MEMORANDUM

TO Senators and Ex-Officio Members of the Senate

FROM Earl L. Rees, Secretary to the Faculty

DATE February 20, 1979

The Senate will hold its regular meeting of the Faculty Senate on Monday, March 5, 1979, 3:00 p.m., 150 Cramer Hall.

A. Roll
* B. Approval of Minutes of the February 5, 1979 meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
E. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
F. Unfinished Business - none
G. New Business
   *1. Graduate Council Proposals - Bentley
   *2. Faculty Benefits - Rempfer
H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

Regarding agenda items: B. - Minutes of the February 5, 1979 meeting
G1 - Graduate Council Proposals**
G2 - Faculty Benefits**

**Included for Senators and Ex-Officio Members only
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 5, 1979
Presiding Officer: Elaine Limbaugh
Secretary: Earl Rees


Alternates Present: Walhood for Adams, Midson for Kimball, Dressler for Sommerfeldt, Montgomery for Tracy.

Ex-Officio Members: Corn, Dittmer, Forbes, Grimes, Heath, Hoffmann, Morton, Nicholas, Parker, Rauch, Rees, Richelle, Rodgers, Schendel, Todd, Trudeau, Van't Slot.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Wilson, noted as absent, was present. The minutes of the January 8, 1979 Senate meeting were approved as corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. The Presiding Officer announced that the senators were invited to the Koinonia House for sherry after the meeting.

2. Waller, chairman of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and member of the Executive Board of the Association of Oregon Faculties, reported that the pro tem officers for the latter were Robert Becker (OSU), President, Sally Maleug (OSU), Vice-President, and Richard Scott (OCE), Secretary-Treasurer. The lobbyist for the state system faculties is Bob Davis, president of the Public Affairs Counsel. The reaction to having a lobbyist has been positive and members of the PSU faculty are encouraged to pledge support. The featured speaker at the January meeting of the IFS was Governor Atiyeh. His remarks concerning higher education were encouraging. The status of internal management directives and faculty governance is still being considered.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators - none submitted
2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair - Jones, referring to the words "proper methodology," in part G, page 4, of the January 8, 1979 Senate minutes, asked if a decision had been reached concerning who would decide if the proper methodology was being used. Bentley said no specific recommendation was made on this point. Jones asked when this policy becomes effective. Richelle answered that the rule of catalog applies.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Kirrie, Chairperson of the Academic Requirements Committee, informed the Senate about the ARC and the handling of prior learning credits. Many colleges are offering credit for prior learning, that is, for experiential learning acquired in non-academic settings. Prior learning experiences are infinitely variable and the Admissions Office has no means of determining the acceptability or equivalency of prior learning credits offered for transfer. The ARC finds that the best way of handling such transfer requests is to utilize policies and procedures already established for obtaining credit through CLEP and PSU's own credit by examination program.

Highlights of Discussion: Bierman asked what the procedure would be for a more broad based examination of this large problem since the ARC has already made up its mind. Cease said there are really two things to consider: experiential learning and credit by examination. Heath noted that there were several avenues open for further consideration of this matter adding that the ARC is mainly concerned with establishing procedures for accepting prior learning credits. Richelle informed the Senate that a group in the state of Oregon, under the acronym CAEL, Credit Awarded for Experiential Learning, has been actively studying this matter for two years. Heath pointed out that experiential learning is being considered by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. Bentley said the Graduate Council has a policy for dealing with experiential learning and graduate programs but the problem of transfer credits has not been considered.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS- none

NEW BUSINESS

1. Transfer Credits from Special Programs at Accredited Institutions other than Community Colleges, Marjorie Kirrie, Chairperson, ARC. Kirrie, after referring to the motion as included in item G-1 of the Senate mailing, said the present policy of block transfer of credits earned in health science programs is a gross inequity. The motion is purposely general, with no mention of health science, so as to avoid having to initiate action on a similar matter in the future. Johnson moved that the Senate adopt the motion. (seconded)

Highlights of Discussion: Responding to questions, Kirrie said the ARC wants all credits to be considered on a course-for-course basis emphasizing that the concern is for students not completing a given professional program.
N. Rose pointed out that if a student, for example, completes a medical technology program, 48 credits are accepted for the fourth year and the residency requirement is waived. If the program has not been completed, none of the credits are transferable.

Action on Motion: Passed by voice vote.

2. Proposal for updating University policies, Senate Steering Committee. Moseley said the proposal came up because of the efforts of Dean Rauch and the Graduate Council to review graduate program policies and because of the general concern for aged policies. Moseley moved that the Senate adopt the proposal as included in item G-2 of the Senate mailing. (seconded)

Highlights of Discussion: It was noted that there is no definite idea as to the number of existing policies. Cease said no policy would automatically be dropped and the process could go on over a five-year period. Sugarman said it would be advantageous to first review all policies and then initiate a five-year review procedure. Moor thought the Senate Steering Committee could be the key element in the review procedure. Bierman, after stating his opposition to the existence of the Senate Steering Committee, said if a particular issue needs to be resolved, it should be brought directly to the Senate. Cease emphasized that this proposal is meant to bring to the fore the confusion that exists with regard to policies. Richelle noted that going back through the Senate minutes to obtain information on a given policy is time consuming and frustrating. Moseley said the desire to anticipate problems is a factor motivating the review. Johnson suggested that each committee could turn in a policy statement. Jones said a policy of enumerating policies should be adopted. Richelle pointed out that the university catalog comes closest to enumerating policies. The basis for interpretation of that policy, which would be in the Senate minutes, is often impossible to find. Bates moved to refer the motion back to the Senate Steering Committee for clarification. (seconded)

Action on Bates Motion: Passed by voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT 3:58 p.m.
February 17, 1979

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: GRADUATE COUNCIL

The Graduate Council submits the following three proposals for Senate approval at the March Senate meeting.

1. Change of earned grade recorded on a transcript.

PROPOSAL: A petition or Supplementary Grade Report to change differentiated (A, B, C, D, F) or non-differentiated (P, NP) grades recorded for graduate courses must be reviewed and approved by the department chairman and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

2. Senior petition for reserved graduate credit.

PROPOSAL: A senior at PSU who is within 30 credits of completing the requirements for the bachelor's degree may be allowed to select a maximum of 12 credits for reserved graduate credit if the student's cumulative GPA is at least 3.25.

The student must complete a Senior Petition for Reserved Graduate Credit in which the complete set of courses proposed for reserved graduate credit is listed. The petition must be signed by the adviser and approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. Advance approval of the Senior Petition is required prior to enrollment in any of the proposed courses. Approval for reserved graduate credit cannot be given for a course after the course has been completed.

Courses completed in the reserved graduate credit status do not apply toward the baccalaureate degree, and only those credits reserved with a grade of "B" or better can be counted toward a graduate degree.

3. Audit of graduate classes.

PROPOSAL: Graduate students may take any course for which they have the prerequisites and which is open to them on the basis of their admission category on an audit (no credit) basis. The tuition and fees for auditing courses are the same as for taking the courses for credit, but a student's load (total credit hours) does not include audit enrollments.

Courses taken on the audit basis cannot be repeated for credit. During the add-drop period a student registered for a course for audit may change to credit status or vice versa through the official methods; thereafter the change cannot be made.

Enrollment in a course for audit is subject to availability of space and approval of the instructor.
February 17, 1979

To: Faculty Senate
From: Jim Bentley, Chairman, Graduate Council

Our three proposals (March meeting) are part of a continuing effort to improve internal controls over the granting of graduate credit at PSU.

1. Requests for changes of recorded grades in graduate courses are numerous. In cases of clerical or arithmetic error that justifies the need to change a posted grade for graduate credit in a transcript, the approval after appropriate review will be routine. In other cases, such as changing a C, D, or F to a higher grade, approvals will seldom be granted. Note that this does not address the matter of a change which is the removal of an Incomplete.

2. Reservation of graduate credit produces a blizzard of petitions each year from students who wish credit retroactively because (1) they signed up for courses for graduate credit and failed to complete the required petition, or (2) they wish to receive graduate credit, having learned about graduate credit reservation after completing the course.

The proposal does not change the need to petition—a process that is clearly explained in the Bulletin in both the undergraduate and graduate sections as well as in the Graduate Advisers Handbook. It does require that they petition at one time for all the hours they intend to reserve, thereby asking for better planning on the part of the students. It raises the GPA requirement from 2.75 to 3.25, thereby recognizing that being allowed to reserve graduate credit is a privilege granted to superior undergraduates. With the requirement of a higher GPA there is a higher expectation that these students will be successful in the graduate courses.

The proposal narrows the option to students who are within 30 credits of graduation instead of 45. The practical effect of this change is to require students to plan more carefully.

The Graduate Council has no solution for the problem raised by the failure of students and faculty to observe the petition process for reservation of graduate credit. We hope that publicizing this and other regulations will help.

3. The proposal on audits of graduate courses is not intended to prevent students from auditing graduate courses. The change from the present practice is to say that courses taken on an audit basis cannot be repeated for credit. If a student lacks the appropriate background for a course, the appropriate route should be through taking background courses rather than by audits. In the most extreme example, on a GO-12 form submitted recently, a student included 15 courses, of which 11 had been audited at least once, four audited twice, and three audited three times before being taken for credit.
"Our Endangered Retirement Benefits"

To: Faculty Senate
From: Faculty Benefits Committee

Now that Retirement matters are before the Legislature, both in OMISSION (none of the proposed legislation deals with inflation) and in COMMISSION (in our judgment Senate Bill 257 hurts Higher Education) we have resolved to alert you to the following concerns of the Faculty Benefits Committee:

RAVAGES OF INFLATION. The best way to put the matter is BLUNTLY -- as we have done on the right.

Here we see the cruel effect of current inflation -- unrelieved by the farcical 2% annual cost of living pension adjustment provided by current law. As pensions remain nearly static, inflation burns on.

An associate professor retiring after 22 years at $20000 will start his pension-plus-annuity at $8000 (or "her" pension-plus-annuity at $7500). With Social Security that should be comfortable you say? TWENTY YEARS LATER (and nearly half of 65-year-old academicians now live that long -- more than half of the women) that initial $8000 ($7500) will have dwindled, through inflation, to ONLY THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS OF PURCHASING POWER! (We assume a rate of inflation 5% above the niggardly 2% adjustment already mentioned; experts agree inflation has been more than 6.5% during the past decade.)

Our Faculty Benefits Committee recommends that "cost of living pension adjustments" already permitted under State law be realistic, and not frustrated by the present farcical 2% limitation annually.

PROPOSED NEW PAY-OUT RATE (Senate Bill 257). Pension and annuity payments are to be combined in a "full formula", 1.6% of final average salary times years of service. Now our Committee has looked at fifteen pension-annuity pay-out schedules volunteered to us by colleagues (who requested their information, for our use, from PERS). These schedules suggest:

- a "full formula" would have to be 1.75% for women
- a "full formula" would have to be 1.80% for men

MERELY IN ORDER TO DO AS WELL AS WE DO NOW: In short, our evidence (admittedly not a statistically significant sampling) suggests that Academia will be hurt by the 1.6 formula. The Bill makes an exception of police, firemen, and legislators, whose "full formula" is proposed as 2.0%. OEA are pushing for 1.85% for their constituency. The only good thing we have found to say in behalf of the 1.6% "full formula" is that it treats men and women equally (apparently downgrading both, as would appear, in Higher Education).

The recommendation of our Faculty Benefits Committee is that (with no distinction of the sexes) the formula should be at least 2.0% of final salary times years of service.

HIGHER EDUCATION REPRESENTATION ON THE PERS BOARD. At present there is no such representative. While Higher Education accounts for 10% only of PERS clients, and therefore a representative might be deemed disproportionate on a five-man Board, we feel that the difficulties confronting any retirement system in a period of galloping inflation are sufficiently sophisticated to warrant our representation by at least one colleague from higher education with sufficient intellectual and research powers to fathom appropriately some of the formidable and technically novel dynamics and uncertainties of contemporary economic life. Such expert advice is sought out by governmental and quasi-governmental bodies elsewhere. We recommend their use in the present connection.

We suggest, for consideration of the Senate, two Resolutions:

That if a "full formula" for retirement benefits is to be used, this formula should be at least 2.0% of final salary times years of service.

That "cost of living pension adjustments" already permitted under State Law be unencumbered by the present unrealistic 2% annual limitation of pension adjustment.

For the Faculty Benefits Committee
Robert W. Rempfer
February 20, 1979