GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING  
March 17, 2005  
3:00pm, MU Board Room

Present: Pehrsson (co-chair), Steel (co-chair), Filtz, Francis, Koenig, Pederson, Rettig, Rockey, Selker, Strickroth, Tadepalli, Unsworth, Waldschmidt

Absent: Bond, Brown, Ciuffetti

Guests: Charles Boyer, Sam Stern

I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from March 3, 2005, were approved as written.

II. Category I Proposal to Reorganize the School of Education

Sam Stern, Dean of the School of Education presented a proposal to reorganize the School of Education into three departments and change the designation of the unit from the School of Education to the College of Education (see Appendix 1).

The proposal to reorganize the School of Education was approved by the Council

III. Category I Proposal to Eliminate Graduate Degrees in Plant Physiology

Charles Boyer, Associate Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences presented a proposal to eliminate the MS and PhD degrees in Plant Physiology (see Appendix 2). Although courses in plant physiology are of great value to several academic programs at Oregon State University, this particular interdisciplinary graduate program has not been effective for a long time. Since the retirement of Pat Breen, efforts to find a leader for the program have been unsuccessful. Numbers of students wishing to elect this degree have declined over time as well. Faculty members holding graduate faculty status in Plant Physiology and students currently finishing the degree have been contacted. No objections to termination have been raised.

Bruce Rettig (Graduate School) asked whether inactive students would be allowed to readmit and complete their degree programs. Boyer said that this would be allowed if the core courses have been completed. He is aware of only one former student in this position and agreed to work with that student to allow a timely completion.

John Selker (Agricultural Sciences) and Michael Unsworth (Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences) expressed deep concern about the declining availability of plant physiology courses. They argued that these courses are critical to initiatives in biological sciences at Oregon State University. Both would prefer to delay action on this proposal until a plan for providing the necessary courses has been put forward. Selker argued that it is easier to draft a proposal for a name change or modification to a current degree program than to develop a course proposal for a new degree.
Boyer and Sally Francis (Graduate School) agreed to the value of the courses, but argued that the plant physiology degree program is not contributing to the efforts to address this concern, which are described in Attachments 1 and 2 to Appendix 2 (the Category I proposal).

Theresa Filtz reminded the Council that one of the three study groups identified by the Council was studying service courses. Does this issue fall within the purview of that group?

Dale Pehrsson (Education) and Brent Steel (Liberal Arts) asked whether Council members would prefer to delay action on the proposal until Barbara Bond (Forestry), who is both a Graduate Council member and a member of the group studying alternatives for providing plant science courses is available. If Bond recommends that others, such as additional members of the study group and deans of Science, Forestry, and Agricultural Sciences attend, they will be invited. The Council agreed to this action.

IV. Clarification of the Graduate Council Decision on 700-level Courses

On March 3, the Council approved the following motion: “The Council approved a motion that 700 level courses that successfully go through the category II proposal process be accepted as graduate level for programs of study.”

Rettig asked for help in interpreting this motion. Specifically, he cited areas of the graduate catalog that might need adjustment, depending on how the Council’s motion is implemented. First, current policy specifies that only graduate credits may be transferred. If a student completes the Pharm D degree and then wishes to use some of those credits toward a graduate degree, how would this be interpreted relative to the 3/3/05 motion? Second, 700-level courses are now defined as not permitted for use as graduate credits. This might need revision; the Graduate School is unclear whether this definition is based at OSU or whether it is OUS derived. Also, it is unclear that the Graduate Council has the authority to redefine 700-level course descriptions. Third, residency requirements relate to graduate courses. Should 700-level credits be allowed to satisfy residency? Fourth, the current degree requirements require that half of the credits on a program of study be “graduate standalone” and the remainder “graduate standalone or the 500-component of slash courses.” How should 700-level courses be counted in interpreting this “50% rule”?

Filtz argued that formal approval of 700-level courses as meeting graduate standing by all levels of approval in the Category II proposal process would justify the treatment of such courses as graduate standalone. Filtz also indicated that the Pharmacy students in question are likely to enter joint D Pharm and PhD studies holding a previous bachelor’s degree. She agreed that, if any students were to take the 700-level courses while enrolled as an undergraduate and use those courses to satisfy bachelor’s degree requirements, they could not be used on a graduate program of study.

Francis said that she may need to seek the advice of the Provost on whether the Graduate Council has sole authority on these issues or whether others should be involved.
Filtz asked for quick action because the College of Pharmacy is recruiting students and the ability to use some credits for both the D Pharm and the PhD may be critical to some students as they decide whether to come to OSU.

The Council agreed to not amend its motion of March 3, 2005. This issue will not come back to the Graduate Council agenda unless necessary after additional information is acquired.

V.  PhD Learning Outcomes and PhD Degree Requirements

A group of Graduate Council members has been studying material (including an essay by Jules LaPidus) on expected outcomes of a PhD education. (See http://www.cgsnet.org/pdf/doctoraledpreparing.pdf). Among the arguments made by LaPids that resonated with Council members were the following:

“The ability to successfully carry out an independent research project has long been thought of as the primary, and perhaps the sole criterion for obtaining a Ph.D. With few exceptions, however, employers of Ph.D.s assert that this is not the only thing they are looking for, and that opportunities to function as an independent investigator are increasingly limited.”

“Increasingly, candidates for academic employment are being asked about their teaching experience and about their views on education, and some institutions (particularly liberal arts colleges or community colleges) may ask candidates to present a lecture rather than give a research seminar.”

The Council discussed these and other insights, including the focus on scholarship as opposed to research and the ideal of providing stewardship for disciplines. They agreed to keep these thoughts in mind as they review a proposal before the Council to allow an exception for PhD residency in one program and to review other requests that may come before the Council this year.
Appendix 1

Proposal Title: Education Unit Name Change and Departmental Reorganization
Name of Institution: Oregon State University
Name of Proposing College or School: School of Education
Name of Proposing Department(s) or Program(s): not applicable
CIP Number from the Office of Institutional Research: 13.0101
Date of Proposal: February 4, 2005
Proposed Effective Date or Term: Winter Term; Immediately following Board Approval

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.

In February 2002, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the reestablishment of the School of Education at Oregon State University as a separate entity after nearly a decade as part of the College of Home Economics and Education. Also in 2002, a new College of Health and Human Sciences (HHS) was created that included departments in the former College of Home Economics and Education other than education and 4-H. The proposal for the creation of HHS (http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/cat1sweb/HHP_final.htm) specifically indicated that a separate Category I proposal related to the School of Education and Department of 4-H Youth Development would be submitted later.

As part of the College of Home Economics and Education from 1992 to 2002, the School of Education functioned very much like a large department with a number of different program areas (i.e. adult education, community college leadership, counseling education, elementary education, family and consumer science education, and professional technical education).

When the School of Education was reestablished as a separate unit in the spring of 2002, the Department of 4-H Youth Development (formerly in the College of Home Economics and Education) and the College Student Services Administration program (formerly in the Graduate School) were added to the School of Education. During the first year of operation as a new School of Education (2002-2003), it became clear that an organizational structure made up of many small programs was inefficient and served as a barrier to interdisciplinary and collaborative activity. Therefore, through deliberations with faculty, staff, and stakeholders, a new organizational structure with three major departments was developed.

**Department of Teacher and Counselor Education** (includes program areas in teacher and counselor education)
- Education Double Degree BA/BS
- Master of Arts in Teaching MAT
- Master of Education, EdM
- Doctorate of Education, EdD/PhD
- Doctorate of Counseling, PhD

**Department of Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership** (includes the
program areas of adult education, college student services administration, and community college leadership)

- Adult Education, EdM
- College Student Services Administration, EdM/MS
- Community College Leadership, EdD/PhD

**Department of 4-H Youth Development Education** (an existing department, formerly in the College of Home Economics and Education)

- Youth development and educational programs in every Oregon county. During 2003-04, these programs involved more than 6,000 adult volunteers and more than 100,000 youth.

As part of this reorganization it is also appropriate to also consider the name of the education unit at OSU. Prior to being identified as a School in 199 (as part of the merger with Home Economics), the unit was identified as a College. Designation as a College makes more sense now. Most education units at land grant universities are colleges, such as those at the University of Illinois, Ohio State University, and Pennsylvania State University. There are some that are identified as schools, but usually only when they are part of a larger college, such as the School of Education at Colorado State University that is part of the College of Applied Human Sciences.

Designation as a School is not consistent with OSU’s current organizational context. There is no other freestanding academic unit headed by a dean that is designated as a school. Designation as a school is becoming more confusing, particularly now that we are naming major units within colleges as schools (e.g. School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science within the College of Engineering.) Designation as a College will more accurately reflect the growth of Education, the importance of the work in support of OSU’s strategic plan, and the need for improvement and innovation in education at all levels in Oregon and the rest of the nation.

2. **Location within the institution's organizational structure. Include "before" and "after" organizational charts (show reporting lines all the way up to the Provost).**

Location within OSU’s organizational structure is the same as before with the unit designated as a “college” rather than a “school.” The organizational structure within the College will be changed through the formation of three departments rather than a very large number of loosely organized programs representing as few as one or two faculty members.
School of Education Organizational Chart (Before)

Dean (Stern)

- Adult Education Program Coordinator
- Agriculture Education Program Coordinator *
- Community College Leadership Program Coordinator
- College Student Services Administration Program Coordinator
- Counselor Education Program Coordinator
- Elementary Education Program Coordinator
- Family & Consumer Science Education Program Coordinator
- Foreign Language Program Coordinator *
- Health Education Program Coordinator *
- Language Arts Program Coordinator
- Music Education Program Coordinator *
- Physical Education Program Coordinator *
- Professional Technical Education Program Coordinator
- Science & Math Education Program Coordinator *
- Teacher Leadership Doctoral Program Coordinator
- 4-H Program Leader/Department Head

* In collaboration with other OSU Colleges
3. Objectives, functions (e.g., instruction, research, public service), and activities of the proposed unit.

The proposed unit name change and departmental organization are intended to improve effectiveness and innovation in instruction, research, and public service activities. It is anticipated that the departmental structure will facilitate alignment with OSU strategic goals:

1. Provide outstanding academic programs that further strengthen our performance and pre-eminence in the five thematic areas.

2. 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.

3. Substantially increase revenues from private fundraising, partnerships, research grants, and technology transfers while strengthening our ability to more effectively invest and allocate resources.

Furthermore, the proposed departmental organization will greatly help our ability to provide systematic assessment of unit performance.

4. Resources needed, if any: personnel, FTE academic, FTE classified, facilities and equipment.

No additional resources will be required for personnel, facilities and equipment. There are existing positions for Dean of Education (Sam Stern) and an Associate Dean for Research and Operations (Allan Brazier). There is an existing Department Head position for 4-H Youth Development Education (currently Lillian Larwood on an interim appointment). Program coordinator FTE will be consolidated into department chair positions for Teacher and Counselor Education and Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership. Farah Ibrahim will serve as Department Chair for Teacher and Counselor Education and Rich Shintaku will serve as Department Chair for Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership.
Below is a summary of personnel in the School of Education (Fall, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments (proposed)</th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Recurring Fixed-Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education &amp; Higher Education Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Counselor Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Youth Development</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty count does not include part-time fixed term faculty and the large number of clinical faculty who supervise teaching and counseling internships. The School of Education has partnerships for the placement of student teachers and counseling interns with 136 of the 198 Oregon school districts.

The total student head count and SCH numbers for the 2003-2004 academic year as reported in Data Warehouse by course prefix are:

- Unduplicated head count: 1,831
- Student credit hours: 17,029

**Funding sources:** state sources (institutional funds - state general fund, tuition and fees, indirect cost recoveries), federal funds, other funds as specified.

Only minimal new expenditures will be required; e.g. stationary and signage. The funds required for the name change will come from internal reallocation in the dean’s office.

See Appendix B

5. **Relationship of the proposed unit to the institutional mission.**

The proposed unit name change and departmental organization is consistent with the organization of other OSU units and will better facilitate alignment with OSU’s mission and goals. The proposed change will also significantly improve the operation and marketing of OSU education programs and better position them for success. It is anticipated that the new departmental organization will facilitate much better communication and collaboration with all OSU offices, including the Graduate School, Registrar’s Office, Cascades Campus and Extended Campus. The proposed unit name change will be viewed as a very positive development by the more than 14,000 OSU education alums (more than 10% of all OSU alums) and will be helpful in the university’s capital campaign.

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

See Appendix A
7. **Relationship of the proposed unit to programs at other institutions in the state.**

The proposed change is an internal organizational change with no anticipated impact on other institutions.

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

Programs in the proposed Department of Teacher and Counselor Education are accredited by the Oregon Teachers Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) and nationally accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP). The proposed departmental organization is highly consistent with the expectations of these organizations.

In the final report of their last accreditation site visit in 2001, TSPC (the teacher certification authority in Oregon) required us to “… establish a clear line of authority through the implementation of the plan for the reorganization of the unit.” More specifically, TSPC has recommended that, “The unit should continue the work toward the development of a new organizational structure with a focus on the leadership and a line of authority that will foster growth and innovation in recognizing resource development in personnel, finance, and program development that is responsive to the community of diverse learners in the region.”

This proposed reorganization will respond directly to the concerns raised by both TSPC and NCATE during their last join accreditation visit.

**Appendices:**

Appendix A. School of Education Strategic Plan Executive Summary

Appendix B. 4-Year Budget Projection
Appendix 2

Draft

PROPOSAL TO TERMINATE THE PLANT PHYSIOLOGY GRADUATE PROGRAM
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
CIP # 26-0307
December 28, 2004 (Revised February 5, 2005)
EFFECTIVE: Fall Term 2005

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.

The graduate degree program in Plant Physiology has never met the potential anticipated at the time it was created. A principal factor was the rapid rise of molecular approaches to the study of plant biology. As a result, most graduate students have opted to pursue degrees in Molecular and Cellular Biology. Over time many of the faculty who founded the program have retired. The program is currently leaderless and has had no core activities for several years. A committee convened by Dean Sally Francis recommended that the program be terminated in 2004. (See attached letter dated February 2, 2004)

The recommendation for termination was based on a lack of faculty interest and low student numbers. Dean Francis approved program termination based on her discussions with Deans Bloomer, Arnold, and Salwasser (COS, CAS and COF). A copy of her decision is attached (attached e-mail dated April 12, 2004).

2. Location within the institution’s organizational structure. Include “before” and “after” organizational charts (show reporting lines all the way up to the Provost).

Not Applicable

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?

Course offerings for this graduate program were assembled from existing courses offered by many departments. The program only offered blanket number courses. No non-blanket course offered at this time will be eliminated. Thus the four remaining students in the program will be able to complete their course work without difficulty. Currently a group of faculty and departmental administrators from several colleges are developing a plan for a Plant Biology Faculty. As part of these efforts, the group is working to
ensure OSU has a wide array of course offerings needed for plant based graduate programs. This organization should provide a flexible way to support the needs of several existing programs and departments. This is indeed aligned with national trends as evidenced by the American Society of Plant Physiology renaming itself the American Society of Plant Biology (ASPB) in the late 1990s in recognition that plant physiology was a cornerstone to the broader discipline of plant biology.

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

Not Applicable

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

Throughout the years the Plant Physiology Graduate Program was provided a small stipend from the Graduate School for secretarial and office support for the program. This support was accomplished by utilizing department based office personnel. The stipend has not been provided for several years, as the program did not have a director. At no time were faculty lines or support personnel part of the program budget. Therefore, the termination of the program will have no effect on faculty of support personnel.

5. **Funding sources: state sources (institutional funds – state general fund, tuition and fees, indirect costs 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).

   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.]

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

As described above, the program has received a small stipend (for $5,000 to $10,000 annually). The graduate school will be able to reallocate these funds to productive programs.

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

The termination of this program will have little effect on OSU’s progress toward fulfilling its mission and meeting its goals. During the past 10 years, eleven students have enrolled in the Plant Physiology Graduate program. Most of these students have been international. Future students can obtain similar training in other graduate programs. Instructional needs in plant physiology will continue to be delivered through many departments. The group mentioned in 3.a. will continue to work to ensure a the breadth and depth of plant biology courses (including plant physiology) are delivered at OSU.

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

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable
ATTACHMENTS

1. February 02, 2004     Letter from working group recommending program termination
2. April 05, 2004           E-mail from Sally Francis indicating agreement among the respective deans to eliminate the program.
Status of Graduate Instruction in Plant Physiology at OSU

February 2, 2004

Working Group: Barbara Bond
Charles Boyer
Stella Coakley
Barbara Gartner
Glenn Howe
Russell Karow

Contributors: Kermit Cromack
Paul Doescher
Les Fuchigami
Mark Harmon
Robin Rose
Richard Waring
Adam Taylor (Ph.D. student)

Overview:

The status of plant physiology as a discipline has changed both at Oregon State University (OSU) and elsewhere over the past couple of decades. In the 1970s and 1980s, a large number of faculty in three colleges (Science, Agriculture and Forestry) taught courses and/or conducted research related to plant physiology. When the Plant Physiology Program was established at OSU in 1987, it filled a need for coordinating the offering of a graduate degree in this area. With the establishment of the Molecular and Cellular Biology Program in 1991, many recently-hired faculty and students found that program a better fit for their interests. In recent years, most of the faculty originally associated with the Plant Physiology Program have retired or changed positions, and most of those positions have either been eliminated or re-defined. Individual departments have adjusted to these changes, but the impacts of the collective loss of faculty and courses on the institution as a whole have not been considered. In a memorandum dated September 10, 2003, Dr. Sally Francis invited a group of interested faculty and department heads to consider these impacts. Dr. Francis posed three questions:

1. What role is there at OSU for a formal plant physiology graduate program?
2. What faculty strength is needed in plant physiology? What research needs does it serve?
3. How can plant physiology expertise (both teaching and research) be coordinated across departments?

A six-member working group (named above) met on Oct. 17, 2003 to share information and formulate responses to Dr. Francis' questions, and this report summarizes the consensus of that group. In addition, several others (also named above) contributed perspectives via email messages or conversations with members of the working group, and where possible the report incorporates their input.

What role is there at OSU for a formal plant physiology graduate program?

The working group recommends eliminating this degree program. The program has not had a budget since about 1995 and has had no active recruitment of students for many years. Since the retirement of
long-term director, Pat Breen, it has had no leadership. Five of the ten "core" courses in the program are no longer offered due to faculty retirements and reassignments.

One criterion of a valuable program is whether it is attracting high-quality graduate students that would not have come to OSU otherwise. Since the Plant Physiology program was initiated more than 15 years ago, three M.S. students and ten Ph.D. students have graduated from the program. Four Ph.D. students are currently enrolled. At least three of the Ph.D. graduates were already committed to graduate work at OSU before they opted to add or change to the program. Although three international students came to OSU specifically because of the program, it appears that the primary incentive for most others to come to OSU was a particular research group, professor, or research opportunity. The Plant Physiology program has been a good option for these students, but not a decisive factor in their coming here.

Research priorities at national and local levels change over time as questions are answered in one arena and urgent questions arise in others. Plant physiology no longer holds the separate research prominence it once held as a stand alone discipline. Indeed, the American Society of Plant Physiology renamed itself the American Society of Plant Biology (ASPB) in the late 1990s in recognition that plant physiology was a cornerstone to the broader discipline of plant biology. There remains a critical need to provide graduate-level education in plant physiology and related areas to support emerging research areas in many aspects of plant biology. Although the working group recommends eliminating the degree program in plant physiology, we think it is critical to the mission of the university to maintain high-quality opportunities in graduate education in plant physiology and related areas. This is described in more detail below. There is value in maintaining the group identity of an interdisciplinary teaching/research program in plant physiology or the broader area of plant biology to support the teaching and research mission at OSU.

What faculty strength is needed in plant physiology? What research needs does its serve?

Graduate instruction in some aspect of plant physiology is either required by or desirable for & following programs:

A. Existing graduate programs
   - Bioresource Engineering (Water related)
   - Botany and Plant Pathology
   - Crop Science (Cereal Breeding and Genetics, Crop Physiology, Crop Production, Forage and Pasture Management, Hop Breeding and Genetics, New Crops, Oilseed Crop Breeding and Genetics, Potato Production, Seed Physiology, Seed Production and Technology, and Weed Science)
   - Horticulture
   - Rangeland Resources (Ecology of Rangelands, Physiological Ecology, Range Improvement, Range Nutrition, Riparian Zone Management, Watershed Management)
   - Forest Resources (Silviculture)
   - Forest Engineering
   - Forest Science (Silviculture, Tree Physiology, Forest Ecology, Forest Genetics)
   - Environmental Science
   - Civil Engineering

B. Pending interdisciplinary programs. (These programs are all in some stage of development. However, the fact that they are being considered as formal programs suggests these areas are recognized as important, emergent synthesis areas that have strong support at OSU).

   Global Change Biology
The Departments of Crop and Soil Science, Horticulture and Botany and Plant Pathology are currently offering courses in plant physiology for their graduate programs, although course offerings have been severely reduced. In other units (for example, the Tree Physiology option in Forest Science), lack of appropriate courses is problematic.

The instructional needs of these programs vary widely. When the working group tried to define the "core" areas of plant physiology that should be covered in graduate instruction to support these varied programs (i.e., to answer directly the question "what faculty strength is needed?"), they concluded that the chapters of good, current plant physiology texts provide a good framework for instruction. There are certain sub-disciplines, such as plant water relations, that are notably lacking in current course offerings yet critically important to many of the programs listed above. However, a "quick fix" of identifying one or two key courses is unlikely to solve underlying problems in the long run. What's needed, we decided, is a new model for graduate instruction: a series of graduate-level “service” courses that are developed and offered as a cohesive unit, supported by administrators and taught by faculty from multiple colleges.

How can plant physiology expertise (both teaching and research) be coordinated across departments?

We currently have the expertise at OSU and associated institutions (EPA, Forest Service, etc.) to teach the courses in plant physiology that are necessary for top quality graduate programs. However, this expertise is spread across colleges and departments - most programs and departments do not have the expertise to offer the courses they need internally, and even if they did, enrollments would be too low to sustain the courses. It is also critical to recognize that OSU faculty are already stretched and stressed to their limits. It is not realistic to consider asking faculty members to teach additional courses. If new courses are added, something else must be taken away.

As one member of the working group said, "We need unique approaches to do more with less and without adding stress". With this in mind, the working group proposes a new model for offering graduate courses that would involve collaboration among the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Forestry and Science, including several departments within each College. Here we offer only an outline of this model.

A modular approach for graduate instruction in Plant Physiology at OSU. We propose teaching plant physiology as a set of modules that can each be taught within a three-week period for one credit. The courses would all be offered at a specific time (MWF 9-10, for example). Instructors for the courses would come from many departments. Although the topic of each course would be very specific, each course would be designed to be relevant to graduate students from a variety of backgrounds and disciplines. It would be possible to offer students options among similar alternatives (for example, "plant responses to fertilizer" and "biochemistry of nutrient assimilation"). Although some of the courses could be required as prerequisites for others, they should be designed so that students could select only the courses they need for their programs. At the same time, they should be developed so that there is a level of connectivity among them all. Use of a common text could help in this regard.

One advantage to the 1-credit, modularized format is that it may be possible to take advantage of "non-traditional" teaching resources, such as visiting scientists, advanced graduate students, and adjunct faculty. As one example, Dr. Rick Meinzer, a USFS tree physiologist from the Forestry Sciences Laboratory in Corvallis, has expressed interest and willingness to contribute to such a teaching program. However, careful, ongoing management would be needed to maintain continuity and quality of the teaching. This will require the commitment and support of department administrators and faculty within the plant sciences from across the university.
Examples of possible topics for these modules include the following (no particular order is intended except for the first):

Basic overview of plant physiology
Herbicide physiology
Weed Science
Host/microbe/pathogen interactions
Photosynthesis

Attachment 2.

-----Original Message-----
From: Francis, Sally K.
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2004 1:27 PM
To: Coakley, Stella; Gartner, Barbara; Howe, Glenn Thomas; Karow, Russell
Cc: Bond, Barbara; Boyer, Charles; Bloomer, Sherm; Salwasser, Hal; Arnold, Roy G; Dutson, Thayne
Subject: Plant Physiology graduate instruction at OSU

Colleagues,

I'm writing to convey to you the outcome of the discussion among Deans Salwasser, Arnold, Bloomer and me regarding the future of graduate level instruction in the area of plant physiology at OSU.

We accept your recommendation to eliminate the Plant Physiology graduate degree program while ensuring that currently enrolled students can finish their degree as planned. We also accept your recommendation to charter a planning group that will become the core of a Graduate Faculty of Plant Biology that will be charged with developing the courses on various plant biology topics needed to support other graduate degree programs at OSU. As these degree programs are principally in the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences and Forestry, the two cognizant Deans will share joint responsibility for ensuring that essential courses are developed and offered in a manner that will meet the needs of current and future graduate students. They will coordinate this with other deans as appropriate, especially the Dean of the College of Science, and will maintain communication with the Dean of the Graduate School.

We invite you to serve as members of the planning group. The planning group for the Graduate Faculty of Plant Biology is charged to: a) organize a graduate faculty of plant biology; b) conduct a user needs assessment to determine what courses and topics are needed to support existing graduate degrees; c) assess the degree to which existing courses and faculty have the capacity to deliver the needed topics at the graduate level; and d) develop a delivery strategy to sustain capacity and fill identified gaps. That strategy may include the use of distance education, courtesy faculty, traditional courses, and/or modular courses as proposed in the February 2, 2004, report "Status of Graduate Instruction in Plant Physiology at OSU." The planning group will be co-chaired by Charles Boyer and Barbara Bond with the expectation the Dr. Boyer will guide administrative aspects of the strategy and Dr. Bond will guide course content and curricular aspects of the overall approach.

We expect to see the strategy by the close of Fall term 2004, including Category 1 proposals if needed.

We trust that you will be able to accept this assignment. Thanks very much for your continued excellent work on this very important matter.

Sally