Materials linked from the April 12, 2012 Faculty Senate agenda.

Proposed additions appear as shaded, bold text; proposed deletions appear shaded, strike-through text. The recommendation from the Committee on Committees appears in red. The Standing Rules for all Faculty Senate committees/councils can be accessed from [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/).

Note: Only the sections of the Standing Rules pertaining to the proposed revisions appear below; other sections of the Standing Rules will remain unchanged.

### Academic Advising Council (Clay Torset, Chair)

AAC MEMBERSHIP (voting members, limited to one (1) vote/unit):
Head Advisors: Includes each of the academic colleges that advise undergraduate students, as well as University Honors College, University Exploratory Studies Program, and the OSU-Cascades Campus:

- College of Agricultural Sciences
- College of Business
- **College of Earth, Ocean & Atmospheric Sciences**
  - College of Education
  - College of Engineering
  - College of Forestry
  - College of Liberal Arts
  - College of Pharmacy
  - College of Public Health and Human Sciences
  - College of Science
  - OSU-Cascades Campus
  - University Honors College
  - University Exploratory Studies Program

**Rationale:** With the creation of the College of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Science and with that College’s responsibility in providing undergraduate degree programs it is appropriate for that College to become a voting member of the Academic Advising Council. Students, advisors, and administrators will be well-served by the information sharing and input on campus-wide policy and procedures that is the nature of discussion at the monthly AAC meetings.

Committee on Committees Review: Approve

### Baccalaureate Core Committee (Bill Bogley and Kerry Kincanon, Co-chairs)

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met and to evaluate student attainment of category learning outcomes. This work depends on the availability of data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the
College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

A. Course Selection
1. The BCC will solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

4. All submissions that deal with writing skills WRI and WRII must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which consists of the English Department's Composition and Professional Writing Coordinators, and the Writing Center Coordinator, and is composed of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Director, the Director of First Year Writing, the Coordinator of the Writing Center, and a writing faculty member with expertise in technical and professional writing. This Board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

5. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses which are deemed by the BCC to meet these criteria and address the category learning outcomes can be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to approval by the Curriculum Council.

6. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

B. BCC Category Reviews
1. The BCC will periodically request and review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses meeting these criteria will be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to prior approval by the Curriculum Council. Institutional data in order to evaluate Baccalaureate Core categories based on:

   a. adequate access to courses within the category;
   b. consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning;
   c. evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes; and
   d. continued satisfaction of category criteria by individual courses.

2. The BCC will periodically review courses accepted for general education to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria has the authority to request changes to existing courses and/or deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses.
3. The BCC shall consist of two subcommittees, each with one-half of the committee membership and in proportion to its overall representation, for the purposes of general and categorical reviews. Each subcommittee will review separate categories as part of the periodical review.

4. In order for courses to be accepted for or denied from inclusion by a BCC subcommittee, each course must receive the approval of two-thirds of the voting members.

5. The BCC has the authority to deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses that no longer meet the appropriate criteria.

3. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

Rationale: The Committee on Committees recommended changes to Items A.1 (relative to solicitation of course) and A.4 (relative to the composition of the Writing Advisory Board) and we have adopted those changes exactly. The committee also specified the scope of the Advisory Board in its consideration of course proposals involving writing, limiting its considerations to proposals in WRI and WRII. The committee concluded that the writing components in WIC courses are already subject to review by the WIC Director and that Synthesis courses, which also have a required writing component, are more clearly rooted in their disciplines.

The Committee on Committee also recommended deletion of items B.3 and B.4 (both concerning BCC operations relative to category review). In light of the EC charge relating to student learning outcomes and category review, the BCC has concluded that additional clarity and specificity is needed in the standing rules relative to this BCC function. To meet this need, we re-titled Section B of the standing rules to refer specifically to category review. Thus Section A refers exclusively to proposals for courses to be added to the Core. As a result, item B.1 from the current rules was re-cast and moved to Section A.5 inasmuch as it pertains to proposals seeking to add courses to the Core. Item A.6, relating to quorum and voting standards, was added to ensure that business will be completed in a timely manner. These standards comply with default standards used by the Faculty Senate.

Section B is re-titled “Category Reviews,” which is the primary means by which the BCC oversees the overall cohesiveness and effectiveness of the Core. B.1 specifies the obligation of the BCC to conduct category review and to incorporate evidence of student learning into the process. Item B also specifies interactions with institutional administrative actors for the purpose of data-gathering. We have also added a sentence to the preamble of the standing rules indicating the expectation that the BCC will have access to “data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee.” This aspect of shared governance and institutional support for the Core is embedded within the “vitalization agenda” for the Core that was adopted by the Faculty Senate in June 2010. Finally, Item B.2 asserts BCC authority and obligation to work with departments to ensure that courses meet the standards and needs of the Core and Item B.3 details quorum and voting standards for category review processes.

Committee on Committees Review: Approve

Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee (Walt Loveland, Chair)

The Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee assists the Faculty Senate in development of recommendations to the President regarding the University’s budget and fiscal priorities. The Committee reviews the adequacy of resources allocated to existing programs and the fiscal implications of proposed changes in programs, enrollment,
and budgetary priorities and procedures. The Committee participates in the facility planning process and reviews campus building priorities. The Committee consults with administrative officers of the University and is empowered to make recommendations to them during the preparation of the Institution's budget. The Committee consists of six Faculty and three Student members, one of whom shall be a graduate student, and the Director of the Office of Budgets and Planning, ex-officio, non-voting.

A member of the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee, appointed by its Chair, shall be a liaison member, non-voting, on the Curriculum Council. Further, a member of the Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee, appointed by its Chair, shall be a liaison member, non-voting, on the Space Committee. The Chair of the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee shall serve as an observer on the University Budget Committee.

Rationale: The revisions are suggested because the current BFP group or those from previous years do not have the time to fulfill the indicated additional responsibilities. We are fully consumed with advising on fiscal matters and reviewing Category I proposals.

Committee on Committees Review: Approve

**Computing Resources Committee (Stefanie Buck, Chair)**

The Committee shall consist of six Faculty, at least four of whom must be Teaching Faculty, and two Students, and the following ex-officio, non-voting members: the Vice Provost for Information Services or a designated representative, and a representative from Technology Across the Curriculum (TAC). The Vice Provost for Information Services may recommend a resource person from Information Services as another ex-officio, non-voting member. The CRC chair serves as an ex-officio member of the Information Technology Coordinating Committee (ITCC).

Rationale: Rather than having to find a representative for each meeting that the Vice Provost for Information Services may not be able to attend, allowing a designated representative will offer him or her more flexibility and accommodate his or her busy schedule. A designated representative will also provide continuity and a consistent flow of information between the CRC and the Vice Provost for Information Services.

Committee on Committees Review: Approve

**Curriculum Council (Mike Bailey, Chair)**

The Council consists of at least nine and up to thirteen Faculty members and two Student members. Breadth of disciplinary backgrounds is important for the work of the Council so membership shall come from many different colleges. In addition, the following shall be ex-officio members, non-voting: One Academic Affairs representative appointed by the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and one person appointed annually to represent the following: Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee, Registrar's Office, University Libraries, and Extended Campus. The following areas shall be represented by liaison members, non-voting, and appointed annually: OSU-Cascades Campus, Academic Advising Council, and Instructional Technology.
Rationale: Because the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee is requesting a Standing Rules revision to eliminate representation on the Curriculum Council, the Curriculum Council Standing Rules must be consistent.

Committee on Committees Review: Approve

**Distance Education Committee (Roger Nielsen, Chair)**

The Distance Education Committee reviews and recommends policies on matters pertaining to distance education that promote the educational mission of the University. It provides policy recommendations regarding faculty relations as they pertain to the creation, implementation, delivery, rewards, and intellectual property rights related to distance education courses and programs. It advises in the long-term planning and financing of distance education courses and programs, including student marketing, recruitment and retention issues in order to ensure a sustainable student base. It advises on distance education curriculum priorities, development, standards and evaluation, and reviews certificate programs to insure high-quality offerings. The Committee monitors standards of academic quality for all distance education courses to ensure the quality and uniformity of degree offerings. The Committee maintains a continuing examination of the impact of distance education on the educational mission of individual programs, departments, colleges and the University. It provides reports and recommendations to the Faculty Senate and operates in an advisory role to the Associate Provost of OSU Extended Campus.

The On-line Education Committee considers and provides recommendations to the Faculty Senate on a wide range of philosophical and technical issues considered important to faculty and students related to the role of online education in meeting the academic mission of Oregon State University.

Rationale: The Committee feels that the proposed verbiage and name change better describes the purpose.

Committee on Committees Review: We are concerned with the lack of specificity of the duties and membership, but approve the proposal.

**Diversity Council (Lizz Koch, Chair)**

The Council consists of seven faculty members, with at least three being teaching faculty. There shall be two students, one of whom may be the Multicultural Affairs Task Force Director, or designee. In addition, ex-officio, non-voting members shall include the Director of Community and Diversity, the Director of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, the Director of the Women's Advancement and Gender Equity Office, Executive Director of Equity and Inclusion, and the Director of the Difference, Power, and Discrimination Program, or designees.

Rationale: The proposed position deletions no longer exist; however, these offices have been combined to create the proposed added position.

Committee on Committees Review: Approve
Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee (LeeAnn Baker, Chair)

The Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee formulates statements of policy and advises on matters of salaries, and Tax Deferred Investment programs, retirement programs, retirement benefits, insurance, and other programs which affect the economic benefits of both active and retired faculty. **Matters related to salaries, healthcare insurance, Tax Deferred Investment programs, retirement programs, retirement benefits, family and child care resources, and optional welfare insurance are all within the purview of this committee.** It shall make information related to retirement and retirement options available to the faculty. When appropriate, recommendations and findings are made to the Faculty Senate **Executive Committee and to the Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate.** The Committee shall also formulate recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for possible submission to the Legislature **the State Board of Higher Education** for amendments to the retirement **system and alternative group health and welfare insurance.**

The Committee consists of nine faculty, including at least one professional faculty; two or three shall be retired faculty. In addition, the OSU Employee Benefits Manager shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member.

**Rationale:**
- The committee was asked to review the Standing Rules in light of SB 242 and changes outlined therein. In doing this review the committee recommended to use consistent verbiage with SB 242 using ‘the State Board of Higher Education’ and ‘alternative group health and welfare insurance’.
- In addition the Committee on Committees recommended that we look further at the Standing Rules and include things the committee is currently doing, (i.e. family and child care resources) delete what it does not do (i.e. It shall make information related to retirement and retirement options available to the faculty) and include who the committee reports to (i.e. to the Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate).
- We did discuss what will happen if OSBHE is dissolved but for consistency the committee asked that it remain clearly stated.

Committee on Committees Review: Approve