

4-8-1985

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet April 1985

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet April 1985" (1985). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 16.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/16>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

LD4349
.A192
F25



portland state university

MEMORANDUM

To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

March 21, 1985

From: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on April 8, 1985, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.



AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the March 4 and 11, 1985, Meetings

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 the Officers of Administration and Committees

1. Spring Term Registration Report - Blumel

*2. Annual Report, Academic Requirements Committee - Dressler

*3. Annual Report, Committee on Effective Teaching - Lockwood

*4. Annual Report, General Student Affairs Committee - Kimball

F. Unfinished Business

1. University General Education Requirements - Senate Steering Committee

G. New Business

PLEASE BRING OAA MAILING

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

*B. Minutes of March 4 and 11 Senate Meetings**

E¹ Annual Report, ARC

E² Annual Report, Committee on Effective Teaching

E³ Annual Report, GSA

**Mailing to Senators and Ex-officio Members Only.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 4, 1985
Presiding Officer: Nancy Tang
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present: Beeson, Bennett, Bjork, Brenner, Cabelly, Campbell, Cogan, Constans, Cooper, Diman, Dunkeld, Edner, Featheringill, Hakanson, Harmon, Heneghan, A. Johnson, D. Johnson, Kimbrell, Kosokoff, Kristof, Lall, Mandaville, Martinez, Maynard, Moor, Olson, R. Petersen, J. Peterson, Reardon, Reece, Robertson, Rodich, Rose, Scheans, Sheridan, Smeltzer, Solie, Sommerfeldt, Soohoo, Spolek, Stuart, Tang, Tayler, Tracy, Walton, West, White, Wolk, Wyers.

Alternates Present: Gerber for Cawthorne, Blake for Rufolo, Rueter for Forbes, Newborg for Kimball, Cumpston for Grimes, Withers for Hillman, Gaffuri for Jones, Lockerby for Newberry, Frost for Wrench.

Members Absent: Bentley, Carl, Jackson, Kempner, Neklason, Williams, Wurm.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Corn, Dobson, Dueker, Edgington, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Miller, Paudler, Pfingsten, Ross, Schendel, Trudeau, Williams, Guy for Leu.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the February 4, 1985, meeting were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The AAUP open house was announced. TANG talked about the likelihood of a continuation of this meeting to March 11 and also announced the K-House reception following Senate meetings.

QUESTION PERIOD

CABELLY wanted to know the outcome of the legislative meetings. TANG recalled that three legislative up-date sessions had been held; the first two were attended by 8-10 people; the third by about 15 persons.

NEW BUSINESS

For the discussion of the general education requirements it was moved that the Senate act as a committee of the whole and that privilege of the floor be granted to all those in attendance. The motion was passed. TANG explained that all phases of the proposal would be discussed at the Senate meetings; departments and program areas could then discuss the proposals. The vote on the proposal would then come at the April meeting of the Senate.

SMELTZER reviewed the document prepared by the ad hoc Committee on General Education. Throughout its discussion the committee considered the special characteristics of the PSU student; it concluded that requiring a single core curriculum is not feasible, given the high percentage of transfer students. For that reason a liberal education program focusing on the following areas (9 credits each) was proposed to fulfill the breadth requirement:

- °World Culture and Civilization -- students should have historical consciousness and broad knowledge
- °United States Studies -- students need to know the development of U.S. history and culture
- °Fine Arts and Humanities -- similar to the present arts and letters requirement; however, different departments may also fit
- °Individual and Society -- similar to the present social sciences requirement; however, different departments may also fit here
- °Mathematical and Computer Sciences -- students need some experience with math and computer sciences
- °Natural Sciences -- graduates need some experience with the natural sciences

For the writing skills requirement the GEC suggested two freshman level courses and the satisfactory passing of a junior-level competency examination. SMELTZER admitted that administering the examination would be considerable work, but it was manageable. He said most transfer students now bring in two writing courses from the community college and are excused from WR 323. He concluded that the University has an obligation to the students and to itself that students have the use of standard English.

The health and physical fitness requirement should be left at three credits; however, students should be able to fulfill the requirements in different ways.

In discussing the BS and BA degrees, SMELTZER pointed out that the critical distinction between the two degrees is two years of foreign language; the GEC is further suggesting, however, that the BA be available to students in the fine or performing arts.

Acting on behalf of the ARC, DRESSLER distributed the "Summary of Issues" sheet which compared the positions of the 1983-85 catalog with the General Education Committee proposals and the ARC responses (see Attachment A). She highlighted some significant differences as follows: ARC was unanimous in not allowing a selected list of pre-authorized courses to fulfill the distribution requirements; such a list is impractical for PSU with so many transfer students. ARC also voted against having part of the 54 credits of

distribution requirements be upper division. The committee doubts if there is merit in selecting upper division courses which have no pre-requisites. For the writing skills, the ARC supported the current vertical program but proposed enforcing the policy that the second course be taken as an upper division course, not before the junior year. ARC did not favor the junior-level examination of competence.

Following these presentations, the discussion was opened to the persons present. D. JOHNSON said he had heard that Dean Paudler had been working on a plan and wanted to know more about it. PAUDLER admitted that he had a plan but suggested that the Senate discuss the two presented and save his for a later time.

One of the first points made was that community college transfers would have problems with the proposals as would foreign students; the GEC proposal is much more restrictive than the current system and therefore would present difficulties. PAUDLER and WALTON argued that this should be an academic issue; we are revising the program for our students, not for transfer students. We should decide first what we want, then how we can accommodate transfers. SCHEANS countered that we cannot ignore the fact that 80% of our students are transfers. What do we mean by our students? The nature of our concerns must be considered first. RODICH was concerned that neither committee had given a statement of their objectives. We need to have a definition of "liberal education," for example.

Many other issues were raised. COOPER argued for more departmental autonomy in identifying courses that would satisfy the breadth requirement. For example, the English Department would not want WR 227 to count; the department fought that battle once and won; if composition courses should be excluded from arts and letters, then experimental writing courses should also be excluded. BJORK wondered which courses in mathematics and computer science would be included. SMELTZER responded by saying that the GEC rejected the narrow definition of a core curriculum, especially because of the many transfer students. BJORK, however, wanted to know what the liberal education in math and computer sciences was; he said that an anti-science bias comes through in the document. SMELTZER pointed out that the GEC in its proposal actually wanted to make sure that students take math. MANDAVILLE observed that foreign language was listed under fine arts and humanities and wanted to know if two years of it would satisfy both humanities and foreign language. SMELTZER said yes; DRESSLER did not think so because of the exclusion policy, but HOWARD pointed out that students could take two foreign languages. DRESSLER admitted that that could be done.

S. BRENNER wondered if we were studying solutions for which there were no problems. Virtually no problems or objectives have been identified by the GEC and ARC. One thing he was looking for in the committee reports was a statement on the institutional impact of these proposals. He felt that we were only at the first of about 20 steps and that it was too early for departments to look at courses they may want to have included as fulfilling breadth requirements -- a suggestion TANG had made. KIMBRELL agreed with Brenner, but he also pointed out that the GEC grouping gave three categories to the social sciences, two to sciences, and only one to the humani-

ties. He preferred simply three divisions and supported the idea of having a list of courses which would satisfy distribution requirements. He was unhappy with the present "drop-in-U" system.

HEATH responded by pointing out that the GEC's configuration made it possible to fit courses into more than one area. E.g., art could fit under world culture and civilization, United States studies, fine arts and humanities, or under individual society ("the psycho-analysis of art"). The committee had wrestled with the question of what is liberal arts and had considered many other programs, including Harvard and Berkeley. Further, the committee had representatives from across the University. BJORK pointed out that Harvard had a core curriculum. HEATH agreed but still said that the core curriculum was not practical for PSU's many transfer students.

WOLK had problems with the ARC's breadth requirements and felt those were arbitrary restrictions; students should be able to select from the two concentrations. It makes no sense to create two tunnels. DRESSLER defended the ARC by saying that students should not be allowed to take 18 hours in one department. CONSTANS and others supported Wolk and felt that students would leave a sequence after only two terms and move to take another dab elsewhere. WEST wondered what all this discussion would mean if we were to shift to a semester system. SCHEANS felt that we had only created new pigeon holes for old pigeons and cited German 101, 102, 103 as an example. CABELLY added, however, that both committees had ignored one important pigeon, the professional schools: BA, SW, ED, UPA, and EAS; the committees had therefore done a disservice to the schools. He urged that new additional opportunities be created for them in this area of breadth requirements. DUEKER concurred and said that PSU should consider "content" alongside of "discipline" in the general education/breadth requirements. We must ask what content the professional schools can provide.

SCHENDEL turned the discussion to the composition requirement and wanted to know what problems there were with administering a junior-level competency examination. DRESSLER said the ARC saw no problem with the exam, but it did not favor it. SMELTZER said it was mostly a problem of time and effort, but it was not nearly the problem that the English department feared. 15 readers could handle 1,200 papers per day. WESTBROOK, however, pointed out that no reliable examination beyond the high school level existed. There was no reasonable exam that tested for critical reading and thinking, writing and usage, and curricular validity had to be present. Further, an exit exam like that raises peculiar pedagogical and legal problems. There are also financial implications, the huge burden of administering the exit exam. We should also ask what course we would provide students to help them pass the test. And then there is the question of whether an exam should dictate the curriculum. At PSU many 20-30 year veterans are teaching writing courses, and there is the problem of telling them exactly what they should teach. PAUDLER had a hard time agreeing that it is more expensive to give an exam than to have students in a term-long class. Other states have not found the exam impossible. WESTBROOK argued that an exam would be more useful at the beginning of the university career than at the end. PAUDLER related his experience that at one university

freshmen and seniors were given the same examination, and 80% wrote better as freshmen. WESTBROOK took that example and said that is why the English department favored the vertical program; frequent or multiple exposure to writing is important. WOLK agreed and added that research showed that students write best about what they know well. Therefore, de-contextualized writing is not a valid measure of what students can do.

HOWARD pointed out that the exam was being proposed in addition to the courses, not replacing a course. MOOR said he'd be content if PSU students wrote as well as they did in high school. COOPER warned that we don't want to give the wrong message and imply that there is a satisfactory minimum. KRITSOF, KIMBRELL and WEST all complained of the poor writing skills of students. KRISTOF said an exit exam would catch those who could not write. WESTBROOK reiterated the fact that no good examination existed, unless we wanted to reduce writing to just mechanics. KRISTOF responded that would be better than what we have. BEESON also wanted to know what would happen to those who didn't pass the test; what courses would they take? REECE warned that the Senate had followed a mistaken emphasis in the discussion. Which is the best exam is the wrong question; rather, the focus should be on the students' writing.

TANG now directed the discussion to the HPE requirement. WHITE said the ARC discussed a number of classes and felt that HPE 298 was the proper course.

Since many people had been leaving, the meeting was adjourned at 16:50, to be continued the following Monday.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES

Attachment A

CAT - 1983-85 catalog
GEC - General Education Committee
ARC - Academic Requirements Committee

DISTRIBUTION (BREADTH) REQUIREMENTS

Should the number of categories from which the 54 credits of distribution requirements are chosen be increased?

GEC - yes
ARC - yes

How many categories should there be?

CAT - three
GEC - six
ARC - six

Should there be a maximum and/or a minimum number of credits from a single department (discipline) which can be used to meet the 54 credits of distribution requirements?

CAT - no
GEC - yes
ARC - yes

What should the maximum number of credits be?

CAT - 18 credits
GEC - 12 credits
ARC - 12 credits

What should the minimum number of credits be?

CAT - 1 credit
GEC - no comment
ARC - 6 credits

Should all courses taught in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the departments of Music, Theater Arts, and Computer Science (with the exception of Mth 93, 94, 100: Wr 120, 121, 222, 323) be allowed to fulfill the distribution requirements?

CAT - yes
GEC - no
ARC - no

Should the courses be limited to a selected list of pre-authorized courses?

GEC - yes
ARC - no

Should all omnibus numbered courses be excluded?

GEC - yes
ARC - yes, with exception made for pre-approved courses undergoing regular curriculum development and review

Should a part of the 54 credits of distribution requirements be upper division?

CAT - yes
GEC - yes
ARC - no

How many credits of upper division should there be?

CAT - 9 credits
GEC - 18 credits
ARC - 0 credits

How many of the upper division distribution requirements should be taken at PSU?

CAT - 0 credits
GEC - 12 credits
ARC - 0 credits (no UD required)

How many of the upper division distribution requirements should be outside of the student's major distribution area?

CAT - 9 credits
GEC - 0 credits (unspecified)
ARC - 0 credits (no UD required)

Should a foreign language with a different prefix be considered out of major and allowed to fulfill distribution requirements for a student taking a major in a foreign language? (i.e., GL for FR major)

CAT - no
GEC - no comment
ARC - yes

OVER

WRITING SKILLS

Should satisfactory performance on a junior-level examination of competence in standard written English be required?

CAT - no
GEC - yes
ARC - no

Should writing be taught on the horizontal or the vertical pattern?

CAT - vertical implied
GEC - horizontal implied
ARC - vertical required

If vertical composition is to be the required pattern, should transfer and registration policy enforce registration for the second course as an upper division course taken no earlier than the junior year?

CAT - no by present practice
GEC - uses horizontal pattern
ARC - yes

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL FITNESS

Should the HPE requirement be HPE 298 or allow some other combination of three credits from HPE courses?

CAT - HPE 298
GEC - 3 credits
ARC - HPE 298

BS DEGREE

Should a BS require 36 credits in either Social Science or Science?

CAT - yes
GEC - no
ARC - no

BA DEGREE

Should a BA degree require 36 credits in foreign language, literature, and/or philosophy?

CAT - yes
GEC - no
ARC - no

Should a BA degree require completion of two years of college level foreign language or equivalent?

CAT - yes
GEC - yes for all majors except fine and performing arts
ARC - yes for all majors except fine and performing arts

MAJORS IN GENERAL STUDIES

Should General Studies Option I be retained?

GEC - excludes recommendation for this major
ARC - yes

Should General Studies Option II be retained?

GEC - excludes recommendation for this major
ARC - yes

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 11, 1985
Presiding Officer: Nancy Tang
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present: Beeson, Bennett, Constans, Cooper, Diman, Edner, Jackson, A. Johnson, D. Johnson, Kimbrell, Kosokoff, Kristof, Mandaville, Moor, Olson, J. Peterson, Reardon, Reece, Robertson, Rodich, Rufolo, Rose, Scheans, Sheridan, Smeltzer, Solie, Sommerfeldt, Spolek, Stuart, Tang, Tayler, Tracy, White, Williams, Wolk, Wyers.

Alternates Present: Blake for Rufolo, Ruetër for Forbes, Newborg for Kimball, Cumpston for Grimes, Gaffuri for Jones, Gorji for Lall, Frost for Wrench

Members Absent: Bentley, Bjork, Brenner, Cabelly, Campbell, Carl, Cawthorne, Cogan, Dunkeld, Featheringill, Hakanson, Harmon, Heneghan, Hillman, Kempner, Martinez, Soohoo, Neklason, Newberry, R. Petersen, Maynard, Walton, West, Wurm.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Dobson, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Paudler, Schendel, Trudeau, Williams, Guy for Leu.

The Senate reconvened as a committee of the whole to continue the discussion of the general education requirements. OLSON asked the question why PSU was seeking to change the requirements. BLUMEL pointed out that when he appointed the task force, scholars across the country were addressing the meaning of a higher education degree. Major institutions (e.g., Harvard) were examining their programs, and it was time for PSU to look again at what we meant by general education, given the way in which our general education requirements had developed. There is a lack of coherence. The GEC has worked very long and hard and has articulated what it felt a PSU general education should be. BLUMEL said he appreciated their effort. Subsequent history has validated the committee's report. Changes have been taking place around the country. The President feared that if we do not make changes, they will be mandated, and that would be the worst of situations.

CONSTANS still felt that the biggest problem was with the 3 hours and even the 6 hours. There will be too much skipping around. She suggested 9 hours and liked the concentration in one field for the entire year. Foreign language would present a problem, because that would be 12 hours, yet a full year of foreign language is needed. WOLK asked what percentage take foreign language. PAUDLER estimated 60%. RODICH wanted to know where computer science fits now. Should it be moved to concentration II?

GUY spoke in support of the general education review, but he pointed out that elementary education majors are different from other majors, and the present catalog exempts them from the normal distribution requirements.

The GEC made no note of that exemption, while the ARC did. He urged the Senate to continue that exemption, which made sure that elementary education students had the broadest possible program, as required by TSPC.

KIMBRELL asked what the actual courses of the breadth requirement would be. He was bothered by the fact that courses fit into more than one category and suggested that no committee can make those decisions. SMELTZER said that departments would recommend and decide into which category courses will fit. KIMBRELL thought that could become as vague as the scholars' program. BLUMEL pointed out that that program was working well. Still, KIMBRELL wanted a clearer statement, so the checkers in the registrar's office would not be making decisions. HEATH argued that it is the departments which will determine the category of courses, thus preserving their autonomy.

SOMMERFELDT supported the ARC proposal in general and urged that we go the next step and look at the categories. HOWARD recalled, however, that when we had lists at one time, ARC was besieged with endless petitions; usually departments supported the requests. He saw going back to the lists as a real problem. WHITE agreed, as former chair of ARC. He also pointed out that 88% of PSU students have transfer credits. DOBSON reported that the 1976 review of the evaluation office showed that there were many problems incurred because of the lists.

BENNETT asked if it would destroy the proposal if the two categories from social science were combined. DRESSLER did not think so. COOPER said the areas did not make sense, except in science where they are a reasonable distinction. He hoped the areas of concentration would be eliminated. WOLK also argued against the groupings. CONSTANS, however, was concerned about the elective hours. RODICH pointed out that students could not take both math and computer science, because they are in the same category.

DRESSLER suggested that a 12-hour maximum in any one department should be debated. REECE wanted to know if English, Writing and Linguistics would be considered one or three departments. DRESSLER said therein lies the problem and suggested that it would probably be three departments. KRISTOF also argued that a language is hardly worth taking unless it is taken for two years.

SCHENDEL concluded that courses apparently would be accepted by prefix, yet there are courses in any department which are inappropriate. The ARC proposal does not deal with that issue. DRESSLER agreed. Nor does it deal with omnibus numbers. She suggested that a list of inappropriate courses could be generated, rather than vice versa. An example might be that photography would be unacceptable as fulfilling the science requirement. PAUDLER did not like the talk of creating a hit list. Rather, we should be talking about an academically sound core curriculum for PSU students. LEHMAN thought that courses should be evaluated on their content rather than by prefix, but HARRIS then asked if the same prefix would be allowed to serve in fulfilling a breadth area. MOOR thought that we could not answer that question until we saw a scheme. TANG pointed out that the GEC had provided for the concept of crossing departmental lines as long as

courses are taken within the categories. The ARC, on the other hand, recommended that we stay with departmental prefixes. She was ready to begin taking straw votes on several items. SMELTZER reiterated that the GEC felt that PSU students needed background in the development of the wider cultures of the world in which they live and that many courses would be appropriate. It is the substance that the GEC wanted to get at. WHITE said he understood and that the ARC also was in favor of that concept, yet they saw problems that needed to be resolved. The dilemma was grave and the straw votes would be difficult. Should all courses taught in CLAS be acceptable? REARDON had a problem with that and argued for some exclusions. RODICH argued that courses in the professional schools could also be used.

At this point several votes were taken; all present were allowed to vote.

Persons in favor of the GEC concept to let the content of the courses determine acceptability: 27.

Persons in favor of the ARC proposal of using departmental prefixes with concentration in specified areas: 13.

Persons favoring neither proposal: 4

Persons favoring excluding omnibus numbers as fulfilling breadth requirements: 33

Persons favoring not excluding omnibus numbers: 10

Should the courses be limited to a selected list of pre-authorized courses? Yes: 31 No: 9 Abstain: 2.

KIMBRELL said that the problem was that you don't know what happens in a class unless you take it. Therefore no committee can decide which courses are appropriate.

COOPER's opinion was that departments should determine the courses and propose the lists. The departments are competent to do that. SCHEANS, on the other hand, still argued that criteria are more important than lists.

In turning the attention to the writing requirement, TANG reviewed that the GEC proposal says that students must take a junior-level course. MOOR wanted to know if students could avoid the course if they passed the exam. COOPER explained that that was possible now; in fact, many students sign up for composition and then take the exam and fail. DRESSLER emphasized that the ARC did not like the horizontal composition program and did not want to allow WR 122 (perhaps taken elsewhere) to count for WR 323, nor did the committee want to allow 323 taken before the junior year. Studies have shown the greater value of vertical composition programs, i.e., several exposures to writing courses throughout the college career, rather than all in one year. CONSTANS asked why not require a full year. SMELTZER said his committee discussed that idea and liked a full year of freshman composition; however, it would present a staffing problem.

At this point many people were leaving. Those remaining voted on the following:

Persons favoring a horizontal composition program: 8

Persons favoring a vertical composition program: 16

Persons abstaining: 6

Persons favoring a junior-level exam of writing competence: 23

Persons not favoring an exam: 10

Persons abstaining: 1

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 16:45

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

April 8, 1985

The Academic Requirements Committee has met on a regular weekly schedule since it reported to the Senate last April. Almost the entire meeting time has been devoted to review and discussion of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education on Undergraduate Liberal Education Distribution Requirements. The recommendations of the ARC on this report were transmitted to the faculty on February 4, 1985.

From March 9, 1984 through March 4, 1985, the committee read and voted on 329 petitions. Of these, 268 were granted and 61 were denied.

The ARC dealt with appeals from several students whose petitions were denied.

Jeanette DeCarrico ESL
Adriane Gaffuri PSY
Harold Gray MUS
Donald Howard PHY
Robert Jellesed Student Member
Joyce Petrie ED
Sandra Rosengrant FL
Charles M. White HST
Dawn Dressler, Chair. PHY
Robert Tufts, ex officio
Forbes Williams, ex officio

COMMITTEE ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
April 8, 1985

The Committee on Effective Teaching has two major functions: (1) to encourage, through the awarding of funds from the Fund for the Advancement of Teaching, innovative and experimental projects related to effective classroom teaching; and (2) to stimulate effective teaching and contribute to professional development among faculty through a variety of workshops and speakers dealing with methods, materials, and concepts related to effective teaching.

Grants may be requested and are awarded to individuals, groups, departments, colleges, schools, or to university committees. Although no specific limit is set for the size of grants, and each request will be judged on its merits, applicants should know that previous awards have typically ranged from \$50 to \$500.

The Committee still has approximately \$2000 of its annual \$4200 budget remaining and encourages grant applications. All grant funds allocated must be spent by June 1, 1985. A copy of the guidelines can be obtained from the chairperson. The following grants have thus far been awarded during the 1984-85 academic year:

- 1) Ann Roseberry, School of Education: Technology in Metropolitan Education-- An In-service for School of Education Faculty.
- 2) Philip Withers, Biology: Monitoring Muscle Function with a Computer in Student Laboratories.
- 3) John McDermott, Speech Communication: Computer Assisted Instruction Materials for Speech and Hearing Sciences.
- 4) Bill Olsen, Cooperative Education Program: Improved Teaching Methods Through Cooperative Education Programming.
- 5) Candice Goucher, Black Studies: The Furnace Eats the Forest: The Iron Industry of Bassar, Togo (West Africa).

Committee Members:

Sandra Anderson - SSW
 Jeanne Bernard - FL
 Anne McMahon - LIB W
 Carl Pollock - BA

Bruce Stern - BA
 Donald Tyree - ENG
 Chris Iwai - student member
 Forbes Williams - Dean of Undergraduate Studies, is advisor to the Committee

Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Lockwood

Robert W. Lockwood - AJ
Chairperson

GENERAL STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

1984 - 85

Kenneth Ames, ANTH
Charles Becker, HPE
Susan Danielson, ENG
Leslie Herren, Student
James Kimball, TV, Chairperson

Sandra Nelson, ASPU (Student)
Al Sugarman, SP
Michael Knight, Student
William Williams, Consultant
Major Morris, Consultant

Student Health Protection Plans

Since the University is in the process of negotiating with the insurance industry for a new health protection program for students, the Committee held a number of meetings during fall term, 1984, and winter term, 1985, to evaluate the present program and to determine potential areas of revision for a new plan taking effect fall term, 1985. The Committee met with the insurance broker to discuss such matters as student experience with the current plan, together with various options, i.e., eye care, increased surgical benefits, that might be added to a new plan. Throughout our deliberations we attempted to propose those revisions that would provide reasonable benefit for students, while at the same time keeping premiums at a modest level.

Analysis of Student Affirmative Action

The Committee had the opportunity to review and discuss the results of a comprehensive analysis of student affirmative action prepared by the Office of Student Affairs. Basically, the analysis revealed that the University should be more actively involved in efforts to recruit, admit, enroll, retain and graduate various ethnic minorities, particularly Blacks and Native Americans. Additional efforts could be made to encourage women students to pursue study in "non-traditional" academic disciplines such as engineering and business. A separate committee composed of those University representatives directly involved with the above mentioned functions is currently preparing a series of recommendations that will improve Portland State's record in student affirmative action. The General Student Affairs Committee will continue to monitor their progress in this important area.

JK:e