed construct of having a department of zoology offer a biology degree is awkward, especially since over 27% of the SCH are offered by faculty in another college.
- Currently, as an autonomous program, the Biology Program serves a diverse undergraduate population, engages all departments in the life sciences, and provides a broad foundation in Biology education. Zoology is a sub-discipline of Biology. The plan to administer a Biology major by Zoology has the potential to change student perception of Biology into a more narrow discipline at the expense of other sub-disciplines such as Microbiology, Biochemistry, and especially Agricultural sciences, i.e., plant biology.
- In the Provost's MOU, references are made to:
 - "The CAS will be responsible and accountable for contributing to a strong university-wide Biology Program, for participating in active advising and mentoring of undergraduate biology students, for providing Graduate Teaching Assistants for the Biology Program, and for working with the COS and other relevant academic colleges to manage and sustain a strong Biology program and curriculum at OSU"
 - "It is critical that the University continues to provide a strong Biology Program for its undergraduate students...Faculty expertise in biological sciences at OSU is distributed among many units and colleges. It is important that OSU brings together those resources effectively to provide teaching, mentoring and research opportunities for its undergraduate students, particularly in the collaborative, interdisciplinary environment that is central to its vision."

We do not see the proposal for the School of Life Sciences providing such an opportunity for broadening and supporting a strong major in biology.

Ultimately, the importance of biological sciences and the wide distribution of faculty with expertise in this area at OSU would suggest that the biology program might be placed at the university level; this has happened at other institutions. However, we are not proposing that at this time but rather that the biology major be placed at the School level and be managed similarly to how it has been in the past. We are sure that one can find many different models for how biology is offered at other institutions but the construct proposed here is highly unusual, if not unique.

Input from faculty who have taught in the biology program includes "I do believe that this point in time is ripe for action to address the current awkwardness in the administration and curricula within the Life Science programs. There has been recent turnover in leadership in both colleges and this category I proposal as well as liaison responses may serve as nucleation points for more than just discussions, but action that can mutually benefit colleges and departments associated with the Life Sciences." We believe that if the biology program is placed at the School level, that we can collectively work to address the concerns we have expressed.

The following Technical corrections are needed to the CAT I which we originally reviewed:

Table 6: BPP was specifically excluded from this table; further, FTE presented for MB faculty is inflated by FTE paid for by the CAS or the Center for Genome Research and Biocomputing (CGRB).

Correct COS FTE:

Dreher, T.	0.25 (0.25 CAS, 0.50 CGRB)
Giovannoni	0.8 (0.2 CAS)
Ream	0 (1.0 CAS)
Trempey	0.75 FTE (0.25 CAS)
Field	0.75 FTE (0.15 FTE paid by BRR/CAS)
Schuster	0.50 FTE (0.50 CAS)
Halsey, K.	0.75 FTE (0.25 CAS Patent funds)
Mueller, R.	0.75 FTE (0.25 CAS Patent)

Marshall, C. 0.80 FTE (0.20 CAS extension)

Fulton, M. 0.25

p. 20: Targeted student/faculty ratio (student FTE divided by faculty FTE): this calculation is not accurate; the 27% contributed by BPP is not taken into account here.

Cary J Green
Associate Dean
College of Agricultural Sciences

Feedback provided in response to a request from the Senate President on Curriculum Proposal 84452 (formation of a School of Life Sciences in the College of Science)

A. Feedback from Deans

From Larry Rodgers, Dean, CLA:

Hi Kevin:

Per my experience having led a substantial reorganization and having been on the front line of hiring a new CoS dean, I'll add a couple of points of discussion that are not about the specifics of the proposal but about how to get to a better outcome than might otherwise be obtained.

1. It was clear during the CoS dean hiring process that some of the college's labeling of its departments and its organizational structures were out of date when compared to the current best thinking of other Science Colleges across the country. Without weighing in on the nuances of what specifically is best, as it's outside my knowledge base, I would say it's clear that changes of some order need to occur.
2. During this kind of process, unless the faculty feel like the procedural rules have been followed, and unless the bulk of the messy conversations have happened in advance of any formal consideration, there is no way, regardless of the merits of any proposal, that things won't stall out.
3. While senior faculty, with longstanding histories in the university, tend to be the most vested in these processes, they tend not to have the benefit of having recent experiences at the country's best programs. Thus, it is important to seek out and pay strong attention to the input of junior faculty, post-docs and others who are not as vested in OSU-centric positions.
5. As to the specific questions addressed below, I believe our CLA faculty will work hard be willing partners with the CoS regardless of structure; whatever challenges are raised on our side of things are likely to emanate more from concerns about governance and process than about disciplinary terminology and related issues.

Larry

Larry Rodgers, Dean
College of Liberal Arts
Oregon State University

From Cyril Clarke, Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine:

Dear Kevin,

I have compiled responses received from colleagues in the College of Veterinary Medicine and inserted these in blue below.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Cyril

Cyril R. Clarke, BVSc, MS, PhD
Lois Bates Acheson Dean
College of Veterinary Medicine
Oregon State University
200 Magruder Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
USA

From: Kevin P. Gable [<mailto:kevin.gable@oregonstate.edu>]
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2013 11:19 AM
To: Clarke, Cyril
Subject: Senate action on Curriculum Proposal 84452

Dear Cyril:

On June 13, 2013, Faculty Senate considered a curriculum proposal (<https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals/view/84452>) that would reorganize several departments into a School of Life Sciences under the College of Science. Senate voted to postpone the vote on this proposal to the October 10, 2013 meeting, after a discussion in which several Senators expressed a desire for broader input than the liaison process had garnered. This letter is to request such input from you. This will be shared with Senators and with proposal originators, so you should expect contents of your response to be public. I request that you discuss the proposal with your unit by whatever process you deem appropriate, and that you return to me comments that address the following issues:

1. a. Does the proposed structure for organizing departments and programs in the College of Science directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

No direct effects are anticipated, assuming that the proposed School will still collaborate with the CVM in delivering graduate education (primarily involving Microbiology) and pre-veterinary, undergraduate education.
- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

No negative impacts are anticipated. The CVM supports efforts to integrate biological sciences. Indeed, we encourage further integration and expansion of the vision to establish closer, collaborative interactions with other departments not included in the proposal. In particular, opportunities exist to advance interdisciplinary graduate education.
2. a. Proposal originators responded to requests from the Curriculum Council by proposing to

change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Integrative Biology. Does this proposed change directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

“Integrative Biology” is an accurate description of the Department’s interests.

- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?
- 3. Are there other elements of the proposal that directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

Effects on the CVM are expected to be positive, arising from the overall benefits of integrating the life sciences.

- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?
- 4. Do you have any other comments or information about which Senate should be apprised prior to voting on the proposal?

For some units on campus the connection may be too peripheral but I would encourage some response to that effect as confirmation that you did consider the matter. I also realize that many faculty are away from campus over the summer, and therefore request that you respond by Oct. 1, 2013. I will send a timely reminder in mid-September. However, I’m sure that you recognize as I do our desire to give the proposal originators time for thoughtful reflection on your input and I appreciate earlier response where possible.

Thank you.
Kevin Gable
President, OSU Faculty Senate

B. Feedback from Unit Leaders (Chairs/Heads)

From the Biology Program faculty:

1. a. Does the proposed structure for organizing departments and programs in the College of Science directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

The Biology Program faculty are in full support of the merger of the Biology Program and the Zoology Department into the Department of Integrative Biology. The proposed change will have direct positive impacts on the students and faculty in the Biology program and the Zoology Department by bringing together strength in research and strength in instruction and student services to create a department that will better serve both the biology major and the zoology major students. The Biology Program faculty see no negative impacts to our faculty, students or programs.

Although not addressed in these questions, the Biology Program faculty believe that there will be similar benefits to students in the General Science Major that currently not only do not have a departmental home but also do not have any administrative overview.

Benefits to Students:

- The affiliation with a research department will benefit our students by giving them a departmental home and promoting more direct interactions with faculty members than a program model. This relationship should also foster greater faculty ownership of the student curriculum and experience in the Biology major. Biology Majors would continue to be encouraged to seek out the important opportunities, expertise and coursework in other units on campus as they do now.*
- Putting the Biology major under the deeper administrative structure of a research department will directly benefit our students and faculty through increased and intentional administrative and faculty support of program goals and issues that arise. The Biology Program is currently limited by size at times and would benefit from collaboration with a broader set of colleagues with which to share ideas, best practices, and solutions.*
- Being part of a larger research unit will also allow for the development of new curriculum, assessment and advising practices and capacity that are currently not possible given the limited resources in the Biology Program. These developments should ideally be done by committees within a department to ease the workload and use the expertise available from a large faculty. A working committee structure has been difficult to manage in the Biology Program due to lack of participation from other units and lack of numbers within the program itself. These changes would allow us to improve curriculum and student services in a way that will be a direct benefit to our students.*
- The Zoology Major students have already benefited by being included in the Biology Program professional advising structure, orientation, and programmatic assessment that is continually showcased by the university. The shift to Biology being part of the Zoology Department will increase the already extensive commitment of Zoology to students and improve the training and administration of both undergraduate advising groups.*
- Having a departmental structure will allow us to be better prepared to deal with the growth in student numbers in courses and the majors that has occurred over the past decade. We would be better prepared to strategically plan hires, courses and curricula that would directly benefit our students. Students directly benefit from being taught by faculty that have their needs met in a timely manner.*

Benefits to Faculty:

1. *The interaction between the Biology Program instructional faculty and the Zoology faculty will increase collegiality and broaden the content knowledge and instruction expertise of both groups.*
2. *Faculty will benefit from the depth of the Zoology departmental administration with clear expectations, working committees, and bi-laws.*
3. *There are no other instructors on this campus that do not have a departmental home. This merger would result in the acceptance of the Biology Program instructors into a departmental structure that has opportunities to contribute more fully to the service of the university.*

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

We see no negative impacts because an MOU exists that provides for continued contributions and input to the Biology Major by plant science experts from the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology.

2. a. Proposal originators responded to requests from the Curriculum Council by proposing to change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Integrative Biology. Does this proposed change directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

The Biology Program faculty believes that it is essential that we maintain the name “Biology” on our campus as a department. We view the proposal as a merger of the Biology Program with the Department of Zoology. The teaching and research in the Zoology department is much broader than the traditional definition of the field of “Zoology” and Zoology, as a department title, has become antiquated and has been changed on many campuses across the nation. Coupled with the fact that the new department will administer the Biology Major, changing the name to be more reflective of what we do while maintaining the name Biology makes sense. Also, changing it to “The Department of Integrated Biology” will be attractive to students and faculty and it captures the true nature of the new department and changes in biology in general.

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

There are no negative impacts to the Biology program faculty or students caused by changing to name to the Department of Integrative Biology.

From Lynda Ciuffetti, Head, Botany & Plant Pathology:

(next page)

1 October 2013

To: Kevin Gable, President of OSU Faculty Senate

From: Lynda Ciuffetti, Head of the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology

Dear Kevin,

Thank you for your request to provide comments regarding the proposal to place several departments under the School of Life Sciences in the College of Science. The major concern/objection for the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology (BPP) is the elimination of the Biology Program and the placing of the Biology Major under the Zoology Department (or under any Department). We provided our concerns/objections in our liaison letter of June 2012 and I have attached that document here.

1. a. Does the proposed structure for organizing departments and programs in the College of Science directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

As stated above, the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology does not object to the formation of the School of Life Sciences but rather to the elimination of the Biology Program and placing the Biology major under the Department of Zoology (or any other department). Please see full comments in our liaison letter of June 2012.

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

BPP requests that the originators of this proposal withdraw their proposal from the system such that we do not simply repeat the discussion that occurred at the June 2013 Faculty Senate meeting. This will provide the opportunity for the involved parties to work together, along with the help of mediation, and resolve this conflict in a way that could be acceptable to the **two major contributors** to the Biology Program (that is, the departments of Zoology and Botany and Plant Pathology).

2. a. Proposal originators responded to requests from the Curriculum Council by proposing to change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Integrative Biology. Does this proposed change directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

Changing the name Zoology to Integrative Biology does not eliminate the major concerns related to the Biology Program. It is a secondary issue. However, this departmental name change does have the potential to cause problems across OSU and will likely affect many units that are involved in Integrative Biology. Integrative Biology encompasses the big "integrated" view as cited by the National Academies Report on "The New Biology for the 21st Century". Toward this, many units on campus are evolving in this direction in their research and teaching endeavors. In fact, it was partially this concept in the 'Report' that was used as an example of why the Biology Program should not become a major under the singular discipline of the Zoology Department. Please see the comments made in our liaison letter of June 2012. Thus, for one unit to suddenly call itself "Integrative Biology" as opposed to a coordinated cross-disciplinary evolution of this process has the real potential to be misleading to students and to present a broad concern for multiple units at OSU.

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

Given the statement above from Kevin Gables that the Curriculum Council proposed this name change we would like to know why the Curriculum Council proposed such a name change and what benefit they felt this change would provide?

3. Are there other elements of the proposal that directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

Please see the original June 2012 liaison letter from BPP for details and also the liaison letter from Dr. Pat Muir.

4. Do you have any other comments or information about which Senate should be apprised prior to voting on the proposal?

We appreciate the amount of time and energy this process takes and the continued efforts of the Faculty Senate. BPP requests and encourages the originators of this proposal to withdraw it from the system such that it does not come to the floor of the Faculty Senate in October. This would provide the opportunity for those involved in the Biology Program to resolve our differences prior to consuming the consideration of the Senate. Please see 1.b. above.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda M. Ciuffetti
Head, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the Abbreviated Category 1 Proposal.

For more than 20 years, the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology (BPP) has been and continues to be dedicated to the teaching, training, and advising of undergraduate students in the Biology Program. BPP has a substantial role in the teaching mission of the Biology Program, and is currently the second largest contributor. Thus, BPP has been a long-standing partner with the Biology Program and this is something we value a great deal.

The BI courses our faculty currently teach include the following: BI 211, BI 212, BI 213, BI 301, BI 311, BI 314, BI 370, BI 370 (Ecampus version), BI 371, BI 420, BI 445/545, BI 570/670. Our faculty serve as program-specific advisors, train a large number of Biology students in their laboratory and field research projects, and also serve as Honors Thesis advisors. The Department provides a substantial number of Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) to the Biology Program, currently 25.5 quarters per year. The Department pays an unsustainable high cost (approximately 91%) for these GTAs through returned overhead.

As the Department and faculty invest substantial resources into the Biology Program, our faculty reviewed this Proposal and provided valuable insights. Although many points were voiced and discussed by the faculty, the main issue of concern was dissolution of the Biology Program and transformation of this Program to a major in the Zoology Department. Pat Muir and Bruce McCune independently voice some of these additional points through this liaison process; these points will not be restated here. The consensus view of the faculty of Botany and Plant Pathology, with which I agree, is that the Department is not supportive of the dissolution of the Biology Program and the movement of Biology, as a major, into the Zoology Department. Major concerns of this action are provided below:

- Pedagogical. Modern education is becoming more distributed, as students need broader exposure to more interdisciplinary instruction. The intellectual and human resources necessary to offer a modern degree in Biology are not housed in one department at OSU. If anything, the program should become more inclusive of the rich strengths in biological sciences on the OSU campus, which exists across different units. This inclusive approach fits well within the National Academies Report on “The New Biology for the 21st Century” and is an approach visible at some of the major Universities in the country; e.g., The Institute for Biology Education, University of Wisconsin, <http://www.biology.wisc.edu/>
- Practical. The Department of Botany and Plant Pathology has long been committed, and remains so, to the Biology Program. It is simply unrealistic to assume, however, that a department should commit its valuable and limited human and monetary resources to another department’s major. Also, it remains a challenge to distribute and assign credit for student credits hours; the proposed move would significantly complicate an already difficult situation.
- Education about the biology of plants and the role of plants in human life and the entire biosphere should be enhanced in the Biology Program. Movement of Biology to a major in the Zoology Department has the grave potential to short-change the

plant sciences in the minds of the students, relegating this component of their education as subsidiary to the biology of animals or bio-medical components. Biology majors need also to consider, for example, that it could be their job to find ways to feed the planet.

- Although not part of this proposal, we understand there has been discussion related to the potential elimination of the Zoology major and folding this major under the Biology major as an “option”. If this scenario were to become a reality, it would only enhance the branding problem for Biology and further exacerbate concerns addressed above.
- The extent of BPP’s involvement in the Biology Program, from our perspective, was not adequately represented in the Proposal.

In summary, the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, a unit that contributes to a substantial portion of the teaching FTE in Biology, was not sufficiently consulted on this matter prior to receiving a copy of this Abbreviated Category 1 Proposal. We recognize the faculty involved with the preparation of this Proposal spent a great deal of time and effort in its design. However, we do not agree with the curricular changes as proposed and request that additional and more extensive liaison be conducted to resolve the issues in a manner that is equitable to all parties.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lynda M. Ciuffetti". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lynda M. Ciuffetti
Professor and Head
Department of Botany and Plant Pathology

From Tony Wilcox (Head, School of Biological and Population Health Sciences)

Hi Kevin, below are my responses (in blue) to the survey being conducted by the Faculty Senate. The attached document makes the case that, since the proposed *School* of Life Sciences is not an academic unit, it is not subject to review by the Category I process, and, furthermore, should not be called a *school*.

As noted in the attached document, in my experience and interpretation of the Category I policies, the elements of the proposal that rightfully require Category I review are:

- changing the name of the Department of Zoology,
- moving responsibility for the BS degree in Biology from the Biology Program to the Department of Integrative Biology (formerly Zoology), and
- eliminating the Biology Program.

I have circulated this message and attached document to the faculty of the School of Biological & Population Health Sciences, and no faculty member has communicated any disagreement with the arguments made concerning the proposed "school" or comments about the other elements of the proposal (below).

Thanks for the invitation to provide direct input into Faculty Senate consideration of this proposal.

Tony

..... Anthony Wilcox, Co-Director
School of Biological & Population Health Sciences
College of Public Health & Human Sciences
101 Milam Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis OR 97331
(541) 737-6799
anthony.wilcox@oregonstate.edu

From: "Kevin P. Gable" <kevin.gable@oregonstate.edu>
Date: Friday, June 28, 2013 11:03 AM
To: Tony Wilcox <anthony.wilcox@oregonstate.edu>
Subject: Senate action on Curriculum Proposal 84452

Dear Tony:

On June 13, 2013, Faculty Senate considered a curriculum proposal (<https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals/view/84452>) that would reorganize several departments into a School of Life Sciences under the College of Science. Senate voted to postpone the vote on this proposal to the October 10, 2013 meeting, after a discussion in which several Senators expressed a desire for broader input than the liaison process had garnered. This letter is to request such input from you. This will be shared with Senators and with proposal originators, so you should expect contents of your response to be public. I request that you discuss the proposal with your unit by whatever process you deem appropriate, and that you return to me comments that address the following issues:

1. a. Does the proposed structure for organizing departments and programs in the College of Science directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

The proposed affiliation of the three "Life Sciences" departments in COS (Biochemistry & Biophysics, Integrative Biology, and Microbiology) appears to have the enthusiastic support of the

faculty in those departments and COS administration, and the collaboration of departments may well have the potential to achieve the positive outcomes described in the proposal. However, since the COS Life Sciences collaboration is not an academic unit, and all of the existing schools at OSU (in Business, Engineering, Liberal Arts, and Public Health & Human Sciences) are academic units, this collaborative affiliation of departments should not be called a "school." The schools that exist at OSU have varying organizational and administrative structures, but what they all have in common is that they are academic units, which means that they are the tenure home for faculty, the academic home for degree programs, and the unit level for budgeting. None of this is true for the proposed COS Life Sciences collaborative. It is important that there be a consistent meaning to the use of "school" as an organizational unit, and the creation of a "school" that is not an academic unit would muddle that meaning.

See attached document.

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

1. Remove from the Category I review any consideration of the COS Life Sciences collaborative because it is not an academic unit and, as a result, not subject to Category I review. This is a positive outcome for the COS, for it allows them to implement their plan in a timely manner, and to modify it, if deemed appropriate, without the cumbersome process and delays of curricular review.
2. A term other than "school" be used to refer to the COS Life Sciences collaborative.
 2. a. Proposal originators responded to requests from the Curriculum Council by proposing to change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Integrative Biology. Does this proposed change directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

We do not anticipate negative impacts with this departmental name-change.

- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?
3. Are there other elements of the proposal that directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?
- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?
4. Do you have any other comments or information about which Senate should be apprised prior to voting on the proposal?

It is clear from reading the liaison exchanges that there is controversy associated with the proposal to eliminate the interdisciplinary Biology Program and to move the Biology BS degree program to the Department of Integrative Biology, since the Department of Botany & Plant Pathology has a significant role in determining and delivering the curriculum of the Biology degree. We are not able to offer much advice on how to best resolve those concerns, but we recognize that it is important to sustain and support this successful interdisciplinary degree program. Biology courses are required in several majors within our school, and we are impressed by the quality of the instruction that occurs and the education our students gain in those courses. Our students and programs have an investment in the the Biology degree program and continued maintenance of its high standards.

For some units on campus the connection may be too peripheral but I would encourage some response to that effect as confirmation that you did consider the matter. I also realize that many faculty are away from campus over the summer, and therefore request that you respond by Oct. 1, 2013. I will send a timely reminder in mid-September. However, I'm sure that you recognize as I do our desire to give the proposal originators time for thoughtful reflection on your input and I appreciate earlier response where possible.

Thank you.
Kevin Gable
President, OSU Faculty Senate

(document attached separately)

Denise Lach (Head, School of Public Policy, CLA)

Kevin – I read the proposal to reorganize the SLS with great interest having gone through a reorganization in Liberal Arts three years ago. Thanks for asking – my comments are below. This reorganization stuff is hard work, but I think critical to shaping a university that will be not just sustainable but innovative as we move into a dynamic future. Also, while I know that budgetary concerns shouldn't drive reorganizations, they shouldn't be ignored as they are in the proposal. Let me know if you need additional information - Denise

From: Kevin P. Gable [mailto:kevin.gable@oregonstate.edu]

Sent: Friday, June 28, 2013 11:11 AM

To: Lach, Denise

Subject: Senate action on Curriculum Proposal 84452

Dear Denise:

On June 13, 2013, Faculty Senate considered a curriculum proposal (<https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals/view/84452>) that would reorganize several departments into a School of Life Sciences under the College of Science. Senate voted to postpone the vote on this proposal to the October 10, 2013 meeting, after a discussion in which several Senators expressed a desire for broader input than the liaison process had garnered. This letter is to request such input from you. This will be shared with Senators and with proposal originators, so you should expect contents of your response to be public. I request that you discuss the proposal with your unit by whatever process you deem appropriate, and that you return to me comments that address the following issues:

1. a. Does the proposed structure for organizing departments and programs in the College of Science directly affect your faculty, students or programs? **NO** If so, how?
b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?
2. a. Proposal originators responded to requests from the Curriculum Council by proposing to change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Integrative Biology. Does this proposed change directly affect your faculty, students or programs? **NO** If so, how?
b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?
3. Are there other elements of the proposal that directly affect your faculty, students or programs? **NO** If so, how?
b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?
4. Do you have any other comments or information about which Senate should be apprised prior to voting on the proposal?

I appreciate the amount of work and discussion/debate that went into this proposal – having gone through this myself recently I know that balancing the interests of the students, faculty, and administration is not easy. That being said, however, it is not totally clear to me how the coordination claimed by the proposers will actually happen with the addition of a Director and Executive committee for the new school but no real changes in the departments or structure of decision making there. I read in one of the liaison comments that the faculty in the proposed SLS are supportive of this organizational structure; of course they are, because for most of them nothing will change. There will still be decisions about budget, curriculum, hiring, P&T, etc. done at the individual “departmental” level where they have always been, without “interference” from any other department. It will be interesting to see how a part-time Director will be able to influence any decisions about School-wide issues in an organization that retains this structure; it seems to be adding an additional level of administration with limited added value. For example, asking a current chair to add Director of the School to their current responsibilities with an incentive of one-month of summer salary suggests to me that the proposers see this role as mostly symbolic – there really won't be much work to be done at the School level. And,

echoing concerns of the School of Public Health, it seems like some of the graduate programs in the proposed School don't meet the requirements of students enrolled/graduated. The proposal gets around this by summing all the grad programs together for a total that does meet the requirements even though the programs remain separately administered, etc. This doesn't "fix" anything, it just covers up the problems. I like the idea of a true School of Life Sciences that brings the programs together to chart a path for the future including input/participation from other Colleges and other Schools. This proposal doesn't quite get there.

For some units on campus the connection may be too peripheral but I would encourage some response to that effect as confirmation that you did consider the matter. I also realize that many faculty are away from campus over the summer, and therefore request that you respond by Oct. 1, 2013. I will send a timely reminder in mid-September. However, I'm sure that you recognize as I do our desire to give the proposal originators time for thoughtful reflection on your input and I appreciate earlier response where possible.

Thank you.

Kevin Gable

President, OSU Faculty Senate

From Laurie Schimleck, Wood Science & Engineering:

Hi Kevin – I have shared your Email with WSE faculty. One faculty member expressed the following concern:

"I see only a remote connection between the plan to create the School of Life Sciences and our Department: the name is so general that it may affect recruiting efforts in our and other units perceived (correctly or not) as related. In a general sense, forestry, agriculture etc. are all life sciences. In EU old ag & forestry schools are all renamed Life Sciences Universities. That includes food science, vet medicine etc."

Regards

Laurie

C. Feedback from Senators

Sal Castillo:

Hi Kevin,

I am in the Associated Faculty group; I'm not sure if you would like a consolidated response from this group, given its eclectic nature. For now, this is my individual opinion as an IR director. Of course, I don't have a direct curricular role, but from reporting perspective, I will say that labels can have an impact on how our stats are reported to state and federal entities or how we respond to national surveys such as the CUPA salary survey. Also, this can affect the perception of applicants and the general public.

Sal

1. a. Does the proposed structure for organizing departments and programs in the College of Science directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

For the most part, creating a school of life science will not cause any problem in reporting; we usually report at the college or program level; however, occasionally we are required to report at what would be a departmental level. But this is not generally a problem; it only takes a little extra effort to look up other information on websites or CVs.

Personally, I think this is a great idea to improve the administrative efficiency of related fields.

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

I don't think there are negative impacts.

2. a. Proposal originators responded to requests from the Curriculum Council by proposing to change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Integrative Biology. Does this proposed change directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

This change is more concerning, with regard to perception of what the proposed title represents versus other departments that have a similar "integrative" nature. I don't have a biological background, but from an outsider's perspective, I don't know why zoology would be more integrative than botany or microbiology. Unless we were merging the three departments, I'm not sure why one department would receive a descriptor that applies to the other two. I'm also not sure of the value to doing so. Is there an expectation that such a title would improve the research funding or enhance undergraduate and graduate recruiting? I would like to see more support for these, if that is the argument that is being made.

There is no CIP code for "integrative biology", although this may be due to the federal government's lag in keeping up with trends. In looking at a few universities with "integrative biology" departments, it seems that they are in biological science schools where the other department is "molecular and cellular biology", with microbiology fitting in the latter. If such a dichotomy is the long term goal for the school of life sciences, I can see why the department of botany and plant pathology may be concerned about perceptions and resources being affected.

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

Perhaps a title that is not as comprehensive, but still shows a breadth of mission beyond zoology, may be less threatening, such as Ecological, Evolutionary and Animal Biology.

3. Are there other elements of the proposal that directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how?

None that I know of.

b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such?

4. Do you have any other comments or information about which Senate should be apprised prior to voting on the proposal?

No other.

Chrissa Kioussi:

Dear Kevin,

As a faculty member of the College of Pharmacy I have no objections to move forward with this curriculum proposal. Please see below my answers.

Thanks
Chrissa

Chrissa Kioussi, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Pharmacology | Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences | College of Pharmacy | Oregon State University | 1601 SW Jefferson Street | Corvallis, OR 97331-3507 | Phone: 541-737-2179 | Fax: 541-737-3999 | Email: chrissa.kioussi@oregonstate.edu

Anne Gillies:

Hi Kevin,

I like this approach. As an associated faculty member, I do not think this proposal has a direct effect on my constituency.

I was a bit uncomfortable with the proposal when it came before the senate, because of those academic faculty who raised concerns but did not feel they were adequately addressed; this seems like a good process to pursue those concerns. I wonder how we might decide who "gets" to have "Biology" in their department name if it is a contested title...

Hope all is well with you!

anne

Shelly Signs:

See below. Thanks for asking, and have a great summer!

~Shelly

Shelly Signs | Oregon State University

University Events | 541-737-0724

From: senators-bounces@lists.oregonstate.edu [mailto:senators-bounces@lists.oregonstate.edu] **On Behalf Of** Kevin P. Gable

Sent: Friday, June 28, 2013 11:43 AM

To: senators@lists.oregonstate.edu

Subject: Senate action on Curriculum Proposal 84452

Dear Faculty Senator:

The following letter was circulated to academic unit leaders. I invite you to respond, should you desire; all responses I receive will be shared with the proposal originators and with you prior to our October meeting.

On June 13, 2013, Faculty Senate considered a curriculum proposal (<https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals/view/84452>) that would reorganize several departments into a School of Life Sciences under the College of Science. Senate voted to postpone the vote on this proposal to the October 10, 2013 meeting, after a discussion in which several Senators expressed a desire for broader input than the liaison process had garnered. This letter is to request such input from you. This will be shared with Senators and with proposal originators, so you should expect contents of your response to be public. I request that you discuss the proposal with your unit by whatever process you deem appropriate, and that you return to me comments that address the following issues:

1. a. Does the proposed structure for organizing departments and programs in the College of Science directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how? **Nope**
- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such? **No, I've been impressed with the reorganizing of departments into schools. While it may feel scary to some, I don't think it impacts students much, and in the end, creates opportunities for collaboration. The toughest thing for people like me is keeping up with who's the leader of what!**
2. a. Proposal originators responded to requests from the Curriculum Council by proposing to change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Integrative Biology. Does this proposed change directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how? **No, but names are important. The more buy-in early, the better. The more we can avoid giving one more thing for people to hold up as a symbol for hating the change, the better**
- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such? **Nope**
3. Are there other elements of the proposal that directly affect your faculty, students or programs? If so, how? **nope**
- b. If there are negative impacts, can you suggest methods for ameliorating such? **Nope, just make sure everyone feels as much a part of the new structure as possible. Since resources contributed to the education effort sounded to be a part of the disparity, then offering an opportunity for meeting discussion based on this ratio might be a solution that shows that the Faculty Senate recognizes this distribution. If this distribution is just one person's opinion, then it could be an opportunity to educate the individual on the true distribution/contribution of funds... but I suppose this could open another can of worms.**
4. Do you have any other comments or information about which Senate should be apprised prior to voting on the proposal? **I appreciate your transparency of process.**

For some units on campus the connection may be too peripheral but I would encourage some response to that effect as confirmation that you did consider the matter. I also realize that many faculty are away from campus over the summer, and therefore request that you respond by Oct. 1, 2013. I will send a timely reminder in mid-September. However, I'm sure that you recognize as I do our desire to give the proposal originators time for thoughtful reflection on your input and I appreciate earlier response where possible.

Thank you.

Kevin Gable

President, OSU Faculty Senate

August 5, 2013

To: Kevin Gable, President,
Faculty Senate

From: Anthony Wilcox, Co-Director
School of Biological & Population Health Sciences

RE: Liaison Input to the Category I Proposal To Create A School Of Life Sciences
Within The College Of Science

With respect to the purposes of Category I curricular procedures (<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/academic-programs/curriculum/category-1-proposals>), the elements of this proposal that require Category I review are: changing the name of the Department of Zoology, moving responsibility for the BS degree in Biology from the Biology Program to the Department of Integrative Biology (formerly Zoology), and eliminating the Biology Program. The Category I process is neither necessary nor appropriate for implementation of the organizational structure affiliating the Life Sciences departments in the College of Science, nor should this collaboration of departments be referred to as a *school*.

At OSU, the schools that have been created in the colleges of Business, Engineering, Liberal Arts, and Public Health & Human Sciences are academic units, which means that they are the tenure home for faculty, the academic home for degree programs, and the budgetary-unit level. Departments were dissolved and faculty and programs from these departments merged to create new schools, and such restructuring of academic units requires approval through the Category I process.

The proposed School of Life Sciences is not an academic unit. Unlike the recent proposals to create schools, no department will be dissolved to create the proposed *School* of Life Sciences, and it will not be the home for faculty tenure or academic degree programs. The Departments of Biochemistry and Biophysics, Integrative Biology, and Microbiology will still be the tenure home for their respective faculty, the home for their respective academic degree programs, and the budgetary level of operation (although there will be a nominal budget for the proposed *School*).

Therefore:

1. This proposal should have all elements pertaining to the creation of the *School* of Life Sciences stripped from the proposal as an action item. The collaboration and organization proposed for the operation of the programs across these three departments is commendable, and can be implemented on their own initiative internally within the College of Science. Since it does not create or alter an academic unit, it is not subject to Category I review and approval.

2. The organizational collaboration of these departments should not be called a *school*. As noted above, *schools* at OSU have taken on the meaning of being academic units, and it would subvert and confound the meaning of the term *school* if mere affiliations or confederations of departments were to also be identified as *schools*.

Taken together, not only should no curricular action be taken regarding the proposed *School* of Life Sciences, it would be a disservice to OSU if the curricular process were to endorse the creation of a *school* that is not an academic unit.

Since the guidelines specify that an Abbreviated Category I proposal is required to establish “a new college, school, department or program” (<http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/academic-programs/curriculum/category-1-proposals>), it might be argued that it *is* appropriate for the proposed School of Life Sciences to be the subject of Category I curricular review and approval *because* they are calling the entity a *school*. However, the inappropriateness of using the Category I curricular process hinges on the simple fact that what is being proposed is not an academic unit. Thoroughgoing University-level curricular review of organizational structure is reserved for matters affecting tenure and/or academic degree homes. Category I review is not necessary for strategic alignments that do not affect tenure or degree program homes, such as when the University created *divisions* aligning clusters of colleges. And since, to this point in time at OSU, the term *school* has been used in the names for academic units only, the term should not have been applied when naming the COS Life Sciences collaboration. Had the confusing use of the term *school* been avoided, it would have been clear that the COS Life Sciences affiliation of departments need not be reviewed for approval at the University level. Ultimately this is advantageous, for it allows the College to implement their strategic organizational plan more quickly and to modify it without the delays and burdens of unnecessary curricular procedures.

In short, because the COS Life Sciences collaboration is not an academic unit, it should neither be subject to Category I review nor bear the name of *school*.