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Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  

DATE  May 18, 1981

FROM  
Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

The Senate will hold its regular meeting on Monday, June 1, 1981, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 CH.

AGENDA:

A. Roll
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 4, 1981, Senate Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   (Election of Presiding Officer of the Senate, 1981-82)
D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

   a. Question for Dean Trudeau, submitted by the Senate Steering Committee:

      "What is the status of the proposal to establish a Department of Communication?"

   b. Question for Vice President Todd, submitted by Don Howard:

      "Recent changes in medical plans resulted in one Blue Cross plan being discontinued, with faculty enrolled under that plan losing all coverage unless they initiated the transfer of plans before May 8. The announcement for this was sent from Salem dated April 24. In light of the extremely serious result of total loss of insurance and the very short (and as usual, rather confusing) notice, why was there no effort made to personally notify affected faculty?"

   c. Question for Vice President Gruber, submitted by the Senate Steering Committee:

      "Please describe the criteria used by the Deans in making their budget reduction suggestions."

   d. Question for President Blumel, submitted by the Senate Steering Committee:

      "The faculty is most interested in the continuing budget considerations. Would you please describe the progress you have made in your own contingency planning."
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2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
   (Election of Presiding Officer Pro Temp)

E. Reports from the Officers of the Administration and Committees

*1. University Scholars Board Annual Report -- Limbaugh
*2. Advisory Council Annual Report -- Karant-Nunn

   (Election of four members of Senate Steering Committee, 1981-82)

*3. Committee on Committees Annual Report -- Bentley
*4. Educational Policies Committee Annual Report -- Tuttle
*5. Research and Publications Committee Annual Report -- Howard

   (Divisional Caucus to elect Committee on Committees members as follows:
    for two-year terms: AL, EAS, HPE, LIB, SC, SSC
    for one-year terms: BA, DCE)

F. Unfinished Business

*1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment (Article III, Section 1), Final Reading -- Karant-Nunn
*2. Proposed Constitutional Amendment (Article III, Section 3), Final Reading -- Karant-Nunn

G. New Business

*1. Committee on Committees Motion -- Bentley

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:

B Minutes of the May 4 Senate Meeting
B1 University Scholars Board Annual Report**
B2 Advisory Council Annual Report**
B3 Committee on Committees Annual Report**
B4 Education Policies Committee Annual Report**
B5 Research and Publications Committee Annual Report**
B6 Proposed Constitutional Amendment (Article III, Section 1)**
B7 Proposed Constitutional Amendment (Article III, Section 3)**
G1 Committee on Committees Motion**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio members only.

Senators unable to attend the meeting should pass this mailing on to their alternates.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 4, 1981
Presiding Officer: Marjorie Enneking
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: D. Johnson for Brooke, Westbrook for Burns, Kasal for Kimbrell.

Members Absent: Burden, Clark, Dueker, Feldesman, Bierman, Hales, Heflin, Manning, Sugarman, Williams, Wurm.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Corn, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Gard, Gruber, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Hoffman, Howard, Leu, Morris, Pfingsten, Rauch, Ross, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Van't Slot.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes of the April 6 and 13 Senate meetings were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

In the absence of Al Sugarman, Jim Bentley was asked to serve as parliamentarian for the meeting.

Dart read Al Sugarman's report of the April 9-11 IFS meeting in Salem and Monmouth. IFS met with about thirty legislators, including members of Ways and Means and Higher Education Sub-committee. Most of the legislators emphasized the importance of the passage of the Governor's appropriation package. Major actions taken at the meeting were:

- approval of continued investigation of Affirmative Action procedures in the system

- approval of an inquiry to the Chancellor regarding summer employment and possible variance in the application of Administrative Rules
- approval for continued discussion of a phased retirement plan that would be beneficial to both retiree and institutions

- reaffirmation of IFS's opposition to the 4% salary reduction for academic employees in the State Board's 10% contingency plan

- reaffirmation of IFS support for AOF's salary plan, including the 13% catch-up; we cannot continue to retreat from quality Higher Ed programs

- approval of an inquiry to the Board as to how it anticipates reducing enrollment in items 1, 3 and 4 of the "decision package"

Pam Reamer of the VANGUARD reported that the paper had received many inquiries from persons concerned with the possible budget cuts. A committee of 8-9 students and faculty is proposing an organized write-in in front of Millar, to be used by students and faculty to write legislators and help make them aware of the problems. Chino's written discussion of this meeting was circulated. It is hoped that a write-in would give PSU a loud, unified voice and also that the media would cover this protest action. May 13 was mentioned as a possible date, and faculty were urged to participate.

Brenner announced that AOF was holding an open meeting in OSU's Wilkinson Hall on May 9, at 10:00 a.m. The Chancellor, higher ed presidents and deans are participating.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

Blumel has been advised that the issue of early retirement is potentially bargainable and therefore could not give opinions on the issue, as requested in the question. However, Todd described the salient features of current plans at UO:

- available to tenured faculty between ages 60 and 64 and continues to age 70

- includes one-time 6% salary increase above regular cost-of-living and merit increases for year prior to year of early retirement

- during period of agreement, individual is eligible for regular across-the-board and merit increases

- appointment is not to exceed .33 FTE (9 month) or .28 (12 month)

- agreement is subject to same rules and regulations as regular faculty members
- if law changes, individuals are to receive applicable benefits
- deferred compensation provision has been deleted from the agreement

There are approximately 35 participants in the UO plan so far.

A plan similar to UO's has been submitted to OSU's president by the faculty senate.

Early retirement legislation is being discussed in Oregon. In April, hearings were held on nine retirements bills; SB 494 (retirement at 55 or 58 after thirty years of service) seems to be favored. HB 2795 would allow State agencies who are members of PERS to agree on individual plans of early or partial retirement. The salary sub-committee of Ways and Means is discussing the bill now. PSU is continuing discussions with TIAA-CREF on options and alternatives and evaluations of proposals from UO, OSU, California, Utah, and John Dart's committee. R. Nussbaum wondered if the University paid the insurance premiums. Todd said that the University would not pay for persons with less than .50 appointments. Buell wanted to know if the .33 or .28 persons would be paid one-third of their salaries or hourly wages. Todd replied that the Social Security maximum is an issue here, because deferred compensation is not a part of the plan. Vivienne Olson said that the AAUP bargaining team has put this matter on the table, but the Administration has not recognized it being on the table.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair – none

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Brenner gave the draft of the Budget Committee's third report to the Senate, saying that the complete report would be sent to all faculty within a few days. He reminded the Senate that this was the Committee's report and not the University's, and that other groups (Advisory Council, Educational Policies Committee, AAUP, and CADS) were also preparing proposed plans. The President would then prepare a tentative plan and circulate it for comments. Only after that would the final plan be written.

The following tables show the Budget Committee's proposed programs to be considered for elimination, their grouping, ranking and scores, and their overall budget reduction plan:
TABLE 2

PROGRAMS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR ELIMINATION
(listed in ranked order of elimination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>PROPOSED DOLLAR CUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Scholars Program</td>
<td>$118,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central European Studies Center</td>
<td>7,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for the Moving Image</td>
<td>87,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Studies Center</td>
<td>80,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Science</td>
<td>229,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>60,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education (undergraduate option)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies (undergraduate program)</td>
<td>75,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (parts of various programs)</td>
<td>200,000$^{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Education (service course)</td>
<td>200,000$^{1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>76,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PROPOSED CUT
BY PROGRAM ELIMINATION $1,196,724

$^{1}$Service course are related to the required health and PE requirements. Expenditure budget could be restored if the program became self-supporting.

$^{2}$Due to state requirements the specific cuts are left to the school.
TABLE 7

UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED BUDGET REDUCTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional</th>
<th>Specific Reductions</th>
<th>Program Eliminations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### $1 Million Reduction Level = $500,000 Instructional Share

#### Specific Reductions

1. English as a Second Language to remain as a DCE Program
2. Department Heads shall return to 9-month contracts with $1500/year bonus
3. Summer Session to be placed on a self-supporting basis through increased fees

Subtotal = $440,015

#### Program Eliminations

1. University Scholars Program

TOTAL = $118,561

### $2 Million Reduction Level = $600,000 Instructional Share

#### Specific Reductions

None

#### Program Eliminations

1. Central European Studies Center
2. Center for the Moving Image
3. Public Health Studies Center
4. Systems Science, Ph.D Program
5. Women's Studies Program
6. Business Education (undergraduate option)
7. Urban Studies (undergraduate Program)

Subtotal = $601,241

*Note*

1. To determine the total cut at any level one must add all previous cut levels to the one being considered to provide the total cut at that level.
2. The percentage cuts shown in the "general cut" categories refer to the Beginning Budgets for 1980-81

TOTAL = $558,576

TOTAL = $601,241
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Department and Their Budgets (in dollars)</th>
<th>Group Aggregate Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business Education 200,111-60,000=140,111</td>
<td>$3,984,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Economics 419,372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mathematics 1,110,003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Engineering and Applied Science 861,629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Black Studies 124,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Marketing 433,363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Management 500,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Finance Law 394,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Health &amp; Phys. Ed. 785,833-200,000=585,833</td>
<td>$4,299,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Accounting 588,679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Foreign Languages 517,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Middle East Studies Center 163,819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Social Work 481,077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Geography 386,729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Public Administration 149,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Speech Communications 507,832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Theatre Arts 213,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sociology 536,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Environmental Science PhD. 169,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Biology 711,443</td>
<td>$4,492,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Physics 695,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Urban Studies Graduate Program 366,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Psychology 669,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Chemistry 754,098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Education 1,475,626-200,000=1,275,626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>English 1,304,215</td>
<td>$4,442,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Art &amp; Architecture 657,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Administration of Justice 142,548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Anthropology 299,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Music 390,752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>History 644,619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Earth Science 303,994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Philosophy 305,946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Political Science 388,988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Because programs were eliminated in our plan before any percentage budget reductions were calculated, this table excludes program and/or program dollars listed in Table 2.

2 Where programs have had dollar amounts trimmed by program elimination a gross and a net figure after such elimination is shown.

3 Group average is $4,304,897
### TABLE 7 (cont.)

#### $3$ Million Reduction Level = $700,000 Instructional Share

**Specific Reductions**

None

**Program Eliminations**

1. Education (Parts of various programs) \( = \$200,000 \)
2. Service Courses in Health and Physical Education \( = \$200,000 \)
3. Journalism \( = \$76,922 \)

Subtotal = $476,922

**Percentage Reduction**

Departments and Programs in Group 4 (see Table 6) share the balance of the cut at this level \( ($223,078/4,442,922=5.02\%)\) Subtotal = $223,078

**TOTAL = $700,000**

#### $4$ Million Reduction Level = $700,000 Instructional Share

**Specific Reductions**

None

**Program Eliminations**

None

**Percentage Reduction**

Departments in Groups 3 and 4 share this cut at this level \( ($700,000/$8,935,537=7.83\%)\) Subtotal = $700,000

**TOTAL = $700,000**

#### $5$ Million Reduction Level = $700,000 Instructional Share

**Specific Reductions**

None

**Program Eliminations**

None
Percentage Reductions

Departments and Programs in Groups 2, 3, and 4 share this cut at this level
($700,000/13,234,989=5.29\%) Subtotal = $700,000

TOTAL = $700,000

$6 Million Reduction Level = $700,000 Instructional Share

Specific Reductions

None

Program Eliminations

None

Percentage Reductions

Departments and Programs in Groups 1, 2, 3, and 4 share this cut at this level
($700,000/17,219,590=4.07\%) Subtotal = $700,000

TOTAL = $700,000

Non-Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall University Reduction Level</th>
<th>1 mil</th>
<th>2 mil</th>
<th>3 mil</th>
<th>4 mil</th>
<th>5 mil</th>
<th>6 mil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Instruction Reduction</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPAA</td>
<td>220,850</td>
<td>176,680</td>
<td>132,510</td>
<td>132,510</td>
<td>132,510</td>
<td>132,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPFA</td>
<td>191,150</td>
<td>152,920</td>
<td>114,690</td>
<td>114,690</td>
<td>114,690</td>
<td>114,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPSA</td>
<td>38,400</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td>23,040</td>
<td>23,040</td>
<td>23,040</td>
<td>23,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnRel</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>19,360</td>
<td>14,520</td>
<td>14,520</td>
<td>14,520</td>
<td>14,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25,400</td>
<td>20,320</td>
<td>15,240</td>
<td>15,240</td>
<td>15,240</td>
<td>15,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Non-Instructional Guidelines

1. Library books should not be cut until the $3 mil level unless library services are no longer in balance in terms of material acquisitions, staffing and service requirements.
2. Library books maximum cut through the $6 mil/yr. level will be no more than $400,000.
3. Deans' offices should be cut at least 3% for each $1 mil level of reduction (except where the offices have less than $75/major - in this instance they should be exempt from any cuts in this area).
4. The pro rata share concept was used in the non-instructional area:
   - VPAA 6,513,332.21 = 44.17%
   - VPFA 5,636,595.25 = 38.23%
   - VPSA 1,131,903.79 = 7.68%
   - UnRel 741,392.13 = 4.84%
   - Other 748,965.57 = 5.08%
Table 8

Comparison of Budget Committee Plan Cumulative Percentage Instructional Reductions with Across-the-Board Reductions Required to Save the Same Amount

Overall University Reduction Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Cumulative Instructional Reduction)</th>
<th>$1,000,000</th>
<th>$2,000,000</th>
<th>$3,000,000</th>
<th>$4,000,000</th>
<th>$5,000,000</th>
<th>$6,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($500,000)</td>
<td>(1,100,000)</td>
<td>(1,800,000)</td>
<td>(2,500,000)</td>
<td>(3,200,000)</td>
<td>(3,900,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 Percentage Reduction at Each Level</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4.07%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 Percentage Reduction at Each Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 Percentage Reduction at Each Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.83%</td>
<td>13.12%</td>
<td>17.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 Percentage Reduction at Each Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
<td>12.85%</td>
<td>18.14%</td>
<td>22.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across the Board&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>15.05%</td>
<td>18.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total Instructional 1980-81 Beginning Base Budget is $21,261,857.

<sup>1</sup> "Across the Board" percentage is calculated by dividing the cumulative instructional reduction by the Total Instructional 1980-81 Beginning Base Budget.
Brenner explained that non-instructional areas were cut less the further we go into the cuts, in order to save the functioning of the University. He pointed out that no library books were cut until the 3 million mark.

Karant-Nunn felt abhorrence at how the idea of the traditional university had been violated in the Budget Committee's scheme, but John Walker from the Committee pointed out that the professional schools took cuts three times larger than the colleges. Hoffman wanted to know which group would be eliminated if there were enormous cuts and whether there would be a university left. Cooper from the Committee said this was not a list of eliminations, and Brenner added that the Committee only considered cuts up to 6 million, or 18% of the University budget. He also stated that the market place and growth patterns of departments were considered. Chavigny said that the growth had been assessed arbitrarily by the Committee; Public Health Studies, for instance, has been subsumed by other departments, and therefore the figures used were not complete. Toulan was saddened by the fact that we talk about the University as an assembly line, dealing only with dollars and figures and not with quality of programs. Bates wanted to know if the data used by the Committee would be available, because he had profound questions on how figures were interpreted. He admitted that student/teacher ratios in Psychology and Economics had shifted dramatically, but he pointed out that Black Studies and Women's Studies had shown considerable growth recently and said the latter two programs should not be cut even though their student/teacher ratios were still low. Trudeau felt that the Budget Committee had not dealt with the anatomy of the University and had riddled programs. Brenner answered that no one on the campus was extraneous, therefore the Committee considered all programs evenly and only those considered non-essential were targeted for elimination. L. Nussbaum suggested that Arts and Letters was one of those essential areas of a university, but that Engineering and Business Administration could be eliminated completely; teachers could easily get jobs outside of the University, and closing down those schools would cause a public outcry that would have positive effects. Gard said that the Committee's report was prepared without input by administrators of the divisions. The report cannot be defended, and he opposed the release of the document. Chavigny agreed. Brenner said that he had received nothing by way of input, even though the Committee repeatedly requested it. M. Enneking observed that the content is common knowledge now and is a report of a faculty committee advisory to the President and the Faculty Senate; she said that the Senate Steering Committee wanted it distributed to all faculty. The annual report was accepted.

2. Lockwood presented the annual report of the University Athletics Board. He pointed out that several sports had been moved to club sports, that affirmative action had been watched carefully, and that more faculty input will be sought through a questionnaire.

R. Nussbaum wanted to know if the seven ex-officio board members voted along with the five faculty. Lockwood replied that only the five faculty and two students voted. The report was accepted.
3. In the absence of Elaine Limbaugh, Scheans presented the annual report of the University Scholars' Board. It was pointed out that the report did not list the Board's membership. Dunbar said the question of counterfeit could be raised. Grimes was offended by the typing errors throughout. A. Johnson moved that the report be sent back to the Board for resubmission, following the suggested format for annual committee reports. Heath observed that the faculty constitution includes no committee report format, but M. Enneking charged that the initial report submitted to the Steering Committee had been returned to the Board with detailed written suggestions for changes and additions, because the Board's chairperson had not been present at the Steering Committee meeting. The motion to return the report to the Board was passed.

4. Rose presented the annual report of the Teacher Education Committee, lifting out for special emphasis the Committee's major concerns given in the second paragraph. He also praised the excellent attendance of students and faculty members. The report was accepted.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Midson presented for first reading a constitutional amendment of Article III, Section 1 -- an addition to be inserted after the final paragraph and dealing with emergency situations. Swanson suggested that the phrase "or the appropriate chairperson" be dropped, because it tended to confuse the entire statement. Midson gave last summer's dropping of WR. 120 as an example of an emergency. The proposed amendment was sent to the Advisory Council for review.

2. Karant-Nunn presented a constitutional amendment of Article III, Section 3, for first reading. She pointed out that this statement was coming to the Senate jointly from the Advisory Council and the President. Howard moved to amend the last sentence as follows:

"The department head shall serve a stated term of three (3) years, and may be elected to serve a second three (3) year term. No one may serve more than two (2) consecutive terms as department head. For the purposes of this provision, those serving as department head during the 1980-1981 academic year will be considered in their first term."

Blumel said he could not support the amendment, because he has not had a chance to think about it and needed to talk to the Deans first. White opposed the amendment because of the two-term limitation, and Beeson opposed it because he feels that the term of department head should be limited to two years. R. Nussbaum said a good argument in favor of the amendment could be made in that it gave a young university some stability. Karant-Nunn reminded the Senate that this provision is written with both the department and the administration in mind. The Howard amendment failed. A. Johnson moved to "amend the constitutional amendment by placing a period after 'three (3) years' and striking the rest of the sentence." Buell and Tuttle both argued that that would make the statement too ambiguous, and Scheans added that "without prejudice" was an important phrase to keep and that the Advisory Council had deliberated one and a half
years over that point. The Johnson amendment failed. Bates wanted to know who may grieve and which grievance procedure would be used. Blumel replied that the non-contract grievance procedure was intended.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Tosi presented the OAA recommendation that the Challenge Program be approved to continue with the 800 student ceiling. The recommendation was approved.

2. Speaking for the Educational Policies Committee, Tuttle presented the following motion:

"PSU Faculty Senate recommends and urges that the President appoint a Select Committee to prepare an Alternative Retirements Plan for presentation to the Senate at the earliest possible time. The Committee should consist of faculty members and staff expert in matters of university funding, personal finance and taxes, and retirement economics, with membership from outside the University if necessary for the required expertise."

Tuttle added that alternative retirement programs may present important budgetary advantages to the University. L. Nussbaum wondered what had happened to the AAUP committee which had prepared a plan. Dart said that the AAUP Retirement Committee had discussed the matter at some length with the administration but nothing has come of it. He thought it was time to forget this as a bargaining item. Moor stated that there was more to it than that. The bargaining team and the administration had agreed to discuss it away from the table. If an agreement can be reached away from the table, then the University can move on the item. Blumel explained that that is not a matter of common understanding, and therefore the administration cannot discuss the item here. The motion by the EPC was passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p. m.
During the 1980-81 academic year, the University Scholars' Board met to review current program offerings and those proposed for 1981-82. Although the program budget was reduced by 10%, money was raised through grants from private foundations, from the Oregon Committee for the Humanities, and from a benefit concert organized by the students in the program. Consequently, the colloquia and lecture series originally planned for this year have been held. Enrollment in the colloquia has been at a maximum level; in addition, the four lecturers who have visited to date have met with the Scholars' colloquia and with departments and community groups. Professor Heilbroner's lectures were attended by 1000, Professor Kuklick's by 100, Professor Stent's by 350, and Professor Paul's by 75. Special meetings were arranged with the Departments of Economics, Philosophy and Biology, and with the Institute for Policy Studies, with the appropriate visiting scholar. Scholars' students held receptions for the departments, using money raised by the benefit concert to provide refreshments. With the exception of the faculty of the Department of Economics, who attended the reception for Professor Heilbroner and were most gracious to him, the faculty response was abysmal. The students have decided to suspend this social feature of the program for the faculty.

Six colloquia are being developed for the 1981-82 academic year. In planning this year, the Board discussed the process of developing the colloquia and identifying the visiting scholars. The Director of the Program reported that for three years letters were sent to each department head describing the colloquia, explaining the funding, and requesting that faculty make recommendations. In three years, four proposals were made, all of which were developed. In asking faculty about the minimal response, the most frequent answer was that the information had never been received. For this year certain areas of interest were identified and individual faculty were contacted as to their interest and suggestions. To date, five visiting scholars have indicated that they are willing to participate:

Professor Aldo Scaglione  
Professor of Comparative Literature  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Professor John Schaar  
Professor of Political Science  
University of California at Santa Cruz
As in the past, appropriate departments will be asked if they would like to invite the visitors to meet with faculty and students in special seminars.

There were no decisions relating to personnel, as no decisions were required. A subcommittee of the Board received 20 proposals for independent study projects and 10 proposals for undergraduate theses. The subcommittee reviewed the proposals and made recommendations for approval or alteration. Forty-five students were admitted to the program during this year. Six students received degrees at Fall and Winter commencement. Twenty students have applied for Spring and Summer term commencement. Ten students left the program, four by choice, six who have fallen below the minimum g.p.a. requirement. No appeals were made to the Board. One hundred and seventy-five students are currently in the program.

The Board received and discussed a report from the Director on the effects of possible budget reductions. The Board also received a request from the Student Advisory Committee to recommend a change in the name of the program from University Scholars' to University Honors. The Board will be discussing this request and proposing a process for consulting with departments and administrative officers as to its desirability and feasibility.
The members of the Advisory Council this year are Marvin Beeson, Earth Sciences; Steven Brenner, Business Administration; Ralph Bunch, Political Science; Susan Karant-Nunn (Chairwoman), History; Rudi Nussbaum, Physics; and Daniel Scheans (Secretary), Anthropology.

The council has handled a number of routine matters assigned to it by the Faculty Constitution, such as examining constitutional amendments forwarded to it by the Senate, interpreting the Constitution, nominating members of search committees, advising the President on questions he has brought to it, and bringing to the President topics concerning faculty welfare.

Our activities of more than average moment and consumption of time have been the following:

A. Through a process of negotiation and compromise with the President, we have drafted an amendment to Article III, Section 3, on the election of department heads. This proposal is presently before the Faculty Senate.

B. We have made several recommendations to the President on budget curtailment. We have already come before the Senate and summarized this advice. Above all we have urged sustaining those parts of the University that are essential to its existence and its mission, such as the library and the liberal arts core. We have suggested publicizing to the utmost PSU's and public higher education's plight should the Governor's budget not be passed and funded by the legislature.

C. We have met three times with the advisory councils of the other three universities, including the Health Sciences Center. On one of these occasions, in early December, our guest was the Chancellor of Higher Education. The faculty had an opportunity to "grill" him on his and the State Board's practices and policies. Most recently, on April 29, our own Advisory Council organized a dinner in Salem for members of the advisory councils, several key legislators, and Robert Davis of the Association of Oregon Faculties. Before the dinner each university group went to the Capitol and talked with legislators able to affect the funding of higher education. We from PSU called on Rep. Vera Katz.

D. We interviewed three candidates for Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

E. A continuing concern of this council has been the matter of appointments to administrative posts. The Advisory Council has expressed to the President the importance of insuring that faculty participation in search committees be representative, be without conflict of interest, and be before the fact of selection.
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE
1980-81

Carl Abbott - Urban Affairs
Ray Adams - Continuing Education
Marvin Beeson - Earth Sciences
Alma Bingham - Education
James Breedlove - Social Work
Larry Bruseau - Library
Margaret Heyden - Health & Physical Education
Laureen Nussbaum Foreign Languages
Franz Räd - Engineering
Charles White - Summer Session
Helen Youngelson - Economics
James Béthley - BA - Chairman

The Faculty Constitution charges the Committee on Committees with recommending to the President candidates for membership on constitutional and administrative committees except as specified otherwise by charter or regulation. A further charge is to advise the Senate relative to assigning further duties to the several committees, and to suggest the establishment of special Senate faculty committees.

SUMMARY OF APPOINTMENT ACTIVITY

During the 1980-81 academic year, the Committee made approximately 135 recommendations for assignments on 37 committees and recommended the formation of one ad hoc committee with a limited life. As a result of the Committee Preference Survey some 556 individual committee preferences were expressed by faculty. These preferences were consulted in making recommendations for appointments. As of April 1, 1981, 258 faculty were serving on University committees. Of these, 25 were serving on more than one committee.

ACTIVITIES STEMMING FROM THE COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY OF SPRING, 1980

1. The Committee recommended to the Faculty Senate in March, 1981, the formation of an ad hoc committee on instructional media charged with assessing the place of audio-visual instructional media throughout the University for the purpose of recommending, by Fall, 1981, whether there should be: (1) a separate faculty advisory committee for instructional media services, or (2) a specific charge to the Library Committee concerning instructional media. Following the Senate's approval of this proposal, the Committee sent the President a recommendation for a charge to the committee and five recommended appointments. This committee, to be chaired by Professor Frank West, has been appointed.

2. The Committee met with the chairpersons of the three campus committees—Campus Environment, Parking and Transportation; Campus Planning; and Campus Safety and Security—to assess whether these committees had overlapping responsibilities and the extent to which a consolidation of their efforts might be feasible or desirable. Although there are areas of mutual concern, it seemed clear that their problems were diverse and that none of them had free time to take on the functions of some other committee in a consolidation. The Committee recommends to the Senate that there be a formal acknowledgment of the community of interest of these committees through regular planned meetings of the chairpersons and consultants of these committees at least once at the beginning of each term, the meetings to be chaired in a rotation which they will decide. The results of these activities should be reflected in the reports of the respective committees.
3. The Committee met with the chairpersons of Academic Requirements and Scholastic Standards Committees to discuss questions of jurisdiction and the respective committee charges. The two chairpersons have agreed to explore these matters and report back to this committee in the Fall term, 1981.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

1. In response to a question directed to the Committee regarding the report of a committee, the Committee was unanimous in concluding that although the report is typically written by the chairperson, it is not only the chairperson's report and should represent committee consensus. In cases where there is a division of opinion, the report should indicate the lack of consensus. If there is a strong division of opinion, the report should make room for a minority opinion, or at least be prepared in time for the minority to present its report at the same time as the main committee report.

2. The Committee recommends to the Senate that in the committee structure the designation of Administration be changed to All Other (AO) to conform to the wording of the Constitution and recognize that the "constituency" of this member of a University committee is not solely from administration, but rather is "all other faculty jointly as a single entity." (See Article V, Section 1, (2))

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

The Committee is in the process of dealing with other charges from the 1979-80 annual report, including means of determining committee effectiveness and consultation with committees regarding overlap, lack of clear mandate, and lack of activity. We are also considering the question of appropriate representation on key committees.
The Educational Policies Committee met weekly during the 1980/81 academic year, discussing and taking action on several matters, as follows:

1. During fall quarter the Committee reviewed a revised version of the proposal to join the present Departments of Speech Communication and Journalism, the Center for the Moving Image, and the instructional component of Television Services in a Department of Communication. The Committee found that several serious problems it had pointed out in its December 13, 1979, report on the original proposal were not addressed in the revision. The Committee returned the revision on November 20, 1980, stating its desire to see such a merger achieved and making several specific recommendations to that end.

2. Also during fall quarter the Committee began discussions of its role among those charged with making recommendations to the Senate and the President on the budgetary crisis. On December 11, 1980, the Committee sent to the President several recommendations premised on the Committee's judgment of the likely effects of the Governor's budget on the University. However, the Governor's budget proved not to be a sound basis for recommendations.

3. On April 1, 1981, the Committee sent to the President a set of recommendations taking into account the worsened budgetary prospects and reflecting some considerations of the work being done by the Budget Committee. The report containing the Committee's recommendations was summarized before the Senate in April and is printed in full in the minutes of that meeting.

4. Following its April 1 report to the President, the Committee discussed further its recommendation that a policy on early and partial retirement be initiated and implemented. At the May Senate meeting the Committee successfully moved a formal Senate recommendation to the President aimed at achieving an Alternative Retirement Plan.

5. The Committee devoted its remaining meetings to a review of various recommendations for coping with budget reductions in light of long-range educational policy, with the intention of making a further report to the Senate and the President.
In its June, 1980, report to the Senate, this Committee stated its intention better to "fulfill its responsibility to participate actively in the formulation and revision of educational policy." The Committee recognized that accomplishing this intention would require leadership on the part of the Committee and active cooperation from other faculty bodies and from the Administration. The Committee concludes that its activities this year have moved it but a short distance towards its goal. The Committee is preparing a statement of advice to its successor, including a recommendation for an amendment to the Committee's constitutional charge that would encourage a more productive relationship between the Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs than is now provided for.

The Educational Policies Committee

Robert Tuttle, English, Chair
Gerald Blake, Urban Affairs
Oma Blankenship, Health and P.E.
Michael Carl, Education
John Dart, Geography
Roger Moseley, Management
Thom Neff, Engineering and Applied Sc.
Guido Pinamonti, Social Work
Walter Shold, D.C.E.
Robert Van Atta, Earth Science
Robert Walker, T.V. Services
Mike Ezeh, Student
James Heath, O.A.A., Consultant
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION COMMITTEE

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: Donald Howard, Chairperson

The Research and Publication Committee is charged with soliciting proposals from the faculty in order to distribute a small amount of funds designated each year for faculty development in the areas of research and scholarship. The committee met in the fall and reviewed the existing guidelines. With very minor changes these were approved and distributed to each department office, along with a summary sheet sent to each member of the faculty. Closing date for proposals was February 27, 1981. A total of 34 proposals were received, requesting funds amounting to $53,240.

The committee has studied these proposals in detail. We apply the following conditions:

a) Faculty salaries and out-of-state travel expenses are not supported. Travel is funded only in so far as it is an essential part of a research study.
b) Services that are provided to faculty by the University, such as routine computer use, is not supported. Special needs that cannot be met by the Computer Center are, however, considered.
c) Requests for support of individuals that are not a part of this faculty are not supported.
d) Projects that are basically thesis research of students are not supported. Student wages can be included where the role of the student is clearly outlined and where the function of the student is a necessary part of the research study. Student wages (this year figured at $3.75 per hour) are assigned at the same rate to all funded proposals.

After deliberation, we have recommended that 24 of the proposals be funded in total or in part, amounting to $27,665. These recommendations have been forwarded to the Office of Graduate Studies and Research for implementation.
The Committee also has recommended to OGSR that the remaining $5,335 of the $33,000 allocation be used to establish an account to be administered by the Library to be used to meet expenses of unsupported faculty members wishing to make use of the new on-line search facilities.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald G. Howard, Chairperson
Sandra Anderson
Richard Crittenden
Ivan Curcin
Rod Diman
Marc Feldesman
Richard Forbes
Don Gibbons
Don Hellison
James Heneghan
Robert Lockerby
Joyce Petrie
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Advisory Council
RE: Amendment to Article III, Section 1 of the Faculty Constitution

May 15, 1981

The text of the amendment as we received it is as follows:

University-wide academic requirements shall not be suspended or modified without prior consideration by the Faculty Senate. In an emergency the Academic Requirements Committee or Graduate Council, the Advisory Council, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, shall first be consulted. Notification of any change made shall be submitted to the Senate immediately with a request for ratification.

We have altered this slightly, in consultation with the Secretary to the Faculty, hoping that we have understood the intention of the Academic Requirements Committee:

University-wide academic requirements shall not be suspended or modified without prior consideration by the Faculty Senate. In an emergency the Academic Requirements Committee or the Graduate Council, the Advisory Council, or the Presiding Officer of the Senate shall first be consulted, in that order. Notification of any change made shall be submitted to the Senate immediately with a request for ratification.

Words underlined have been added. In addition, we have omitted a comma after "Presiding Officer of the Senate."
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Advisory Council

May 15, 1981

RE: Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of the Faculty Constitution

Professor Charles M. White has suggested to us that Article III, Section 3 be subdivided since it deals with two separate topics, the selection of administrative officers and the election of department heads. We think he is right. We propose changing the title of Section 3 to Faculty Authority in the Selection of Higher Administrative Officers, inserting the word "Higher." Only the first paragraph would remain in the new Section 3.

We would then create a Section 4, to be entitled Faculty Authority in the Selection of Department Heads. The following thus becomes the proposed text of Section 4:

The faculty of each Department shall decide, by secret ballot of all full-time members (0.5 FTE or more), the mode by which its choice of Department Head, either regular or acting, shall be determined. These procedures shall be published and filed with the Office of Academic Affairs. They shall be implemented by April 15 of the Department Head's third year in office and otherwise upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of Department Head. Any revisions of the procedures must be made and filed at least one month before an election.

The Department shall forward the name of its choice to the Dean of the appropriate College or School, who will promptly review the nomination and forward it with comments to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President in turn shall promptly review the nomination and forward it with comments to the President.

In the circumstance that the President finds substantive reasons to question the willingness and/or ability of the person chosen by the faculty to fulfill the functions of the office as described in the current "Position Description for Department Head," the President shall, within six weeks of the Department having notified its appropriate administrative officer of its selection, state in writing to the members of the Department the reasons for refusing the appointment. Ordinarily, the Department shall then promptly nominate another person. The final responsibility and authority in appointment of Department Heads is that of the President. Grievances arising in connection with the appointment of Department Heads are to be handled through the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

The Department Head shall serve a stated term of three (3) years but without prejudice to re-election or re-appointment.

We have removed "he or she" and "his or her" from the text we originally presented to the Senate.
MOTIONS TO ACCOMPANY THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES:

1. The Committee on Committees moves that the chairpersons of the three "Campus" committees—Campus Environment, Parking and Transportation; Campus Planning; and Campus Safety and Security—be designated as an informal Campus Steering Committee that will meet at least once at the beginning of each term, along with ex-officio members and consultants, to review the work to be undertaken by each group.

Purpose of the motion - This motion is not intended to create more committee work, but rather to try to assure that these three groups, who do have areas of mutual concern, keep fully informed of each others' activities and thereby avoid duplication of effort and achieve coordination of projects of mutual concern. No special report is required under this motion. Each committee is free to report any activities or benefits that may result. Also, because the nature of the activity is more informal than formal, the three chairpersons may wish to rotate the chairing of these meetings as they deem appropriate.

2. The Committee on Committees moves that the following statement be added to the Guidelines for Constitutional Committees and included in the Faculty Governance Guide:

The committee's reports, although typically written by the chairperson, should represent committee consensus and should be prepared in time to allow committee consideration. Where there is a division of opinion, the report should indicate the lack of consensus. If there is a strong division of opinion, the report should make room for a minority opinion, or at least be prepared in time for the minority to present its report at the same time as the committee report.

3. The Committee on Committees moves that in the committee structure the designation Administration be changed to All Other (AO) to conform to the wording of the Faculty Constitution (Article V, Section 1, (2)) and recognize that the "constituency" of this member of a University committee is not solely from administration, but rather is "all other faculty jointly as a single entity."

Article V deals with the Senate. Section 1 refers to membership, and paragraph 2 on Elected Members reads, in part: "... For the purpose of representation, the word "division" shall mean any instructional unit or college, or instructional unit which reports directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Library; and all other faculty jointly as a single entity." (Emphasis added)