

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate  
Minutes (Minutes Only)

University Archives: Faculty Senate

---

1993

## Annual Faculty Senate Minutes October 1993 - June 1994

Portland State University Faculty Senate

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

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Annual Faculty Senate Minutes October 1993 - June 1994" (1993). *Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate Minutes (Minutes Only)*. 24.  
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateannualmin/24>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate Minutes (Minutes Only) by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 4, 1993  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Abrams, Andrews-Collier, Barna, Beeson, Bjork, Bowlden, Briggs, Burke, Cooper, DeCarrico, Farr, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Gray, Greco, Hales, Jackson, A. Johnson, D. M. Johnson, D. Johnson, Jolin, Kenny, Kimball, Krug, Lall, Lansdowne, Limbaugh, Miller, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Reece, Schaumann, Seltzer, Smith, Svoboda, Talbott, Tama, Visse, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Westover, Wetzell, Wollner.

Alternates Present: West for Manning, Rad for Kocaoglu.

Members Absent: Barton, Brenner, Etesami, Falco, Fisher, Gillpatrick, Liebman, McGuire, Midson.

Ex-officio Members Present: Bleiler, Cabelly, Desrochers, Diman, Erzurumlu, Kaiser, Koch, Kosokoff, Mestas, Pfingsten, Reardon, Toscan, Wamser, Ward, Weinberg.

OSHIKA called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM and made the following announcements:

1. President Ramaley, in accordance with normal governance procedure, accepted the three motions that were passed in the June 1993 meeting, and listed in the minutes as G1, G2, and G3. One is a Graduate Council proposal, one supports adequate child care facilities, and the third is a Curriculum Committee proposal.
2. Senators are encouraged to identify themselves and to speak up throughout Senate proceedings.
3. K-House prepares refreshments and sherry after every Senate meeting. Senators and *ex-officio* members are encouraged to attend.
4. The Advisory Council exists to respond to any concerns the faculty may have. This year's Chair is Larry Bowlden.
5. Senators should give the names of their alternates to the Secretary.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the June 7, 1993 meeting were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. President's Report. The President is out of town and unavailable.
2. Provost's Report.
  - a. REARDON brought the faculty up to date on PSU programs that we have sent to the State Board for approval. The Master of Public Health program has been approved by the Board. This is a joint degree program with OHSU and OSU. In addition we have a component of this program, an MS in Public Health, which has been discussed by the Academic Council and will be on the Academic Council Agenda for the October meeting. It will then undergo external review. Our undergraduate program in Child and Family Studies has gone through the Academic Council at the September meeting and will next go to the Committee on Instruction for examination at the October Board meeting.
  - b. PSU is preparing for accreditation review by the Northwest Accrediting Association. The formal review is scheduled for 1995, but the early stages have begun. We are pleased that Prof. Cooper has agreed to serve as Chair of the University Accrediting Committee. Subsequent membership will be announced soon. Accreditation involves self-study in all aspects of the university. Deans have been asked to discuss processes with all academic personnel, to look at the self-study documents that have been developed, and use these at all levels. One difference in this year's accreditation process is that now, for the first time, professional schools undergoing their own accreditation will also be part of this process.
  - c. There exists a directive from the Chancellor requiring each institution to develop plans for productivity and institutional reform. This directive includes methods to be used to study this process. Important components for us include:
    - i* The Time Line. We must make a progress report at the December Board meeting, and must have a complete report to submit to the Board at its March meeting.
    - ii* Educational Reform. These processes have already begun.
    - iii* Productivity. Deans in each school and college have been asked to begin working with their faculty to respond to this issue, concurrent with AAUP negotiations. This is likely to include a process for review of the categories to be developed at both the school/college level, as well as at the university level.
    - iv* Faculty Governance. The legislators who visited the various campuses last fall reported that they almost unanimously heard faculty complaints regarding too much time spent in committee work. Therefore, this is a significant issue, and should be examined when responding to the issue of

faculty productivity. This should be studied within the context of governance, particularly the efficacy, amount of time, and the effectiveness of the governance processes, especially if committee work is not seen as valuable. The President, Provost, and Senate leaders will meet on October 26 with some of the faculty committee leaders to begin evaluation of these processes.

COOPER noted that at the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting, Shirley Clark raised these issues in relationship to outcomes of student learning, and wondered if we would be emphasizing these. REARDON agreed that the Chancellor has directed us towards emphasizing learning productivity or outcome productivity. Whether this is what the legislature also wants us to do is a question. However, there is agreement within the chancellor's office and the state institutions. DESROCHERS noted that the 2010 Committee, formed by the Board, met on October 2, and heard the Chancellor state that the definition of productivity should be viewed broadly. A number of legislators are on this committee, and seemed to agree with this statement.

3. KOSOKOFF, Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board, introduced the new Portland State University coaches. Bernie Fagan, coach of the soccer team was not available. Tim Walsh is the new football coach, joining us from Sonoma State University. Cathy Nelson is the new volleyball coach, joining us from the University of Oregon. The coaches received a large round of applause.

### Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

BJORK asked for an enrollment report. TUFTS stated that as of October 4 (eight days into fall term), total headcount was down 3.3%, and total credit hours were down .8%, compared to last fall at this time. These are preliminary. There has been some change in the type of data, especially some of the self support courses through the School of Extended Studies.

BEESON asked about the remodeling of 53 CH, especially the poor quality of the overhead slides. DESROCHERS noted that an improvement in quality was desired, and that she would look into the situation. She had not been aware of the problem before this time, and will have the technicians see what adjustments could be made. BEESON also welcomed comments from other faculty using the room.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

There were no questions.

### Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

1. Semi-Annual Report, Faculty Development Committee—BLEILER presented the report, noting that the June 1993 issue of *PSU Currently* has the full list of funded proposals. Last year there were many excellent proposals, and not enough money. Most proposals were funded at significantly lower levels than desired. This year's proposals will be administered the same way they were last year, but with earlier time lines. Proposals are now due on November 15, so the review process will be completed by the beginning of spring term. Then the committee will meet to determine a clear set of strategic goals for the next year. This year's budget is \$100,000, compared to last year's \$220,000. Last year's budget had requests that were three times the amount that could be awarded. In response to OSHIKA's question, BLEILER noted that there would not be another mailing, but that committee members are available for consultation and advice. OSHIKA then urged all Senators to remind their constituents of the program and the timing; she suggested that this is one of functions of senators.
2. General Education Working Group—OSHIKA began by thanking Pat Erdenberger, a graduate student for her enormous help in arranging student attendance at the September 17 symposium. More than 100 students attended. WHITE then gave the status report for the group, noting that the committee has met a few times since the symposium, has reviewed the written notes from the breakout sessions along with summaries from the committee members.
  - a. White will meet with the Steering Committee on October 11, preparing catalog copy and a proposal for the Senate for the November 1 meeting.
  - b. Lois Becker (History) and Eric Bodegum (Physics) have been added to the committee.
  - c. The proposal is simply a plan for moving forward. If it is adopted there would be an evolution over time.
  - d. The committee cannot respond to the issue of resources. Others must do this. Questions and consequences of student credit hours should be done by the departments; however, the program is designed to be supportive of the major.
  - e. Diversity was also a concern. 61% of institutions making changes similar to ours put diversity across the curriculum. The committee is recommending that faculty be developed in this area.
  - f. Student learning communities will put students of different backgrounds together. This is part of the overall learning goal, again focusing on diversity.
  - g. Peer mentors are essential to the program. Juan Mestas has introduced the committee to the Supplemental Instruction Program, housed in the University of Missouri-Kansas City, designed to assist students in these programs. At Cal State-Long Beach, the program has been found to raise student GPAs by one grade point, compared to students in the same classes without supplemental instruction. More detail on this will be reported.

- h. There were questions about how this proposal would fit with primary/secondary education reforms in Oregon. The Director of Curriculum and Instruction for Portland Public Schools told the committee that our proposal would fit very well with what the state is doing. She also said that this proposal would put PSU in a leadership position.
- i. Writing/communication is a major issue. The committee views writing instruction not simply as mechanics, but as a means of learning and of expression. Mathematics and visual arts are now viewed in the same way. The core of communication is writing, but visual, data, and graphics are means of expressing this. Heavy reliance is placed on faculty development for this. All faculty and student mentors in the program should receive training in communication across the curriculum, where the core is writing. Laboratory work should be seen as normal, and structured into the course curriculum.
- j. At the sophomore level, the question of class size and number of sections rose. Looking at 50 students/class, the committee estimates that 30 classes/quarter will be needed. Student mentors will help here. At the junior and senior levels, 40 sections/quarter will be needed.
- k. The program seems to fit the non-traditional student. All comments from these people support the proposal. There appears to be enough student choice.
- l. The academic integrity of the curriculum is also important. Some wondered if there would simply be "talking heads" coming into the classroom for two weeks and then leaving. The reality is that all people within the teaching team will be committed to the process. All will participate fully in all courses. There cannot be a guarantee that all the courses will have high levels of rigor, but methods to improve that are built in.

JOLIN asked if someone is working on the resource question, and when Senators might receive this information. REARDON indicated that the Deans have been asked to prepare impact statements, and begin examining other resource questions. He also indicated that some of the money PSU has received this year has been earmarked for curricular reform.

OSHIKA then noted that Senators will receive the following before the November meeting: a revised report from the working group; proposed new language to fulfill the distribution requirement; an impact statement from OAA and the deans.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

G. NEW BUSINESS

There is no new business.

H. ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 3:58 PM

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 1 and 8, 1993  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary Pro Tem: Carl Wamser

Members Present: Abrams, Andrews-Collier, Barna, Barton, Beeson, Bjork, Bowlden, Cooper, DeCarrico, Falco, Farr, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Gray, Greco, Hales, Jackson, A. Johnson, Daniel M. Johnson, David Johnson, Jolin, Kimball, Krug, Lall, Lansdowne, Limbaugh, McGuire, Midson, Miller, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Reece, Seltzer, Smith, Svoboda, Tama, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Westover, Wetzel, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Becker for Burke, Casperson for Kocaoglu, Toth for Liebman, Adams for Talbott, Grubb for Visse.

Members Absent: Brenner, Briggs, Etesami, Gillpatrick, Kenny, Manning, Schaumann.

Ex-officio Members Present: Ahlbandt, Barna, Davidson, Desrochers, Diman, Erzurumlu, Kaiser, Koch, Levinson, Mestas, Pfingsten, Ramaley, Reardon, Toscan, Toulan, Vieira, Wamser, Ward, Weikel.

### November 8

Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Abrams, Andrews-Collier, Barna, Barton, Beeson, Bjork, Bowlden, Cooper, DeCarrico, Falco, Farr, Fisher, Fosque, Franks, Gray, Greco, Hales, A. Johnson, Daniel M. Johnson, David Johnson, Jolin, Kimball, Kocaoglu, Krug, Lall, Lansdowne, Limbaugh, Midson, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Reece, Schaumann, Smith, Svoboda, Talbott, Tama, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Westover, Wetzel, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Balsham for Brenner, Becker for Burke, Zelick for Forbes, Toth for Liebman, Chapman for Seltzer, Grubb for Visse.

Members Absent: Briggs, Etesami, Gillpatrick, Jackson, Kenny, Manning, McGuire, Miller.

Ex-officio Members Present: Ahlbandt, Bowlden, Cabelly, Davidson, Diman, Erzurumlu, Everhart, Harris, Koch, Kosokoff, Ramaley, Reardon, Spolek, Toscan, Toulan, Vieira, Ward, Weikel, Wineberg.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

OSHIKA called the meeting to order at 3:05 PM, noting that Carl Wamser had agreed to serve as Secretary *pro tem* in the absence of Alan Cabelly, who will be attending the memorial for Anna Bavetta.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Minutes of the October 4, 1993, were approved unanimously as submitted.

OSHIKA then made the following announcements:

There will be a memorial service for Anna Bavetta, Business Administration faculty member who died in a fall on Mt. Rainier on October 24. The service will be today at 4:00 P.M., at the Old Church. OSHIKA then asked for a moment of silence for the following faculty members who have recently passed away: Anna Bavetta, John Redman, Frank Roberts and Art Terry.

### 1. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY announced that those wishing to contribute to the Frank Roberts Scholarship Fund could do so through the Foundation. Those who wish to contribute to the Anna Bavetta Memorial Fund may do so at any branch of First Interstate Bank.

RAMALEY then distributed a report from the Chronicle of Higher Education, included in the minutes. The material was developed from Illinois State University. PSU is close to the national average in terms of its state support, while most other state institutions have done worse. Part of the reason for our success is the use of lottery funds for non-core programs, so we still have some difficulties. We now have a few years in which to demonstrate the effectiveness of our institution, in an attempt to continue receiving these monies. However, we are not out of the woods. But we should be proud of the fact that we are becoming a national model, identifying the nature of the campus and its faculty, and the relationship of PSU to the community and other educational institutions. This was the goal when Ramaley came to this campus a number of years ago. We also have developed a number of national audiences to address ways of receiving feedback and communicating our successes beyond our doors and state. We have a great deal of influence on what education means in this state, and how this definition it is developing nationwide. She expressed regret that she would have to leave for Anna Bavetta's service later in the day, because the discussion of curricular changes is at the heart of our university, and may be some of the most important changes on our campus in the next ten years.

2. PROVOST'S REPORT

REARDON noted that he would ask the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate to work with the Committee on Committees and help him form new *ad hoc* committees. One is needed for assessment based on accreditation needs and support of instructional changes, as directed by the State System. We must define assessment and outcomes that apply directly to us. This will also be done on a System-wide basis.

A next committee will work with administration to assess and develop models for support structures for instruction and for community activity. We have seen what other institutions have done; now is the time for faculty to develop this.

He is developing a question and answer sheet for general education reallocation, and hopes to have these estimates available by mid-week so they can be used for the final part of the general education discussion.

Finally, Diman has noted that Armageddon, Apocalypse, and Accreditation all begin with the letter A, and that preparation for accreditation is underway. Diman, Cooper and others have attended orientation seminars given by the Northwest Accrediting Association, and are preparing for that process. The ten-year accreditation visit is tentatively scheduled for April 12-14, 1995. Prof. Cooper is chairing the committee, and preparing for our self study. The draft report will be delivered to the accrediting team by winter 1995. There are new accreditation standards, which will respond to much of the national debate on higher education. This is likely to lead to more rigorous standards with new guidelines.

COOPER agreed that this will be more rigorous. He said we should expect to be required to provide data and evidence. Our faculty committee structure will be called upon to assist in the process.

3. Jan KURTZ, President of the PSU Alumni Association, thanked faculty for the opportunity to speak about the Association, and noted that she had received significant opportunities as a student. Scott Kaden is also present today. She asked for assistance from faculty in a number of outreach opportunities. First, the Student Affairs Committee has sponsored internships in the past, and is now offering its first scholarship to children of alumni. They are also designing significant internships, perhaps to be tied to the capstone experience of the new general education proposal.

The next opportunity is the PSU Advocates Committee, which has been quite active in the political arena in the past year. It has told the PSU story to the legislature, and has recently held a sales tax forum. It will now work more directly with a number of specific legislators. The Outreach Committee's goal is to reconnect more alums with the university, letting them see how PSU still can be important in their lives. Finally, PSU Weekend, November 12-14, showcases the value of PSU in the community.

KURTZ concluded by making three requests of faculty. Volunteers for activities and board members are needed; let the Association know which alumni will be good for this. Secondly, information about alumni accomplishments should be communicated to the Association. Finally, we need to invite alums to campus activities that our departments hold. The Alumni Office will help faculty with mailing lists. We all need to continue working together, as this will help our mutual goals. OSHIKA also noted the importance of the relationship.

D. Questions for Administrators

There were no questions.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

TUFTS gave the fall registration report. Headcount is 14,486, down 3.5% from last year. Total credit hours are down 3.3%.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. OSHIKA noted that SPOLEK, Graduate Council Chair, was at class, and would be late. LEVINSON reported for the Curriculum Committee. He noted one correction: for Ch 332, concurrent enrollment in Ch 338 is strongly recommended. JOHNSON/BOWL DEN moved to accept the Curriculum Committee changes listed in G1. JOHNSON then moved to amend G1, adding the colisting of 3 courses in GEOL and CE, courses on earthquakes and seismology (a Nov. 1, 1993 memo notes the rationale for this; a slightly amended memo of Nov. 8, 1993, written by Marvin Beeson, Geology Department Chair, and Franz Rad, Civil Engineering Department Chair, is provided with these minutes):

G 475 = CE 443

G 476 = CE 445

G 477 = CE 448

JOHNSON then summarized many of the points of the memo.

LEVINSON indicated that CE courses were initially approved by the Curriculum Committee, and that the dual listing came out of Graduate Council discussions. He noted that a memo from the University of Oregon from the State Board indicated that dual listing was not allowed. A discussion then ensued in an

attempt to determine the difference between co-listing, dual listing, and cross listing. SMITH supported the need of both departments to offer these courses. It is vital that the community see these courses. Others indicated that many courses are cross listed throughout the university. Some are courses that the two departments share.

OSHIKA noted that she would welcome a motion to table the proposal in the absence of a representative from the Graduate Council.

MIDSON, however, stated that he would prefer to put these courses in place now, and alter it later if necessary. If there were a problem, we would have to change many university courses. TOULAN agreed that many courses would be in violation of the alleged memo. DIMAN suggested that we ask each department for their input: BEESON said that his students would prefer Geology courses, while SMITH and LALL noted that both students and employers preferred a CE listing. BEESON noted that this was an attempt to move into the cooperative mode that we are examining for the entire university. It was then suggested that the issue be sorted out by Curriculum Committee. FORBES said that the amendment was simple, made sense, seemed like the thing to do, and called for question. OSHIKA reminded everyone that the first vote was on whether to add the amendment of the three cross-listed courses to the Curriculum Committee motion. The amendment PASSED unanimously by voice vote. In response to a question, OSHIKA noted that the Faculty Senate would be voting simply on the undergraduate portion of the proposal.

In response to a question from SVOBODA about overlap of MTH 465 and 466 with research/methods courses in other departments, OSHIKA noted that MTH 464 was formerly MTH 460. Regarding overlap, LEVINSON noted that a Math department statement indicated there was not overlap with other courses in the Math department. BJORK then stated that, at the undergraduate level, there is no other course like this. It is taught by a professional statistician. He suggested that the Graduate Council examine overlap of graduate courses. OSHIKA reiterated that the graduate portion would come up at the next meeting.

The amended motion, for undergraduate courses, PASSED with one negative vote.

2. DAVID JOHNSON, noting that he rarely speaks at the Faculty Senate, moved in the strongest possible terms, to accept the report written by the General Education Working Group, along with the motion in G2. WOLLNER seconded.

MOOR/FORBES offered the following substitute motion: "That the Senate approve in principle the adoption of a pilot program wherein the general education program proposed by the General Education Working Group would be

made available to entering first term freshmen as an optional alternative to the present requirements, and that the proposal be referred to the appropriate faculty committees for their review and recommendations."

OSHIKA, without objection, offered to turn the meeting into an informal consideration of the question as if we were a committee of the whole. This eases some of the parliamentary rules. In response to a question by A. JOHNSON, OSHIKA noted that one possibility is that the vote on the proposal would occur on November 8.

FRANKS noted that Senators would be receiving data from OAA in mid-week, and would like to ensure that no vote be taken before we have the information. With that stipulation, she had no objection to moving into informal discussion. OSHIKA stated that we were now in that informal mode.

WHITE described modifications (the October 27, 1993 report) to the Senate. He also discussed the handout from Duncan Carter, describing how the program fits into the Writing Intensive Course Pilot Program. White showed what the new General Education Program looks like. He also noted that the following people have been added to the Working Group: Devorah Lieberman, Speech Communication, and Carol Mack, Chair of Curriculum and Instruction in the School of Education. He also thanked the committee members for their dedication and their work, and described the excitement that members still have after eleven months of work.

Changes in the October 27, 1993, report include the following:

1. Freshmen courses are not traditional core, and are now referred to as "Freshman Inquiry," which more accurately reflects the mission.
2. Duncan Carter helped improve the writing aspect throughout the four years of the program.
3. Suggestions by Darrell Millner and Johanna Brenner significantly improved diversity across the curriculum.
4. Interdisciplinary aspects of the program continue to be improved, especially at the sophomore through senior levels.
5. Course clusters continue to be improved.
6. The committee name has been changed, to delete the word "advisory."

WHITE then discussed the merits of program. The key focus is on ENHANCEMENT of student education. FEASIBILITY is generally not addressed by committee's charge, and will receive responses from the Provost. The question of whether to have a PILOT PROGRAM is important. Phased implementation is required by the current proposal. The program will be phased in over a four year time period. The committee argues that pilot concept is

vague, complex, confusing, costly, and uncertain. It would also be unclear about when to end the pilot.

A. JOHNSON asked what the status of the General Education Committee was, whether it was constitutional or otherwise. REARDON noted that implementation would be considered by appropriate Faculty Senate bodies.

BOWLDEN wanted to know why a pilot was desirable. MOOR thought that there were significant concerns that full-scale implementation would presumably direct resources from underfunded departments. He wondered whether the benefits would be worth the cost. He also wondered what the academic benefits of the new program were. A pilot would enable us to determine whether the approach actually works. This would also allow us to determine what the outcomes are.

In response to OSHIKA's questions, REARDON thought that the new program might help resource allocations, and might give the university better assessment methods. He also thought that many other benefits might accrue to the university. These might go beyond what otherwise might be expected. BEESON thought control groups would help us evaluate the program. He stated that there are many models across the country, some as pilots, some as phased-in, and some as voluntary.

MIDSON thought the pilot would really need four years or more, because the normal expectation is a four year phase-in.

REECE wondered what committees would be involved in implementation. OSHIKA thought these would be those normally involved in curriculum, such as the Curriculum Committee, ARC, and the like. MOOR, REECE, and OSHIKA all thought that we would need to specify future committee work.

DAVIDSON thought that freshmen orientation was not comparable to general education, and would not make a good comparison to the General Education Freshman Inquiry.

DeCARRICO wondered if an optional program would make the reallocation of resources even more difficult than the current proposal. WHITE thought that if the program were optional, he would expect most students to take the new program. He noted that incoming freshman can graduate under their catalog or any newer one, so the old plan would be required for 7 years also.

TOULAN reminded the assembly that we need curricular reform. The current proposal is as good as any; a pilot program would lead to confusion, and educational objectives would not be achieved. We as faculty are here to make

crucial educational decisions for the students. A pilot would not be an appropriate control group, but would be biased toward student selection based on advisor or student perception. DAVID JOHNSON agreed, noting that the pilot would not meet either educational or cost objectives. We should be reminded that course content is based on faculty control; this proposal would restore faculty positions on the basis of majors.

### ADJOURNMENT

At 4:45 p.m. OSHIKA returned the Senate to formal session. A. JOHNSON moved to adjourn; the motion was approved, and OSHIKA noted that the Senate would continue on November 8.

### **THE SENATE RECONVENED ON NOVEMBER 8 AT 3:00 P.M.**

OSHIKA called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM and made the following announcements:

1. There has been trouble with the mailings. Anyone who does not receive a mailing by November 29 should call Alan Cabelly at 5-3789.
2. The next Steering Committee meeting will be by November 15, at 3:00 PM, in SBA 690.
3. There is consideration of moving the Senate to CH 53, the newly remodeled room with the Starship Enterprise technology. Senators are asked to consider whether they would like to move.
4. There are minor editorial changes to be made to G2, p. 1:  
     Freshman "Year" should be changed to Freshman "Inquiry."  
     The word "core" should be deleted.  
     #2: Delete the words, "Each course must be"  
     Bottom line: delete the word "core"
5. All senators should have received two handouts from the Provost's office: "Questions Related..." and "General Education Curriculum."

### Continuation of G1

A. JOHNSON/DeCARRICO moved the acceptance of the Graduate Council recommendations, with the addition of the Beeson/Rad memo of November 8.

SPOLEK noted that the Graduate Council had been asked to do this, but felt that the dual listing was inappropriate because they felt that the content was not dual. The departments and the Senate Steering Committee asked them to reconsider, which they did, without coming to a new decision. There was concern about precedent, and about misleading students. The Council felt that two courses should be listed as Geology, and one as Civil Engineering. RAD knew that the

memo had been given to the Graduate Council, and that this is not duplication, but is anti-duplication. The courses are half civil engineering and half geology. This is a joint venture, and should be encouraged. Part of the goal is to upgrade the level of earthquake awareness in both the general public and the technical professional community. These courses will help this occur.

DIMAN read from the December 3, 1990 report of the University Curriculum Committee, where it discussed cross-listing: "'Cross-listing' occurs when two or more departments share responsibility and perhaps SCH for one course but list that course in the Bulletin and Time Schedule with separate department prefixes." The report later says that "The Committee has adopted for Bulletin purposes the following policy, based on OSU's practice, for cross-listed courses: (1) Such courses must contain the same numbers, titles, credits, and prerequisites, with prefixes indicating the departments offering the course; (2) Descriptions for such courses must reflect identical content; (3) A distinctive indicator (such as "slash-listing") must indicate clearly (a) that each course is cross-listed and (b) which department is primarily responsible for it; and (4) the Bulletin must state that a cross-listed course may only be taken once." DIMAN thought that this policy has not been changed.

SVOBODA asked why the Graduate Council differed from this policy. SPOLEK said that the Graduate Council had not been aware of the policy, and had asked for this type of information. Another institution had been told that it could not do this. Finally, the Council still felt that the courses were distinct in their content: two geology, and one civil engineering. In response to a question from DAVID JOHNSON, SPOLEK noted that he has not found the specific requirement given to the other institution. RAD thought that if a policy prohibiting cross listing existed, then it has been violated many times on this campus. SMITH noted that the instructor has roots in both disciplines, and that the content has developed in both simultaneously. PARSHALL believed that the proposal met the university guidelines; TOTH thought that if the proposal had been accepted at the undergraduate level, it should also be accepted at the graduate level.

HOLLOWAY recalled that he had been chair of the Curriculum Committee when the policy read by DIMAN had been written. He said that this kind of decision had been just fine. HALES thought that the proposal should be approved with the stipulation that the numbers be brought into alignment; RAD noted that this had been tried, and that because of different numbering systems, this was impossible. This will not cause confusion to the students, because they will not be switching between departments.

SVOBODA asked that the overlap between MTH 565/566, Experimental Design and Methods, and other applied statistics and research design courses be clarified. SPOLEK stated that the math department had responded by saying that these were theoretical courses, were not discipline specific, so approved the courses. SVOBODA thought that there was much research design overlap on campus, and asked what the general view towards this was. SPOLEK thought that no permanent policy decisions would be made now, but that the current Graduate Council was willing to allow each discipline to develop their own courses, after consultation with the Math department.

In response to TOTH's question, RAD noted that a student would not be permitted to take any course more than one time, except by normal university rules allowing a student to repeat a course. A student could get credit for the course content only one time.

KRUG called for the question, G1 as amended by the November 8 Beeson/Rad memo. The motion PASSED unanimously.

### Continuation of G2

OSHIKA noted that there were two motions on the floor, the main motion as proposed by the General Education Working Group (with minor editorial changes as noted earlier), and the motion by MOOR (listed with the November 1 minutes) to substitute a pilot program.

Without objection, OSHIKA asked that the Senate return to informal session, as it had on November 1. No objection occurred, and the informal session began.

In response to FARR's question, WHITE noted that it was not required that every course be interdisciplinary. BEESON then assumed that all courses be repropose in the Curriculum Committee, because they are not in the catalog as 4-credit courses. WHITE noted that the fourth credit is writing/communication, and that it would of course go before the Curriculum Committee. OSHIKA then stated that all curriculum revisions would go through the normal processes.

MOOR asked PERRIN if the analysis done by the Provost's office considers this. She said that her analysis was based on student credit hours, and that it was looked at on a course-by-course basis to see how it would affect the numbers. Release time might be the only area impacted by the extra credit.

In response to TOTH's question, WHITE noted that all new courses would have to pass through some screening process. TOTH was also concerned that scheduling would become random or cafeteria style, simply with a set of mixed components. WHITE stated that the General Education Committee would ensure that clusters fit together. SVOBODA then asked if the workshop group would ensure that each cluster touched on all goals. WHITE noted that each 4-credit course and track does not touch on all the goals. However, students taking various courses will touch on most goals.

REARDON thought that the real key is to provide a mechanism to allow faculty to respond to General Education needs. We cannot anticipate what every course would look like before it moved into place. The important process is to keep General Education from drifting once it began. A mechanism to foster this is needed.

BEESON then asked if there were mechanics to force students to take math and science. LATIOLAIS, noting that he is the committee member from the Math Department, said that the courses are being developed to have numeracy, elementary statistics, and algebra. The basic

foundation will exist. GRECO then asked about the requirement to have, e.g., a literature student be required to take a science track. Will we require students to take courses from outside of their major track, in interdisciplinary tracks. WHITE said that the University of Washington has sequences/clusters so the experience range occurs; however, advising is important. WHITE does not envision a student graduating without science.

BJORK, noting that he is a former freshman advisor, wondered what would happen if a freshman responded only to professional goals, ignoring the general education requirement. WHITE said that the student must take freshman inquiry before the sophomore requirements.

FARR, referring to p. 1 of the OAA report, thought that the new plan directs most 200 and 300 courses to disciplinary courses and not to general education. That moves us away from the philosophy of exposing people have coursework outside of their discipline, and into developing skills. BALSHEM thought that this would happen only if we allowed it to occur. Our thinking/teaching allow us to reach out in scholarship/teaching. As a personal exercise, she listed all the courses she taught, and asked herself what she was trying to achieve in these courses. In particular, what is the specific body of knowledge, and then what was the meta level of analysis? For many courses she really needs the assistance of some other faculty member to teach what she truly desires. The interdisciplinary approach facilitates this. At the heart of this proposal is the agenda of what we desire to do at this university.

WINEBERG, Chair of the Academic Requirements Committee, read the following prepared text:

I am troubled by the fact that the Faculty Senate is being asked to vote on the General Education Working Group Proposal, that if approved, would completely overhaul the undergraduate curriculum; yet, there is nothing in the proposal about how to implement the curricular changes.

I find it incomprehensible that the proposal eliminates the diversity requirement. The Academic Requirements Committee spent two years evaluating the merits of a diversity requirement including how to implement such a requirement. The diversity requirements has been in effect for only one year and already there is a move to eliminate this requirement with the rationale being that too many courses can be used to meet the diversity requirement; yet, this is exactly what the Faculty Senate wanted. In the winter of the 1991-92 academic year, the Academic Requirements committee drafted a proposal outlining the criteria to be used in evaluating what constitutes a diversity course. The Faculty Senate would not approve the ARC's proposal stating that the criteria were too narrow. The ARC was instructed to revise the criteria making it more inclusive, the result being that about 110 courses can be used to meet the diversity requirement.

It seems ludicrous to eliminate the diversity requirement with the hope that diversity will somehow be introduced into the curriculum. Why not amend the current proposal to include the diversity requirement? If after several years it is show that diversity issues

have been incorporated into the undergraduate curriculum, then it would make sense to eliminate the diversity requirement.

The proposal has substantial gaps when it comes to transfer students. According to the proposal, a transfer student who comes in as a sophomore (i.e., has 45 credits) does not have to take the freshman inquiry courses. A transfer student who comes in with 43 or 44 credits would be required to take 15 hours of freshman inquiry. This will cause much ill will and animosity among these transfer students not to mention the possible financial implications for the students. Secondly, what happens to someone who takes the first freshman inquiry course and then does not attend school winter term? Will this person have to wait until next winter to continue the sequence? What if the core faculty have changed and the student has completed only two of the three required freshman courses? Does he have to start all over again?

It would be prudent to address some of these issues before voting on the proposal. Why not allow the appropriate senate committees an opportunity to discuss some of these issues and then report back to the Faculty Senate in the January meeting with their comments before voting on the proposal.

REECE noted that the October 27 document, on p. 6 and 7, addresses diversity. He read the following from the report: "First, faculty teaching in the general education program will be required to complete faculty development which focuses upon how to include diversity issues within the courses they are developing or adapting for the program." "The second element of our approach will be to insure that persons with expertise in developing and delivering courses related to diversity, particularly those faculty who teach in the Women's Studies and Black Studies Programs, are members of the general education committee." REECE thought that this would increase, not decrease knowledge of diversity among students. Committee members feel that there will be a great deal more, not less teaching of diversity within the new program.

TOULON compared the new curriculum to architecture. When you start building, you do not start with the furniture. You start with the foundation. The question we should look at is on the quality of the concept. Many problematical issues of implementation will be resolved later. This document is as good as any we could develop. We could be here until next Monday if we want to list and examine all the details. OSHIKA thought that this statement was true, and suggested that now might be a plausible time to go back to regular session to resolve this. BEESON agreed, but thought that the substitute motion deals with this. He thought that the details were important, and that the pilot responded to that. TOULON clarified his point, stating that the committee could have responded to all the details if it had developed a 300 or 400 page document. This probably was not feasible.

AHLBRANDT, agreeing with Toulon, thought that there could be problems with any new proposal. He stated that his perspective at PSU was a new one, so he wanted to look at what attributes employers tell us they need from workers. These include the ability to communicate, the ability to work within teams, to be flexible, to make decisions with limited data. These are

all key elements in this proposal. In today's world of work, we are going from a very hierarchical to a decentralized work environment with flexibility and interdisciplinary teamwork, with cycle time reduction and rapid decision making. These are the kinds of strategies that are making companies competitive; those who cannot adapt to this will not achieve success in the years ahead. Our new curriculum helps companies in our region and our students grapple with these issues. He expressed the fact that he will be proud to be associated with this new curriculum. We should move ahead now without a pilot because this is fundamentally good here; it is not right to make students wait to work out all the nuts and bolts.

DAVID JOHNSON wanted to reiterate what Deans Toulon and Ahlbrandt said. He had many remarkable discussions with people on both sides of the question. Most faculty are seeking answers, are working together to improve general education. MOOR thought that the motive is that there is uncertainty about the quality of the proposal. Thus, we do not want to expand on something that might limit our ability to teach. We are unsure about the benefits; with this uncertainty, it is unwise to take the risks. He believed that the benefits of pilot are the same as full scale implementation, without the risks. If the proposal fails, a wholesale move would cost much. The risk is not worth taking. REARDON reminded the Senate that the only students for whom this is required would be new PSU students, entering in the fall of 1994, with no prior college. If this is a pilot, with student options, we can not test it because it would not involve random selection. REARDON also wanted to know how we would assess the pilot because we have no goals of current program. MOOR reserved the right to answer these questions later.

DeCARRICO thought that a pilot project would not lead to full commitment of the faculty, so the results would be different. If this were done on a full scale basis, we would all be committed, giving a better chance of success. DAVIDSON commented on the cost/benefit process, from the benefit standpoint. She had previously been involved in a similar program, where the benefits to the faculty were strong with little cost. The faculty became engaged with people they had never worked with, enlivening themselves, and revitalizing their careers.

WINEBERG saw no comments about evaluation or implementation in the proposal. He wondered whether this or another group would implement it.

BUNCH was impressed with the proposal, noting that the President said that this might be the most important action taken on this campus in ten years. He was also impressed with the fact that the deans were as positive as they were about it. However, the US Senate is dealing with problems, and finds it important to deal with the details. Items such as NAFTA, welfare, and health care begin with pilot programs: Wisconsin pilots welfare reform, and Oregon health care reform. This might be a great principle, but we might be moving too fast. The devil is in the details. At some point, the whole faculty should be brought in on the decision making if we want their commitment.

EVERHART identified problems with the pilot. By 1996 all high school students graduating will have had a curriculum that matches up with this one. By 1996 the high schools might be more advanced than we are if we only implement a pilot. GRECO thought that full

implementation would let us respond to the tough questions that are being raised. WOLLNER endorsed what has recently been stated by Deans Everhardt and Ahlbrandt. There are many external pressures and variables favoring a full scale move into the program.

OSHIKA, without objection, moved the Senate back to a regular session.

MOOR wanted to answer the question of assessment. He thought that it would be difficult to assess success of a pilot in the absolute. We would simply use outcome measures before and after for both programs. Determining this is like finding a cure for cancer. If I pray and you use medicine, we can see the results and then make comparisons. He agrees with much of what is in the proposal; there are many good concepts here, including the opportunity to engage in interdisciplinary work. PERRIN stated that we can assess old vs. new by comparing new "no prior academic credit" freshman with new "few prior credit" freshman who will take the old program. This is a built in pilot. SCHAUMANN thought that the pilot would give us a built in control. If we go to the new program, we cannot evaluate the new program.

The Question was called. The motion to substitute the pilot program FAILED, by a secret ballot of 32 to 15.

COOPER then asked about the impact of general education on reaccreditation. The questions to be asked include whether you have a clear general education goals, and whether you have evaluated your success towards achieving these goals. WHITE said that, if approved, skillful people on campus could immediately begin the assessment phase.

In response to a question from A. JOHNSON, OSHIKA stated that the proposed implementation date was fall 1994, with freshman inquiry classes beginning at that time.

LALL was concerned about the flexibility in the system. In particular, he wanted to know what would happen with people who come in and out of university. WHITE noted that these are year-long courses. LALL would like to see stand alone courses. WHITE said that there has been much discussion about this issue: e.g., if a student takes off winter, could the student return in the spring. They could, and pick up what they missed in the summer. In response to A. JOHNSON's question, WHITE preferred keeping students together for pedagogical reasons, but realized that this could not be required. Students will be advised to do so, but will have much flexibility.

FOSQUE asked about student retention, wondering what would happen if much transferring between groups occurred. WHITE thought that it probably will not happen this way, and OSHIKA thought that many contingencies were possible. WHITE then agreed with SCHAUMANN's assumption that students picking up many credits in the summer would not be effective because of summer jobs. He preferred that most of the course work be within the three academic terms.

ERZURUMLU was interested in the broader picture, noting that this is a major step towards a

new way of advancing general education, and that the committee has given us a method of resolving what is a national issue. Fine tuning will of course be necessary, but PSU becoming a leader in this is great.

RAMALEY repeated the analogy of building construction, noting that it always has changes after the blueprint has been approved. Here we want to define the "Form Given Goals," then work through the furniture, color of upholstery, etc. It is terribly important to trust our judgment and our faculty; we will be able to solve many of these problems later. e.g., Mary Ricks can provide much of the data needed to see if our freshmen will get out of synch. We have fifteen years of data, and can agree on a broad base of national experience. We then are taking the national experience and relating it to our campus. We have escrowed the resources needed to do this. We don't have to argue about the dollars needed to make this work. The Provost's answers say the dollars are in the bank. This is the **lowest risk approach** that we can take to solve this problem, and I commend all those who have spent their time and thoughtful attention on this.

WINEBERG wanted to know who will review and implement the program. OSHIKA stated that these discussions have begun, and that the course changes will go through standard university governance processes.

The Question was called. The main motion in G2, to implement the General Education proposal PASSED, by a secret ballot of 37 to 9.

OSHIKA announced that there was sherry available at K-House. She congratulated and thanked everyone involved for their hard work.

#### ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:45 PM

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 6, 1993  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Barna, Bjork, Bowlden, Cooper, Crawshaw, DeCarrico, Etesami, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Gray, Greco, Hales, A. Johnson, D. M. Johnson, D. Johnson, Jolin, Kenny, Kocaoglu, Krug, Lall, Limbaugh, Midson, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Reece, Seltzer, Smith, Tama, Visse, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Wetzel, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Dusky for Abrams, Becker for Burke, Goslin for Gillpatrick, Kenreich for Kimball, West for Manning, Brodowicz for Svoboda.

Members Absent: Barton, Beeson, Brenner, Briggs, Falco, Farr, Jackson, Lansdowne, Liebman, McGuire, Miller, Schaumann, Talbott, Westover.

Ex-officio Members Present: Bowlden, Cabelly, Desrochers, Erzurumlu, Kaiser, Koch, Levinson, Mestas, Pfungsten, Ramaley, Reardon, Spolek, Toscan, Toulan, Vieira, Wamser, Ward, Weikel, Wineberg, Zareh, Zeiber.

OSHIKA called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM and made the following announcements:

1. The order of the Senate meeting will be changed. E5 (Student retention report) will come first, then E4 (Scholastic Standards Committee), then E1, E2, E3. Additionally, the IFS report will be made as E6.
2. K-House prepares refreshments and sherry after every Senate meeting. Senators and *ex-officio* members are encouraged to attend.
3. Steering Committee members are requested to remain for five minutes after the Senate meeting for a brief informational meeting.
4. The Library Committee report will be made in January.
5. A letter regarding the Oregon Food bank will go out this week. It will endorse the collection of goods on campus. The letter of support is from various organizations, including the Faculty Senate.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

It was noted that Dean Toulan's name had been spelled incorrectly. With that correction, the minutes of the November 1 and 8 meetings were approved.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

### 1. President's Report

RAMALEY noted that she had asked the Advisory Council what she should report to the Senate. They were emphatic in saying, "the budget." Currently we know little about the budget. The messages from the voters to public officials are to spend less and to do more with what you do spend. The Governor's response apparently is only to spend less, ignoring the other half. RAMALEY and REARDON have been trying to reinforce both, to say that PSU is doing this--spending less with minimum disruption for our students, but not faculty. Initial discussions with the Chancellor's office indicate that Higher Education will take a disproportionate share of the cuts. The Governor's budget targets a \$50 million reduction in the remainder of the biennium from the state general fund, and another \$150 million in other funds. Higher education is expected to absorb \$15-\$20 million of the cut, 30-40% of the total: Higher education's share of the state general fund has been 11%, so this is higher than a proportional cut. RAMALEY does not advocate an across-the-board cut; this would be difficult, because K-12 will take few cuts, and higher education seems to be the biggest target of opportunity. Within the state system, the Chancellor has cut across the board in the past. The PSU share is 17%, which means we would take a \$3 million cut over a two year period. Operationally, this becomes one and a half years. However, we did not receive budget guidelines in November, and cannot serve our students with the cuts coming this late. We are making this case. Our criteria for making cuts or increases to the budget continue to be:

1. Current/past performance.
2. Performance enhancements, to develop better curriculum.
3. Levels of access needs.

PSU does well under these criteria, so across-the-board cuts within higher education are not feasible. There is much to be done to meet these needs. We will be open, and meet with Senate, either between or during Senate meetings. DESROCHERS noted the debate on whether the Governor can make these cuts in mid-biennium. The legislature may disallow this. RAMALEY reinforced the PSU Currently hot line (5-6399), and also asked faculty to direct questions to Carl Wamser, the Faculty Advisor. In response to A. JOHNSON's question, RAMALEY noted that we would not necessarily cut by using the same criteria from last year. Circumstances have changed; we may not go to next dollar value from last year's list, but will continue to use consultation as part of the decision making process.

RAMALEY also noted her responses to the Brock Report in The New York Times. She was quoted the opposite of what she said. The Brock Report says that the business community is upset that the youth of America lacks values, and has various recommendations to respond to this. Reardon might also write an article on undergraduate education in Daedelus magazine. The report also deals with students

different from the PSU type; they are eighteen years old, have never worked, and live a cloistered life. RAMALEY should have been quoted as being in favor of community service.

A. JOHNSON also congratulated Ramaley on the birth of her grandson, Adam, who was born on December 2, and is the most beautiful baby since ....

## 2. Provost's Report

There is no Provost report.

## QUESTIONS

BJORK asked about letters to the Editor (Oregonian) regarding praying at football games.

RAMALEY noted that this was in response to an Oregonian article titled "Praise the Lord and Pass the Football," which discussed several universities. There is a voluntary chapel, using no resources, no proselytism. The other issue is that after games the football team assembles on the center of the field, after the game, reciting the Lord's Prayer. This started about five years ago, strictly as a student led activity. There is a question of how "voluntary" that is, because this is a group bonding activity. Team, coaches, and Athletic Director have met, agree that they like the bonding activity, but will delete the prayer and simply have a moment of silence to continue bonding. Surprisingly, this has not been raised at UO or OSU. WAMSER stated that a letter to the Oregonian will have the University response.

DESROCHERS responded to prior questions regarding CH 53 and LH 175. Koch, Lorraine Duncan, and AV have plans for the introduction of faculty into these rooms. We are currently in the search process for a Director of Information Technologies, who will oversee the process upon arrival (hopefully by June), and probably streamline the processes. Duncan is now the prime individual to facilitate the training of faculty using these rooms, for trouble shooting, and to respond to individual members' software needs.

In response to A. JOHNSON's question regarding an advising question he brought to the Steering Committee, OSHIKA noted that this would come in January, after the Steering Committee meets in December.

## E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

5. Committee on Undergraduate Student Retention—KINNICK began by noting that all Senators, Deans, Directors should have received copies of the report. It also went out to various student groups; Pat Erdenberger helped with this process. The report is a distillation of eight to ten data sources that have been collected over the last few years. The committee developed a great deal of information, and organized it with various themes as noted in the report. Then a smaller group looked at some of the main issues,

again as noted. The next steps are to get feedback, including open forums during winter, and written comments given directly to KINNICK. She concluded by thanking all who served on and contributed to the committee, as well as the President and the Provost for their funding and endorsements.

In response to A. JOHNSON's question about the committee's specific recommendations, KINNICK noted the four main themes of the report: 1. The Provost should convene a group of faculty to examine the implications of the report in regards to teaching and learning; 2. The Dean of Students should convene faculty to study the NH experience; 3. Advising should be examined to ensure that students receive high quality advising; and 4. We should try to connect all students to someone who is here. This report has all the data and findings for implementation. KINNICK concluded by calling for all the appropriate people to review the findings and make their own assessments.

OSHIKA suggested that the Faculty Senate develop an ad hoc committee to review this report and be a contact point. It should determine how faculty can support the process. Those interested should come to OSHIKA before the January meeting. A. JOHNSON wanted to get this as an agenda item for February. OSHIKA thought that the committee would remain available as a resource. KINNICK concluded by stating that she used national information and statistics for the report. This issue has become fragmented elsewhere; we should try to deal with it in one body here. Without objection, OSHIKA formed the ad hoc committee.

4. Annual Report, Scholastic Standards Committee—ZAREH presented the report, noting that the biggest problem for the committee is still the issue of reading petitions in the summer. In response to A. JOHNSON's question about repeated petitions, ZAREH agreed that the committee should not get them unless there have been changes, but often does receive them without any real changes. A. JOHNSON then asked if there are administrative procedures to screen these, and ZAREH said that Penny Jester formerly did this. OSHIKA stated that Registrar Tufts sent a memo on these issues, and this will be included in the mailing for the January discussion. In response to A. JOHNSON's question about resolving the nine month problem, OSHIKA stated that many options are currently being explored. WINEBERG reminded the Senate that other committees have the same problem, and OSHIKA stated that a "super committee" is studying this for many committees. PARSHALL and OSHIKA then clarified the fact that suggested changes from the report will be studied later.
1. Quarterly Report, University Planning Council—WEIKEL stated that the UPC is one of the groups studying the utilization of committees across campus, as well as the utilization of the UPC. This may be impacted by educational reform. They have been asked to contribute to accreditation, along with the budget crisis. They have met with the Provost on this. The most exciting activity has been meeting with DESROCHERS on the draft of the University District report, with the final draft due in January.

2. Annual Report, Curriculum Committee—LEVINSON began by making one correction to the report, stating that the SBA option is now called "Information Systems," but still retains the designation "ISQA." Beyond this, he reviewed the policy issues that had been studied: first, a one-year curricular review process could work if the committee could meet over the summer.

The second issue deals with honesty in catalog advertising. Ricks told the committee that the average student graduates within six years. The committee would like to be able to drop courses after 6 years if they had not been offered; some had not been offered in 24 years. In responses to questions from MOOR, A. JOHNSON and BEESON, LEVINSON reminded all that human processes were available to respond to technology and service issues. OSHIKA thought that active review is the intent of the committee.

LEVINSON also wanted a ruling that 410s be taught no more than three times, as stated in university guidelines. Banner and administrative staff can review this. Department Curriculum Committees should also review these. Dual listing was also studied this year, with much ambiguity of result. The committee's conclusion is that clear policy statements are important for a historical record.

LEVINSON then moved acceptance of the report. A. JOHNSON asked what happens if the report is accepted? He thought that accepting the report only recommends that the recommendations be studied later. OSHIKA, noting that this issue has come up before in informal discussions, stated that a resolution is necessary. In a linguistic sense, the illocutionary force of a report must be decided. Do these recommendations have power, or are these simply assertions that the committee has made recommendations. What kind of force does it have? GOSLIN moved to table the motion. HALES thought we should simply accept the report, but make no decision to accept the recommendations. OSHIKA said that in the past, accepted reports have taken on the aspect of policy without that explicitly being stated. We can do this, and note that if any of these recommendations become policy, explicit motions be made in the future. A. JOHNSON and MOOR noted past practice of the Steering Committee and the Senate to ask for specific motions, and that we should continue this. OSHIKA also thought that we should thank the committee for its report and efforts. GOSLIN reminded the Senate that he had made a motion to table; there was no second to that motion. LEVINSON was asked by OSHIKA to withdraw his motion, with the Senate simply accepting the report without policy implications. He chose not to do so. MIDSON understood that we do not need a motion to accept a report, but would need a motion to agree to the policy implications. OSHIKA ruled the motion out of order, because it is not past practice. The Senate accepts the report as written, thanks the members of the committee for their efforts, and asks the Curriculum Committee to make motions regarding policy decisions in the future if it chooses to do so.

3. Annual Report, Graduate Council—SPOLEK indicated that the Graduate Council has accomplished much this year, with a great deal of deliberations as noted in the report.

The Council took two actions regarding joint Ph.D. dissertations and 700 courses. A. JOHNSON asked who will review theses in the future regarding style, and SPOLEK noted that OGS, through Koch, will give this information. In response to WINEBERG's question of consistency in reading petitions, SPOLEK noted that the Chair provides continuity. SPOLEK then noted the three policy decisions indicated on page 2 of the Committee report. SPOLEK/GOSLIN moved to accept the 3 policy decisions on page 2: Retroactive Credit Level of 400/500 Courses; Readmission of Disqualified Students; Conditionally Admitted Students. COOPER thought that the retroactive rule seemed sound, but that we might want exceptions. SPOLEK thought there was ample opportunity to do this during quarter. MOOR said that the process this way is cleaner, but still not satisfactory. Is the problem that there is no way of knowing what the student did? Faculty could see what the person did. KENNY said that students will come to the instructor a month after the course is over, and that this motion would take away the opportunity for the classroom teacher to help the student. FORBES thought that the question was one of what qualifies a course for graduate credit. Faculty specifically has the student do more. The student has ample opportunity to make these changes in registration, so he will support the motion. HALES, opposing the motion, reminded all that errors take place, and that by removing this, we eliminate the possibility of recognizing this. The requirement of documentation is upon the student. BRODOWICZ wanted to know how many students are affected by this; SPOLEK thought there were about five of these in the past year.

FOSQUE began discussion of the conditionally admitted students, asking if they are limited to nine hours. KOCH said that there had been no university rules, so this is a new principle/proposal. Nine is a specific PSU minimum, but the department can be more restrictive. LALL said that CE requires three specific courses. SPOLEK/GOSLIN then moved that the motion be partitioned into its three component parts.

FORBES moved back to the retroactive credit issue, suggesting that registration/mechanical problems should not be dumped into the hands of the Graduate Council. He therefore modified his support for this. DUSKY, Chair of the Deadline Appeals Board, stated that she always gets petitions of this nature. Many of the problems are the result of poor faculty review of petitions. If this were passed, the DAB would automatically reject these. She also noted that there is a question of differential tuition. TUFTS asked for the privilege of the floor, wondering if a specific time period would help. He thought that many students do not know until they receive their grade report, right after the term ends, that they had registered for the wrong level. WINEBERG wondered if a student could go from Committee to Committee, until the "right" answer was received. TUFTS thought that DAB responded during the current term, and that the SSC responded after the term ended.

SPOLEK stated that the Graduate Council desires to get out of the administrative action; SPOLEK/GOSLIN moved the following:

It will be the policy of the Graduate Council that petitions to retroactively change from 400-level undergraduate credit to 500-level graduate credit will no longer be accepted.

HALES thought it was inappropriate to give a student no means to appeal, but WINEBERG said that through a little known rule all students can always appeal to the Provost. GOSLIN/HALES moved to amend the motion by adding the term "one calendar year." SPOLEK thought that one year was too long, and that these actions should go to Graduate Studies, but not to the Council.

The amendment passed 15-8, placing the amended motion on the table.

A quorum call was then made. Twenty-four people are present; a quorum is not present.

OSHIKA noted that if those here desired, the Senate would move to CH 53. It was decided to do this, without taking any Senate action.

#### ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:40 PM, and moved all remaining action to the January meeting.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 3, 1994  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Barna, Barton, Beeson, Bjork, Bowlden, Brenner, Cooper, Etesami, Farr, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Greco, Hales, A. Johnson, D. M. Johnson, D. Johnson, Jolin, Kimball, Kocaoglu, Krug, Lansdowne, Limbaugh, Manning, Miller, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Potiowsky, Rhee, Smith, Svoboda, Talbott, Tama, Visse, Watanabe, Watne, Westover, Wetzell, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Dusky for Abrams, Dieterich for DeCarrico, Goslin for Gillpatrick, Wadley for Vistica.

Members Absent: Briggs, Falco, Gray, Kenny, Lall, Liebman, McGuire, Midson, Reece, Schaumann, Seltzer.

Ex-officio Members Present: Barna, Cabelly, Desrochers, Diman, Erzurumlu, Kaiser, Koch, Levinson, Murdock, Pfingsten, Ramaley, Reardon, Spolek, Taylor, Toulon, Vieira, Ward.

OSHIKA called the meeting to order at 3:05 PM and made the following announcements:

1. President Ramaley, in accordance with normal governance procedure, accepted the three motions that were passed in the November 1993 meetings. These include the following:

the amended list of undergraduate courses, listed in G1 of the November mailing, including the amendment to cross list G 475 as CE 443, G 476 as CE 445, and G 477 as CE 448.

the amended list of graduate courses, listed in G1 of the November mailing, including the amendment to cross list G 575 as CE 543, G 576 as CE 545, and G 577 as CE 548.

the revised General Education Program Proposal made by the General Education Working Group, listed in G2 of the November mailing.

2. People in the balcony are urged to sit in the main part of the auditorium, below the walkway. This will improve communication within the Senate. Although it is impossible to close the upper tier of the auditorium, **IT IS EXPECTED THAT ALL SENATORS AND EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS WILL SIT IN THE LOWER AREA WHEN POSSIBLE.**

3. K-House prepares refreshments and sherry after every Senate meeting. Senators and *ex-officio* members are encouraged to attend.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Minutes of the December 6, 1993 Senate Meeting were approved as submitted.

### PRESIDENT'S REPORT

- A. RAMALEY began with a "Condition of the Campus" report on the productivity issue, examining where are we on campus regarding technology, networking, etc. We will be publishing periodic updates in PSU Currently. We have reduced staffing by 15%, and have asked everyone remaining to manage the daily campus operations and install new systems. Most people are keeping a minimum of 3 functions in the air at the same time. If people have any concerns about these areas, they should call Carl Wamser, who will determine the most appropriate response. We are in the midst of making significant changes: financial information systems, processing of academic personnel concerns, searching for a Director of Information Technologies, and adding additional features to our student information systems. Let the President's Office know what kinds of questions might arise in these areas; updates will continue in PSU Currently.
- B. Not much can be stated regarding the Budget. The Chancellor's office is negotiating with the Governor's office with respect to a mid-biennium cut. The cuts are hovering at the 30% level. The Governor's office wants the cuts made without program reductions. That would be impossible to do here, because there are no more administrative cuts available. We do not know about mid-biennium cuts, nor what they would look like. For 1995-1997, the figures discussed are a \$5 million-\$8 million cut at PSU. We cannot really guess what it might actually be. What we can do is continue the more orderly method of budget review that was begun a few years ago. We are developing a "Short form," for mid-biennium budget reviews. The Deans will make requests to the Provost, describing any changes that have been made since the main process was completed. With this information, we will try to determine how much we can save in preparation for the next biennium.
- C. We have gotten as much productivity out of our academic administrative staff as possible, and are about as productive as is humanly possible. This has been confirmed (administrative side) by the Peat Marwick study and (academic side) by examining information collected from similar institutions. However, the technology plan, the initiation of new general education requirements, and changes in the development office will be additional opportunities for productivity enhancements. We will determine whether our discretionary funds are being placed in the appropriate places. In March 1994, we will seek input from the Senate for that review, with a sign-off to occur in April. PSU Currently will be used to provide more information to campus. We are attracting national attention for some of our successes, and this should help us. The

reviewer from Peat Marwick has been discussing our productivity successes in large public meetings. Faculty should let the President and Provost know what is impacting them, and how to improve this. RAMALEY thought that our activities are like cooking in a kitchen that is being remodeled, and that we need to continue looking for what's missing/causing difficulties. The year began well with a check from a prior donor that was three times the former size; the donor noted that we were doing better than expected, and should be congratulated.

2. Provost's Report

REARDON noted that he had a formal request, not a report: The Senate should undertake a review to see if we could reduce the total number of credits for the baccalaureate degree from 186 to 180. This is being studied at other OSSHE schools, including OSU and UO. Historically, the number of hours for the baccalaureate degree was increased from 180 to 186 with the addition of the HPE requirement, which we no longer have. A response is desired before the end of the 1993-1994 academic year.

3. Project KPSU Status Report--Don Nasca.

Project KPSU has been funded by the IOC since July. There are three items for today:

- a. KPSU desires an advisory board, including faculty. Volunteers are desired.
- b. There is a need for faculty input on programming. Public radio allows much flexibility, but KPSU needs to know what is desired.
- c. KBPS, Benson High School, wants to do a time share with KPSU. KBPS has been on the air for 71 years as a public radio station. If this is lost, it will be difficult to regain the frequency. KPSU will try to work with them.

Please call Nasca at 5-5669, or write to him at 430 SMC (office of student development), either to volunteer or to share information.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Winter Term Registration Report--TUFTS reported that registration is down 3.0% from last year; autumn had been down 3.5%, so this is comparable.
2. Library Committee--S. TAYLOR noted that the information is in the report, which was accepted as is.
3. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate--Cooper gave the report, which is included in this mailing.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course Proposals—Levinson and Spolek. OSHIKA noted that this refers to F1 in the December 6, 1993 packet. We will discuss the graduate proposals. A. JOHNSON/BOWL DEN moved for acceptance of the listed courses. This was PASSED without debate, unanimously.
2. Annual Report, Graduate Council—Spolek. OSHIKA stated that the Senate accepts the report as written, and invites questions. The report is now placed on file. This means that the recommendations do not necessarily become policy. If a policy recommendation is to be made, there must be a specific motion by the Senate. This is the interpretation of the Senate Steering Committee.
3. Graduate Council Policy Motions—Spolek. OSHIKA stated that this deals with specific motions. CABELLY read the motion, from p. 27 of the minutes:

It will be the policy of the Graduate Council that petitions to retroactively change from 400-level undergraduate credit to 500-level graduate credit will no longer be accepted after one calendar year.

GOSLIN suggested that without a quorum, actions taken are not binding. OSHIKA stated that because the quorum call was made after the amendment was voted upon, there is an implicit assumption that a quorum was present when the vote was taken. SPOLEK/GOSLIN moved the substitute motion, as attached in F3, listed below. SPOLEK believes this responds to the Senate's needs, especially as it applies to administrative issues.

It will be the policy of the Graduate Council that petitions to retroactively change from 400-level undergraduate credit to 500-level graduate credit, based on academic reasons, will no longer be accepted. Petitions based on administrative reasons will be handled by the Office of Graduate Studies.

BJORK noted that the Graduate Council gave the Math Department much support this year, so he is uncomfortable speaking up against this motion. However, he noted that the Math Department has many graduate assistants, and that PSU's policy of requiring different work at the 400 and 500 level is inconsistent with some of the better institutions in the country. For example, Stony Brook, Minnesota, Washington are setting policies for universities nationwide, and they do not have differential requirements at 400 and 500 level. Current courses do not require differentiated work. This proposal will treat students unfairly. Students will make errors in registration, but with this change, they would never have an opportunity to receive credit.

SPOLEK thought that this sounds like an administrative correction, to be dealt with by the Office of Graduate Studies. BJORK would like to see the differentiated work issue be a department, not university prerogative. PARSHALL agreed, saying that FLL does the same thing, and will waive the number of credits required for the degree if appropriate. SVOBODA remembered prior discussions, asked the Senate to ask what the difference is between undergraduate courses offered to undergraduate students, and graduate courses offered to graduate students. This is an important, fundamental question. This may be a university or a department issue. A. JOHNSON thought this was really a faculty member issue. OSHIKA agreed that this is both legitimate and serious, but is not pertinent to this issue. It can be referred to Graduate Council/Curriculum Committee. COOPER, opposing the motion, thought that this is not a workload issue for the Graduate Council, as they had only four petitions last year. It is a fundamental rule of whether to allow exceptions. Exceptions do not weaken the rule; they strengthen the rule. FORBES asked if there is a clear distinction between academic and administrative rules. SPOLEK said a class performance issue is academic.

The motion to substitute PASSED 19-15.

SVOBODA asked if the adoption of this motion reopens the question of what constitutes a graduate course. OSHIKA thought we probably should discuss this later, but it is not totally applicable now. SVOBODA wondered if this would unfairly treat students, especially if this becomes an administrative decision. BJORK thought that if students could continue to petition, they will be okay. Where we had 400G courses, the Graduate Council deleted the petition process. They allowed the Math Department to decide these questions themselves. When a petition is denied, the Graduate Council questions the academic integrity of the faculty members who supported it. He concluded by stating that he does not disagree with the motion. SVOBODA thought the decision might be based on a broader university issue; this is why the Graduate Council exists. He also asked what FLL thinks about the issue. PARSHALL said this probably would not apply to foreign language students. The department will continue to permit graduate students to take undergraduate courses to meet graduate requirements. KOCAOGLU thought that to differentiate between academic and administrative reasons will be difficult. SPOLEK said there must be a difference. There were only four petitions last year, but one (a math student) took two hours. This student had a petition three years after the fact. The Graduate Council is trying to get out of the business of making decisions it cannot make, and wants to leave the responsibility to the departments to do the advising. BEESON, asking what happens if a student signs up for the wrong credit, was told that this was a simple administrative issue.

The motion PASSED 19-13.

SPOLEK/A. JOHNSON made the following motion, attached in F3, listed below.

A student admitted to the University on a conditional basis due to low GPA will obtain regular status after completing 9 graded graduate hours with a 3.00 GPA. A student on conditional status due to low GPA who does not achieve a 3.00 GPA after completing 9 graded graduate hours will have his/her admission changed to "Deny, did not meet conditions" and will become a non-admitted student. This policy should be implemented by the end of fall term 1993.

KOCH stated that there currently is a definition of conditional admission, but that there are no consequences. The motion states when a student would be required to improve a GPA. HALES asked what low GPA means? A. JOHNSON said that if someone is admitted with a low GPA, that person would take 9 graduate credits and must receive a 3.0 minimum. In response to OSHIKA's question, KOCH noted that any other conditions would be stated. SVOBODA asked if these 9 credits could come from anywhere, and be "paid for?" KOCH/SPOLEK thought that a department might not accept these credits. BJORK stated that he supports this motion. GOSLIN/HALES moved an amendment to add "PSU credits" after the word "graded." FORBES asked if this means 9 credits from Berkeley or Harvard would not count; he was told that this was a correct interpretation.

The amendment PASSED, but not unanimously.

The amended motion PASSED unanimously.

#### NEW BUSINESS

A. JOHNSON/KRUG moved that the Provost's issue suggesting that **the total number of credits required for the baccalaureate degree be changed from 186 to 180** be sent to the ARC. The motion PASSED unanimously.

#### ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:15 PM.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 7, 1994  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Abrams, Andrews-Collier, Barna, Beeson, Bowlden, Cooper, Falco, Farr, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Gray, Greco, Hales, Jackson, A. Johnson, Jolin, Kenny, Kocaoglu, Lall, Liebman, Limbaugh, Manning, Midson, Miller, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Raedels, Reece, Rhee, Schaumann, Svoboda, Talbott, Tama, Visse, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Westover, Wetzel.

Alternates Present: Dieterich for DeCarrico, Carr for D. Johnson, Kenreich for Kimball, Robertson for Krug, O'Toole for Lansdowne,

Members Absent: Barton, Bjork, Brenner, Briggs, Enneking, Etesami, Gillpatrick, D. M. Johnson, McGuire, Potiowsky, Seltzer, Smith, Wollner.

Ex-officio Members Present: Barna, Cabelly, Davidson, Desrochers, Erzurumlu, Johnson, Kaiser, Koch, Krug, Mestas, Oshika, Ramaley, Reardon, Toscan, Toulan, Ward.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Faculty Senate Minutes for January 10, 1994 were approved as circulated.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

OSHIKA announced that there will be an IFS report, as well as an IFS motion in G3.

Mary Kinnick's retention committee would like feedback/volunteers to assist the committee. Please give structured comments to Oshika/Kinnick, so Senate feedback can be incorporated into the final report.

The Steering Committee, at the direction of the 1991-1992 Senate, will undertake an evaluation of the SBA and Library reorganization.

Tony Midson is now Chair of the Committee on Committee. Thanks to Janice Jackson for all her service to the Senate and the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate.

David Johnson has resigned his position on the Advisory Council. Steve Brenner will serve the remainder of his term.

## PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY noted that she has little to report on the budget. With respect to the mid biennial budget, the Governor is saving \$12 million dollars now to ease shock of future cuts from the 1995-97 Budget. However, we do not expect additional faculty cuts now. The Chancellor's office will receive instructions for 1995-97 cuts in March 1994.

There was a successful event, called "meet the people," last month. The goal is to look at the 2010 Committee's statements of important issues for the future. This is occurring on all campuses within this state. Eight groups talked about these issues. PSU is looking better at the collaborative mode of tying ourselves to the community than are other campuses. "Give us more flexibility" is a request heard at other campuses, but seems to be all right here.

## PROVOST'S REPORT

REARDON stated that retirement plan proposals are available. Faculty desiring this should enter into an agreement by April 15, and retire by December 1994. PSU can pay health benefits up to \$400/month for seven years. If PSU pays, this is not taxable income according to current tax laws. This is not finalized, but is close.

MESTAS then stated how Admissions/Financial Aid/Registrar are changing. The Office of Admissions and the Office of the Registrar are combined into one unit called *Admissions and Records*. This unit of Admissions and Records is then combined with Financial Aids into a unit called *Enrollment Services*. It has two co-directors: Jesse Welch, co-director of Enrollment Services for Admissions and Records, and John Anderson, co-director of Enrollment Services for Financial Aid. We are looking to combine window services, so students need go to only one window for service. We are in the process of combining the mailroom for the same reason. The office of new student orientation is being joined with the office of admissions. We are in the process of establishing a system of faculty advising for new student orientation. The goal is to provide services to students in a seamless, integrated way. If we integrate offices, we can then integrate services, and provide services from the day students enter until they graduate. Tying technology into this will improve the processes, reduce paperwork, and make information available to students more directly. We should not force them to talk to human beings unless they have a true need to do so. The touch tone registration system is one example. We will develop more of these processes soon with financial aid coming next. The ATM system is an analogy: the student should be able to access their information directly, so counselors are true advisors. We should be able to train all people working within student affairs to do all SA activities, train them on diversity, and train them on customer service. The student is the customer.

## REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate—COOPER gave the report, which is presented in its entirety in the minutes.

A. JOHNSON asked if we are accredited as a state institution or a whole state system. COOPER said that each institution was accredited individually. KOCAOGLU asked about the implications of being a public corporation, and COOPER said that much savings would be available. DESROCHERS thought that a minimum of \$10-20 million per year could be saved, if done properly. In response to questions from KOCAOGLU and LIEBMAN, DESROCHERS said that appropriations would continue to come from the state, but be managed by a corporation. She did not know of any implications for service regarding the Chancellor's office if this proposal went through. RAMALEY said that the governance structure would not be changed, just the revenue and cost items.

### NEW BUSINESS

1. Constitutional Amendment—Midson introduced the Amendment to the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty with the following statement:

Because of how membership of the faculty is defined in the Senate Constitution, only one third of the faculty members from the Extended Studies division of the Senate are either able to vote to be represented, or able to serve on committees.

Over the last year this lack of sufficient representation has become a problem in finding enough names to appoint to committees. The Committee on Committees discussed this motion in the Fall term. They endorsed it and recommend that the Senate adopt it.

There are simply no longer enough division members with the former style job titles to fill the required slots in committees. Their jobs haven't changed, but in recent years their titles have. The faculty of this school work with each department on campus in designing academic programs, selecting course instructors, and assessing the outcomes. Some of us also work as a team with other faculty adapting the university to the demands for more flexible learning patterns. Community-based learning, independent learning, weekend college or, (as in my own case) distance learning--are all part of this response to contemporary student needs. In this way, Extended Studies is a central component of the university's instructional mission.

Let me anticipate one concern some of you may have. There are a number of faculty from other non-instructional areas apart from the Library that also are not included in the Senate but could be in the "All Other" category. Their status too will need further study and debate for a future decision, but I urge that this happen separately.

This proposal represents a case that is both clear cut and urgent.

--We are the only group identified as a separate school, as an instructional unit, defined by the Constitution.

--It is an academic unit from which the dean reports to the provost.

--We are constitutionally required to have representation.

I therefore urge the Senate to pass this resolution.

OSHIKA clarified the procedure: the Senate will discuss and potentially amend the amendment today, refer it to the Advisory Council, which, according to the Constitution, "shall review the proposed amendment for proper form and numbering." The Senate then votes on the Amendment next month.

OSHIKA then read into the record the comments of Dean Sherwin Davidson, who is ill today.

"The School of Extended Studies both complements and expands the academic offerings of the university. The Dean of Extended Studies shares with the other deans the responsibility for the academic integrity and standards of excellence that are part of PSU's commitment. Extended Studies' faculty work directly with those of other academic units on the campus to develop and implement courses and programs, such as the Summer Program, the PSU statewide MBA, the off-campus specialty certificates and endorsements for educators. With academic departments, Extended Studies faculty develop curriculum for and implement the German Summer School, the Haystack Program for the Arts and Sciences, the English as a Second Language Program for groups coming from abroad, Portland's International Performance Festival, and a myriad of professional development opportunities for social workers, architects, counselors, educators, forensic anthropologists, musicians, lawyers, filmmakers, and technical and creative writers.

In addition to these roles, Extended Studies faculty are working with their peers in other academic units to develop distance learning programs, service learning, the campus instructional support center, and a weekend/evening degree completion option for adults. Because of their dual commitment to knowing the academic needs of many community constituencies as well as the resources of the University, SES faculty are uniquely positioned to contribute to the university-community connection.

Thus Extended Studies employees spend a great deal of time and are very closely involved with the academic programs of the institution. On the basis of these academic functions of the School, I encourage the Senate to accept the amendment entitling a greater number of them to representation in the Senate."

OSHIKA then pointed out that other information and resources are available here. Among others, Sarah Andrews-Colliers has data available from OIRP.

A. JOHNSON then asked who will prepare an amendment to deal with the rest of the people. The All Others group has shrunk, and their representation appears to be a

problem. Extended Studies had been part of All Others. MIDSON stated that the Committee on Committees would be looking at this issue at some time in the future.

WETZEL asked if this would increase representation in the Senate, or increase the size of the pool. MIDSON responded by noting that both would occur. Recent appointments in the School of Extended Studies use many titles other than those in the Professor rank. CABELLY further clarified the fact that Article II of the Constitution is being changed, redefining the membership of the faculty. Thus, more people would be included in that definition.

TOULAN, noting that he is not opposed to this amendment increasing the representation of the School of Extended Studies, asked if this would eliminate the representation by budgeted FTE, substituting instead a representation by actual number of faculty. He noted that UPA has 42 FTE and 48 individuals. He hopes that Extended Studies is not asking for a waiver of the FTE requirement. MIDSON responded by stating that this would not change the way the current FTE representation is utilized.

TOULAN then asked about the subject matter of the Amendment, stating that the university is moving more and more to research with many research appointments, but that the Research Assistants are not being represented. The Senate Steering Committee should look at this, focusing on the broader issue of who gets a voice in the Senate on campus-wide decisions. OSHIKA stated that this has arisen, and is a major concern of the Senate leadership.

COOPER asked about nature of the appointments that these people have, wondering if they have a sustained engagement with the university. MIDSON said that most are on fixed term appointments, utilizing soft dollars. However, their length of tenure has been sustained over many years.

MOOR thought that we should look at all issues of criteria for membership in the faculty at one time. The natural thing to do would be to vote down this amendment, and study the full issue. OSHIKA agreed that this is not a "Neat" issue. It cuts across all areas and other contexts, beyond just the one School. From a process standpoint, the amendment has been proposed, and comments have been proposed broadening this; however, specific changes have not yet been suggested. She asked what the Senate chose to do regarding this.

SVOBODA asked if we could not vote on this next month, and have a committee look at the broader issue of representation. OSHIKA said the amendment can stay as stated, and go to the Advisory Council. It can then be returned to Senate in March, to be voted upon as it stands. Motions can be made to look at other issues, or it can be tabled. FARR asked why the phrase, "Who also engage..." was included. MIDSON said that his intent was to keep parallel language without keeping it directly word-for-word. MOOR said that this is a non restrictive clause, and would need changing. HALES

asked how we define faculty, and separate them from staff and secretarial support. MIDSON said these are technical faculty appointments, and does not change their status. OSHIKA reiterated that this is an issue of many areas/categories on campus. A. JOHNSON asked if we could dispose of the Extended Studies issue, and examine the broader issue. OSHIKA, hearing no formal proposals, suggested that if no changes to the language of the Amendment were suggested, the Advisory Council will then look at the Amendment. SVOBODA/A. JOHNSON moved that the Senate appoints and directs an appropriate committee to view the status of the remaining unrepresented faculty on campus, and make appropriate recommendations to the Senate.

ANDREWS-COLLIER then presented an overhead (included in the minutes), showing categories and job tasks of ranked and unranked positions across campus. This shows a rough breakdown of where these people are. There are 71 ranked faculty, outside of departments, represented as faculty according to Article II of the Constitution. Some ranked people (lecturers, research assistants, research associates) are not called faculty in the Constitution. There are about 50 of these ranked, unrepresented people; another 134 people are unranked, unrepresented. Ranked people might be lecturers, research assistants, and research associates; for Senate representation, the individual must be Instructor or higher. The three lists (71, 50, 134 people) are all unclassified positions. TOULAN pointed out that administrative rules of the Oregon State System do not include lecturers with rank. In UPA, there are eight people who have been on full-time status for more than four years, but UPA gets no credit for them.

BEESON asked if the Steering Committee could look at this issue and bring back a simple amendment. OSHIKA said the Steering Committee could deal with this, but not with a quick solution. REARDON reminded the Senate that the Advisory Council is charged with looking at issues of faculty welfare, so that group would be appropriate. OSHIKA thought the motion would go to the Steering Committee and Advisory Council. MOOR asked if the motion would explicitly take up the question of definition of faculty. OSHIKA said that it would. The SVOBODA/A. JOHNSON motion then PASSED unanimously, and now goes to the Steering Committee and the Advisory Council. The Constitutional Amendment still comes to the Senate in March if no changes are made. FARR then reiterated that the language of the restrictive clause should be changed. After discussion between MIDSON, FARR, and OSHIKA, the Amendment was amended to become:

"The Faculty shall consist of the Chancellor, the President of Portland State University, and all persons who hold State Board appointments with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, and whose full-time equivalent is at least fifty percent teaching, research, or administration at Portland State University. Faculty members of the School of Extended Studies whose full-time equivalent is at least fifty percent teaching, research, or administration at Portland State University shall also be included regardless of title. The University Faculty reserves the right to elect to

membership any person who is employed full-time by the Oregon State System of Higher Education."

The motion to change the amendment PASSED unanimously, and now goes to the Advisory Council.

2. Plus/Minus Decimal Place Proposal--TUFTS

TUFTS described the proposal that, effective Fall 1994, the University use a two-decimal point value on each letter grade. This becomes:

A	=	4.00	B-	=	2.67	D+	=	1.33
A-	=	3.67	C+	=	2.33	D	=	1.00
B+	=	3.33	C	=	2.00	D-	=	0.67
B	=	3.00	C-	=	1.67	F	=	0.00

The proposal fits into what Banner can do, has been recommended by the Graduate Council and the Scholastic Standards Committee, has equal intervals, and fits our various university requirements of 2.00, 2.25 etc. A. JOHNSON/HALES moved the motion. The motion PASSED unanimously without discussion.

3. COOPER described a handout of the minutes of the OSBHE Meeting of October 22, 1993, p. 502 and 504, changing the processes of drafting position descriptions and consulting with faculty in the hiring of university presidents. A unanimous vote by the IFS stated that this change causes various problems; additionally, there are concerns that future boards might be shaped politically. Faculty have the knowledge and right to get involved in the selection of university presidents, and should do so.

COOPER/FRANKS moved that

the Faculty Senate of Portland State University requests that the Oregon State Board rules on Presidential searches be amended to require that faculty be consulted in the writing of position descriptions and in the writing of the qualifications for the Office of President.

OSHIKA then explained what the final language would look like. BEESON asked for the rationale for the Board's change, and COOPER said that in the recent PSU search process, the feeling by Janice Wilson was that too much time had been spent on the search. MOOR asked if she felt that this had occurred in the prior search. The motion to restore the active role of faculty in Presidential searches was APPROVED unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:25 PM.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 7, 1994  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Abrams, Andrews-Collier, Barton, Beeson, Bowlden, Brenner, Briggs, Cooper, Etesami, Falco, Farr, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Gillpatrick, Gray, Greco, Hales, Jackson, A. Johnson, D. M. Johnson, Jolin, Kenny, Kocaoglu, Lall, Midson, Miller, Moor, Oshika, Potiowsky, Reece, Rhee, Schaumann, Smith, Svoboda, Talbott, Tama, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Westover, Wetzell, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Schuler for D. Johnson, Robertson for Krug, Hickey for Parshall.

Members Absent: Bjork, DeCarrico, Kimball, Lansdowne, Liebman, Limbaugh, Manning, McGuire, Seltzer, Visse, Enneking.

Ex-officio Members Present: Barna, Bulman, Cabelly, Davidson, Desrochers, Diman, Erzurumlu, Kaiser, Koch, Krug, Mestas, Miller-Jones, Ramaley, Reardon, Toscan, Toulan, Weikel.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Faculty Senate Minutes of February 7, 1994 were approved with the following corrections:

A. JOHNSON noted that his comments on the top of p. 37 referred to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate report, which was distributed later in the minutes.

MESTAS noted that his comment on p. 36 should indicate that human contact was available and desirable within the admissions, financial aid, and orientation processes, but that students with relatively simple problems could use technology to solve them.

BARTON was present at the meeting, as was BULMAN (*ex-officio*).

### PRESIDENT'S REPORT—RAMALEY made the following comments:

- A. PSU does not as yet have a copy of the Peat Marwick report describing their assessment of our efforts to reduce administrative costs and improve services; however, we do know that they have indicated that we are a model university of our type (urban university). Lindsey Desrochers and Michael Reardon will be attending a Peat Marwick conference (the President is unavailable) later this month along with representatives from other institutions looking at similar ways of managing. In December, Ramaley, Desrochers and Reardon will be attending a similar conference in Florida (all this is at Peat Marwick's expense).

- B. As it was last month, there is no news on the budget. Enrollment is on a downward trend (there is overcapacity throughout the system); the trend is caused by increased fees and increased uncertainty among Oregon students about the future of programs. Short term programs are being instituted to bring enrollment back to the 92-93 level, which was 5-6% (FTE) higher than today. This is marbled throughout the institution. We are also trying to see where we have excess capacity within our institution; if we can add out-of-state students paying out-of-state tuition where we have capacity, it would be helpful. The goal is not to increase enrollment at all costs, but to increase enrollment in areas in which we can do this easily.
- C. As part of the "2010 Process," we have prepared a document outlining what education at PSU might look like in the future, including a picture of the educational environment. CADS, the Faculty Advisory Council, and the UPC will soon review this document. The objective is to help the system as a whole examine its long term strategy, as well as to prepare for the 1995-97 biennium planning.
- D. At the American Association of Higher Education meetings, Ramaley will participate in meetings to try to identify indicators of quality within a university. This should compare the quality of the inputs with the quality of the outcomes, rather than simply looking at outcomes. We can not make the case that we are first rate if we can not use metrics that truly make difference. She will attempt to persuade the AAHE to take on this project.
- E. Juan Mestas might go to Washington, D.C. to join the National Endowment for the Humanities. We will congratulate him if he gets appointed, but be sorry for our loss. We are proud of him, and are awaiting word of the potential appointment.

MOOR asked if the BAS model gave us a benefit for moving segments of our enrollment to graduate enrollment. RAMALEY was uncertain; DESROCHERS noted that different factors go into the BAS model. There might be some advantage to have more upper division or graduate programs if we have capacity, but that we also need to focus on our strategic plan. RAMALEY concurred, noting that we should strive for our desired mix. It is crucial that the system as a whole does not go to the legislature in the next biennium asking for more money while enrollment is declining.

## 2. PROVOST'S REPORT

REARDON indicated that OAA would soon be distributing a lengthy document on undergraduate education. The Deans have seen this, and changes have been made. We now formally ask the Senate to initiate processes next quarter to begin a study to change our undergraduate courses to four credit courses. We should utilize Senate meetings and committees, as well as open forums to study this. We should see if this is academically important and sound, and see if this might have a positive impact on productivity. If so, we could implement this by Fall of 1995.

HALES asked about these changes at the graduate level. REARDON thought that this would need further study. LALL asked about how this related to the proposal to move undergraduate requirements to 180 hours. REARDON said these items would work in concert.

BRENNER asked if this was a PSU or a system-wide decision. REARDON said we can do this on our own. UO set a precedent to do this. They simply reported what they had done without asking for permission. We must be sensitive to the relationship of contact hours to credit hours; we want to retain a relationship between work activity and student contact hours. UO ensured this at the lower division level. BRENNER asked whether we would also review majors and course changes. REARDON assumed that we would begin with the general question this year, then have departments do theirs in the next year.

SVOBODA asked what the productivity advantages are. REARDON thought that for the student this would be good; there would be fewer but more intense courses. Five courses per quarter is not conducive to the best student learning.

BEESON wondered if the number of credit hours within each department would change. REARDON said that there was no intent either way on this issue. The goals are to increase efficiency. Teaching loads will then need to be discussed. GRECO asked who would respond to this question within a department. REARDON expected that no one would teach more than he does, which is two courses per quarter. We may want to consider a two year load of 2-2-2 or 2-2-3, with the last course being a departmental contribution. KAISER suggested that we might simply want to look at a credit-hour load. MOOR then asked about establishing 2-2-3 as a norm. This is 28 hours, and might be appropriate. REARDON noted the volatility of the question, suggesting that this may be achieved in a number of ways.

FORBES hoped that contact hours would fit in; e.g., a 5-credit science course with a lab meets for nine hours per week. REARDON says we must guarantee a correspondence between credit hours and contact hours at the lower division level, where there are at least as many contact hours as there are credit hours; labs will fit in well, because they typically have more contact hours than credit hours. MIDSON thought that the average class size will increase under a four-credit system; REARDON did not know about this. A. JOHNSON asked about night classes, which often meet for three hours in one night, believing that teaching four hours in one night might be difficult. REARDON acknowledged that this was an important question. OSHIKA concluded by noting that this will involve both the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Requirements Committee, with procedural recommendations coming from the Steering Committee.

## REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. University Planning Council: A. JOHNSON gave the report for Weikel. The UPC 1) met with the Provost regarding hiring priorities for new positions, tying these priorities to the university's strategic plan; 2) was responsible for a section of the accreditation report, especially on faculty participation in the fiscal crisis and the budget cuts; 3) was responsible for reviewing a set of assumptions regarding campus wide planning.
2. OSHIKA reported for the Steering Committee and Advisory Committee, who are meeting to collect data regarding implications of ranked vs. non-ranked faculty, and their representation in the Senate. The committees will meet together next week, and are looking at a continuum of options. The question studies the focus of the Senate, and the nature of education. The committees will return a proposal to the Senate.

## NEW BUSINESS

1. Constitutional Amendment--Midson

OSHIKA noted that the new language is the sentence that refers to "Extended Studies." SCHAUMANN asked if there are other units to which a similar amendment might apply. OSHIKA noted that there are other people, perhaps not aligned within a unit, who would fit if such an amendment were made. SCHAUMANN asked if the Senate might be asked to do this more than once, believing that we should do this only once. OSHIKA agreed that this was the best procedure, but also acknowledged that this amendment needed to be disposed of now.

MIDSON stated that Extended Studies is only unit on campus that is required to have Senate and committee representation but in which most of its members are ineligible to serve in the Senate or on committees. Therefore, there is a difference from other individuals who have similar job categories but do not belong to one unit. OSHIKA noted that the School of Extended Studies has representation, but that the entire population is not covered.

A. JOHNSON noted that people from Extended Studies would be added, while similar people from other units would not be added. OSHIKA agreed. MOOR thought at the last meeting that this could be voted down, but now believes that it can be tabled, and asked Oshika's opinion on this, perhaps after the Steering Committee and Advisory Council made a recommendation. OSHIKA and CABELLY agreed that the Amendment could not have been tabled last month, but that this was possible now. MIDSON thought that a full scale resolution would not be brought back next month, but that a committee structure might be decided upon. OSHIKA noted that this would be clarified by the Steering Committee and the Advisory Council, which will define the problem, perhaps developing recommendations. They can do what they choose, after deliberations; this might include a larger study, a quick amendment, etc.

A. JOHNSON, arguing in favor of quick action, stated that agreement now would allow these Extended Studies individuals to participate in spring elections. SCHAUMANN didn't understand why this should be done for Extended Studies only at this time and not for everyone. He wanted to substitute the phrase "Portland State University" for the phrase "School of Extended Studies." OSHIKA said that this change would, in fact, include everyone. The debate concerns whether we should include those people who are not clearly centrally involved in the educational function.

In response to a question from BEESON, OSHIKA stated that a two thirds vote was required. If asked for by one quarter of Senators who are present, a campus-wide mail vote could be taken, again requiring a two thirds vote.

The motion PASSED by a vote of 26-12.

#### ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:15 PM.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 4, 1994  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Abrams, Andrews-Collier, Barna, Barton, Beeson, Bjork, Bowlden, Brenner, Briggs, Cooper, Etesami, Farr, Forbes, Franks, Gillpatrick, Gray, Greco, A. Johnson, D. M. Johnson, Kocaoglu, Lall, Lansdowne, Liebman, Limbaugh, Midson, Miller, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Raedels, Reece, Rhee, Schaumann, Smith, Svoboda, Talbott, Tama, Visse, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Westover, Wetzel.

Alternates Present: Robertson for Krug, King for Potiowsky.

Members Absent: DeCarrico, Enneking, Falco, Fosque, Hales, D. Johnson, Jolin, Kenny, Kimball, Manning, McGuire, Seltzer, Wollner.

Ex-officio Members Present: Cabelly, Diman, Erzurumlu, Frost, Kaiser, Krug, Oshika, Ramaley, Reardon, Toscan, Toulan, Wamser, Ward, Wineberg, Zeiber.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Faculty Senate Minutes of March 7, 1994 were approved with the notation that Barna and Raedels had been present.

### PRESIDENT'S REPORT—RAMALEY made the following comments:

1. Several people (Ramaley, Reardon, Desrochers) attended the American Association of Higher Education meetings last week. The PSU model of institutional rethinking received much positive interest/support. She attempted to develop better measures of what an institution attempts to accomplish. For example, graduation rates assume that all students have this as a goal, and do this within 5 years, which is when the system stops counting. She will present a report soon, and asks UPC to read a draft of this.
2. The Campus Compact was formed eight years ago to support university service goals. We have joined this group this year. The Compact is now attempting to create learning entities/communities. The leadership of CC is asking us if we want to participate, so we now have an additional opportunity for nationwide work.
3. The Governor wants meetings with its stakeholders, including faculty, student leadership, staff, economic constituencies, etc. We will distribute names within each category to the chancellor's office, so they can have input for the 1995-97 biennium.

4. By Friday, April 8, she will be able to give information to the faculty regarding issues of the public corporation. This will open the question of the role of a statewide board of trustees. The public corporation will control all personnel decisions; it will continue PERS; collective bargaining for faculty will not change, but other units will then bargain with the Chancellor's office, not through the state; ORS 279, regulating purchasing, will also be impacted. Tuition issues are unknown. The conclusion is that as much as \$10,000,000 might be saved statewide (conservatively). Campus effects at PSU are unknown.
5. Budget information is still unclear/vague. About a 14% cut is forecast, but this is speculative. Stay tuned.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Academic Requirements Committee—WINEBERG noted two important items of their business: the number of petitions has been relatively normal, although the success rate has been slightly lower than usual. Secondly, committee members are disturbed at lack of input in institutional planning, especially at the General Education Proposal. The ARC does not want to be seen simply as a petition reading committee.

OSHIKA then noted that the Senate Steering Committee recommended that General Education speak to ARC on an informal basis, although a formal contact was not necessary. A. JOHNSON thought that other items are falling through the cracks; in particular, some omnibus courses are approved for distribution requirements without going through ARC, while other departments are doing everything by the book. DIMAN noted that 199, 299, 399 courses will count for General Education requirements, and a memo from him stated that. A. JOHNSON thought that this must go through ARC, or it cannot be used. OSHIKA asked if OAA has discretionary power to allow omnibus number courses to fulfill distribution requirements. The Steering Committee will study this. MOOR suggested that this more correctly should go to the Advisory Council, and OSHIKA agreed. BOWLDEN thought that the Advisory Council has already sent letters to the Provost's office, because this seems to run counter to past practices. WINEBERG concluded the discussion by noting that this letter never came to the ARC. Oshika accepted the report for the Senate.

2. ARC report on credit hour requirement—WINEBERG summarized the report, stating reasons why there is no need for significant change at this time.

REARDON reminded the Senate that two significant items have occurred since 1955: dropping three hours of the writing requirement, and dropping a requirement of five hours of HPE. COOPER asked if UO was considering this, and REARDON stated that they have passed this, while OSU and WOSC are

currently considering this change. WINEBERG thought that UO moved from 180 to 186 in about 1920, and are only now moving down to 180. SVOBODA, looking at the ARC report that showed comparator institutions requiring 183–192 credits, asked if we are away from the norm by comparing ourselves with the UO, or wondered if the data are not correct. REARDON said that the data are not correct. The Peterson guide shows a range of 176 to 191 hours. WINEBERG, using the list provided from Mary Ricks in OIRP indicated that we are moving away from the norm. The list of institutions on the quarter system included Cleveland State (192), Southern Illinois/Edwardsville (192), University of Toledo (186), Wright State University (183), and University of Cincinnati (185). REARDON, however, reminded the Senate that this list is used primarily for fiscal and not academic reasons. WAMSER clarified that 120 semester credits equals 180 quarter credits.

LALL suggested that we take a leadership role on this question. If this is the right thing to do, if it responds to academic and student needs, this should be done. OSHIKA thought that this should be referred to various committees. She said that the ARC has responded to its charge. Now this issue can be referred elsewhere, cohesively, in concert with other curricular changes. Thus, this is unfinished business.

BRENNER noted that when one reduces hours, we must also study implications on transfer students and how many credits they take here. The mix of PSU and non PSU credits is another vital issue. REARDON said that students need 45 credits in residence at PSU. BJORK asked about block transfer requirement of 107 hours, but DIMAN said that these are usually about 90 hours, and TUFTS said that the average transfer student brings in about 82 credits. The most allowed is 108; this number might move to 90. FORBES wondered if we would still require 72 upper division credits. WINEBERG concluded by stating that the ARC simply stated that all these issues should all be looked at together; OSHIKA then accepted the report for the Senate.

3. General Student Affairs Committee—ZEIBER noted that the committee accomplished three major activities in the last year: It revised the Student Conduct Code, reviewed petitions as noted in the report, and is actively reviewing student policies. It is an active committee, meeting regularly. Oshika accepted the report for the Senate.
4. Spring Term Registration Report—TUFTS noted that headcount is down 5.2% from last spring; this is similar to the fall and winter decline. Credit hours are down 4.3%. COOPER asked about our policies for targeting out of state enrollment. RAMALEY noted that other universities are looking for this, but that we are not in the process of doing this. At the undergraduate level, we may do this after we implement our general education requirements. At the graduate

level we cannot compete with the grants students need. For foreign students we need greater infrastructure and support. We are therefore not supporting this strategy, but will try to maintain at short, middle, and long ranges. Further, to be designated as an urban/metropolitan institution, we cannot have more than 15% out of state students.

A. JOHNSON asked if our dropoff is not a reasonable one, based upon our faculty cut of 15%. We have increased our productivity by 10%, so this dropoff should be okay. RAMALEY thought that we would look at these issues. LIEBMAN asked if the shift to community colleges would help us as they become juniors, potentially transferring to PSU. TUFTS was uncertain about these implications, and RAMALEY noted that Wamsler would make a report on enrollment planning at the next Senate meeting.

5. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate—COOPER's report is included in its entirety in the minutes. At the conclusion, he asked for a straw poll at the May meeting, voting on whether each institution (university and regional college) should have parity of representation (at either two or three for EACH of the eight campuses, or differential votes as is the current policy? The PSU Faculty Senate will vote in May, so Senators are asked to read the report closely before the Senate meeting. Senators should ask Cooper, Oshika, or Scott Burns for information regarding context.

In response to DIMAN's question, COOPER and OSHIKA noted that not much actual voting takes place. They said that there is not a traditional split between colleges and universities. The feeling is that bringing this up now might create divisiveness; however, this was "tabled" many years ago, and a resolution is desired at this time. COOPER also noted that this arose several years ago. IFS representatives are asked to get a sense of their campuses. The IFS has been typically non-parochial, except for athletic funding issues.

#### G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Manufacturing Engineering Masters Degree Proposal—FROST noted that the Graduate Council approved this joint 45 credit PSU/OSU program, primarily delivered using ED-NET facilities, with full budget. FROST/KOCAOGLU moved acceptance of the proposal.

SVOBODA noted that the budget is approved through 1997-98, and asked how funding will proceed afterward. ERZURUMLU noted that the state legislature approved funding for faculty, and that these have already been hired. Approved monies are for start-up costs. After four years, these will no longer be needed, and the faculty funding is permanent. The startup costs are for equipment; additional ongoing costs will be minimal. OSHIKA asked if the ED-NET funding

is stable, and if good faculty get poor ratings on ED-NET. ERZURMLU noted that we already teach a number of courses this way, and that other technologies are evolving. We are on the right track. The 2010 committee advocates serving 30,000 students by 2010; this is a good pilot. It was also noted that PSU faculty are currently getting good reviews. KOCAOGLU thought that this requires more preparation, but the feedback suggests that students see no differences.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

OSHIKA then reminded the Senate that in extraordinary circumstances, additional agenda items are at the discretion of the Presiding Officer, and added the following to the agenda, to be discussed before G2:

3. Curriculum Committee—BULMAN stated that the Curriculum Committee met this morning to act on the English Department's request to have a pilot program to move from 3 to 4 credits. This is in response to the State System's request that each institution explore ways to increase productivity. The Provost asked the Faculty Senate to follow up on this, and this is one response from the Curriculum Committee. BULMAN/REECE moved acceptance of the proposal.

TALBOT asked if this were a true pilot, or would this become a fait accompli. REECE said that all have agreed that it is a true experiment, which could either succeed or fail. OSHIKA noted that the context of doing this is university-wide. TOULAN then asked about many other questions, such as whether a full-time student will need to take eight or twelve credits. This is a precursor to many issues. OSHIKA said that these will be addressed later. The Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council will look at this. BRENNER then asked if there is a proposal for OAA to address these. She wondered who will study this. OSHIKA said the Steering Committee would give direction to various committees. REECE then noted that this came from CLAS, not OAA.

BJORK was concerned about scheduling. Most math classes are 4-unit classes; his expectation was that 4-unit courses would be scheduled from 4:40–6:30 and 6:40–8:20. He was concerned that this would cause conflicts with students who want 4-unit calculus and English courses. REECE said that he received guidance from Bob Tufts. BJORK understood this, but still noted potential problems. TUFTS agreed on the need to keep the 6:30–6:40 time open to alleviate scheduling problems, and thought that there might have been a communication problem. REECE and TUFTS agreed to talk about solving the issue. OSHIKA asked that any consideration of the issue will be made based upon resolving these scheduling issues.

WAMSER raised the issue of efficiency and the faculty workload. REECE thought that the faculty members will teach 7 4-credit courses; this will be one more credit, but two fewer courses. WAMSER wanted to add up the total number of courses the department taught.

ERZURUMLU noted that the proposal excluded WR 121 and WR 323, but not other technical writing courses required for other majors. Should those also be excluded? This will create a mixed-mode of credits for some students. REECE said that the WR 121 and WR 323 could be changed easily, so should not be done now, especially with the new General Education requirements. He spoke with Morris and Harrison in CS and EAS; many of their courses are already 4 hours, so this should be no problem. Further, there should be no resource problem in the department.

TOULAN was concerned about making changes only after studying all the ramifications; e.g., non-admitted students can take no more than 7 credits. Therefore, most non-admitted students cannot take two English courses. This runs counter to some of our rules. TUFTS thought that we might want to consider moving the part-time student number to eight credits, especially if the 4-credit mode is a state policy issue.

LIEBMAN is in favor of this, but concerned about larger courses. It was pointed out that students will take fewer courses, so this will be evened out.

REECE requested the privilege of the floor for WESTBROOK, who noted that the department has studied this issue. To simplify the issue, if the majority of students move from four 3-credit courses to three 4-credit courses, then the faculty load, student load, and class size issues all even out.

LANSDOWNE asked about the impact this will have on education itself. REECE thought that many departments have changed from 3-hour/3-term courses to 4-hour/2-term courses, which is similar to two-semester courses. This should offer more pedagogical flexibility, improving the educational experience. WINEBERG asked how this fits in with the needed distribution requirement of 18 hours, where a student might take three 3-credit courses and two 4-credit courses for a total of 17 credits. REECE did not consider this, and ANDREWS-COLLIER asked how the ARC reviewed petitions of this nature. WINEBERG said that this was up to the people on committee; last year, they were quite picky, and turned many of these down.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

2. Constitutional Amendment—BEESON had been forced to leave earlier, so MIDSON presented the amendment. The goal is to give greater representation

from other academic sectors (research, student advising, etc.) of campus to the Faculty Senate, giving a broader focus.

OSHIKA said that as an Amendment to the Constitution, it is not debated today, but can be amended. It then goes to Advisory Council, which checks to see if it is appropriate; the Senate debates and votes upon it next month. This one arose from a joint meeting of the Steering Committee and Advisory Council.

FARR asked if a list identifying those positions to be included could be distributed. OSHIKA said this was possible.

WINEBERG asked about adding "public service" positions to the amendment. ANDREWS-COLLIER said that the AAUP Council discussed the Amendment, and is concerned about the budget office determining who is faculty, rather than using a definition including the bargaining unit.

WINEBERG/SVOBODA proposed an amendment, adding the words "or public service" in the unclassified members sentence, after "research."

At that point it was determined that a quorum no longer existed.

A discussion involving MOOR, MIDSON, FARR, and OSHIKA revolved around the Senate being thwarted in its review process, the role of the Advisory Council, and the attrition rate at Senate meetings. OSHIKA said that this Amendment will be moved to the May Senate meeting in order to have the discussion it warrants; additionally, the attrition rate in Senate meetings will be discussed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:50 PM.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 2, 1994  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Abrams, Andrews-Collier, Beeson, Bjork, Bowlden, Brenner, Etesami, Farr, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Gray, Greco, Hales, A. Johnson, D. M. Johnson, Jolin, Kimball, Kocaoglu, Lansdowne, Liebman, Midson, Miller, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Rhee, Svoboda, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Westover, Wetzell, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Alberty for Kenny, Robertson for Krug, Casperson for Schaumann.

Members Absent: Barna, Barton, Briggs, Cooper, DeCarrico, Falco, Gillpatrick, Hakanson, D. Johnson, Lall, Limbaugh, Manning, McGuire, Potiowsky, Raedels, Reece, Seltzer, Smith, Talbott, Tama, Visse.

Ex-officio Members Present: Bulman, Cabelly, Davidson, Erzurumlu, Kosokoff, Ramaley, Reardon, Toscan, Vieira, Ward, Weinberg, White.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Faculty Senate Minutes of April 4, 1994 were accepted as submitted.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

OSHIKA made the following announcements:

1. Senators have an obligation to stay at Senate meetings from 3:00 PM until 5:00 PM. There are often late votes, and Senate business must be conducted.
2. The Advisory Council report has been added to F3.
3. Faculty are currently being interviewed in response to the 1992 Faculty Senate motion to evaluate the SBA and Library reorganizations. Questions asked include demographic information; specific questions about job functions, reporting relationships, and procedures for pay, promotion, and tenure decisions; and general questions about how the reorganization has affected the interviewee, governance, and representation within the unit. Everyone will be contacted and will have the opportunity to be interviewed. There have already been two open meetings. The Steering Committee will report at the June Senate meeting.

4. Senators will soon receive a list of members of the 1994–1995 Senate; they should prepare for the election of Presiding Officer, Presiding Officer *pro tem*, and members of the Senate Steering Committee.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT—RAMALEY made the following comments:

There is no budget report today, as there is no new information available.

The Stakeholders' Meeting has been rescheduled for 2:00-4:00 Tuesday, May 3. The context for this is that the Governor had asked that all those submitting budgets meet with their stakeholders before doing so, in order to see how those affected by budget reductions would react. For Higher Education this is a complex process, because our stakeholders include students, staff, alumni, and citizens in general. These citizens committees will also examine the "2010 Document." The Chancellor will present his concept of how to respond to a 14% cut. We will listen to all parties and prepare for a summer/fall meeting of campus individuals. We will concurrently ask the Budget Committee to prepare studies of our impacts.

On a related note, people are asking about a potential move of this state's universities into the Public Corporation mode. In general, states follow three patterns of governance and budget control in regard to their public universities:

1. the State System as a state agency
2. the State System is controlled by the state.
3. the State System is assisted by the State.

There are few states in category one, where much control is outside of the university system. We are in category two, which allows us to manage ourselves according to rules established by the state. This also means that we are assessed fees for other state agencies. This comes to about \$6 million per year for PSU. There are also control requirements (signature authority, etc.) that makes our total cost of state control about \$10 million per year. These costs do not add to our ability to provide services. The Public Corporation concept will move us to category three, changing the relationship between OSSHE and the Governor/Legislature. About twelve states are currently looking at this. We will not become privatized; we would become a public corporation, assisted by the state, but with more of our control becoming internal.

PROVOST'S REPORT

REARDON reported that Bob Vieira has been promoted to become Acting Vice Provost and Dean of Students. The Advisory Council has been asked to recommend members of the search committee for a permanent replacement.

### QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

The Committee on Committees, chaired by Tony Midson, asked the following question:

Members of the Committee on Committees note that possibly missing from among their tasks is the appointment of faculty to deliberate on matters for General Education. Please clarify, for the wider benefit of faculty, the committee situation pertaining to General Education at PSU. Specifically:

1. How many ad hoc or special committees are currently still active, what is their current status, how are members appointed, and what are the terms of office?
2. Since "no special committees shall be established which duplicate the work of an existing committee," has the time now come when the Academic Requirements Committee should appropriately handle all future matters of general education requirements, and likewise, the Curriculum Committee handle all course approvals?
3. If there is any reason why the above two committees cannot handle all general education matters, and since general education curricula matters properly fall under the province of the Faculty, would it be appropriate to establish either an administrative or constitutional General Education Committee?

In response, OSHIKA noted that Steering Committee recommended a group of 17-20 people, representing various units and constitutional committees, to serve on the General Education Policy Committee. Its purpose is to recommend methods of implementation, and then go out of business.

WHITE stated that the Committee is studying various policies, and will bring them to the Curriculum Committee. This is a committee with members from all schools, reporting to the Office of University Studies. All faculty on the committee have an interest in general education. REARDON also noted that this committee makes recommendations to the Senate and to OAA. After this happens, this committee will disband. In response to a follow-up question from MIDSON, OSHIKA noted that the committee was slow to begin (overworked faculty were reticent to be appointed), but will still sunset relatively soon.

### REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. **SPRING TERM REGISTRATION UPDATE**—RICKS reported for Tufts, noting that enrollment is 12,780, which is down 3.1% from last spring. (Fall term enrollment had been down 3.5% from the prior fall.) Spring term credit hours are 119,750 credit hours, down 3.1% from last spring.

2. Annual Report, BUDGET COMMITTEE—A. JOHNSON gave the report as noted, thanking the administration for keeping the committee informed. OSHIKA accepted the report as presented.
3. Annual Report, INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS BOARD—KOSOKOFF gave the report as noted, stating that the most interesting item is #9, dealing with sportsmanship and ethical behavior. OSHIKA accepted the report as presented.
4. Annual Report, UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM BOARD—GOUCHER stated that the program has substantially altered its reporting relationships, now reporting directly to the CLAS Dean, and asking whether the Program Board should remain in existence. PERRIN stated that this reporting relationship is similar to what occurs with Black Studies and Women's Studies. SVOBODA asked what happens when a committee asks for a Constitutional Amendment. OSHIKA stated that it is up to the Senate or individual Senators to propose an Amendment to the Constitution

MOOR/BOWLDEN moved that this issue be referred to the University Planning Council (as successor to Educational Policies Committee). The motion PASSED unanimously. MIDSON asked if the Committee on Committees should appoint members to the Board. A. JOHNSON noted that UPC meets Thursday, and will make a determination at that time. OSHIKA reminded all that a constitutional amendment is still needed, and accepted the report as presented.

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT—Beeson

OSHIKA reminded the Senators of the Amendment process, that today's actions identify the Amendment that goes before the Advisory Council for its review.

Currently on the floor is the WINEBERG/SVOBODA amendment, adding the words "public service" to the categories of individuals called faculty. WINEBERG noted that this amendment would add the Center for Population Research. SVOBODA however, believed that other situations of public service faculty might also exist. In response to WINEBERG's question, REARDON thought the phrase "Public Service" is only used in exhibit A of the Budget Document. SVOBODA asked if this might affect anyone else. Hearing no response, he preferred that, in the interest of clarity, we should be inclusive. HALES, however, disagreed, believing that extraneous language should not be included. There was also a comment of additional grant people being covered under this phrase. The motion adding the words "public service" PASSED, 18-6.

HALES/WOLLNER proposed to substitute the words "as defined by the PSU Collective Bargaining Agreement" for the words, "PSU Budget Office." MOOR, speaking in

disagreement, stated that the agreement would never be that inclusive. In response to A. JOHNSON's question, HALES thought that this would not exclude department heads. MOOR stated that the Employee Relations Board order would exclude these people, but by tacit agreement, they are treated as members of the agreement because the PSU Administration and the AAUP agreed that all who were not specifically excluded are automatically included. WINEBERG asked about people who are currently on 100% soft money. UPA would get zero additional faculty under this new amendment, but have nine people who are .5 or greater on soft dollars.

HALES/WOLLNER withdrew their motion, adding a motion to delete the Budget Office language. This motion PASSED, but not unanimously.

HOLLOWAY noted the ambiguity between membership in the faculty and eligibility for the Faculty Senate because status of many individuals is not known until a particular quarter begins. MOOR then suggested that annual FTE is what is important. GRECO asked if the purpose of this amendment was to help the Committee on Committees fill required slots on committees. MIDSON said this was, and still is the case.

FARR asked the privilege of the floor for RICKS, who stated that staff in her office hold the rank of Research Assistant, but are not eligible for union representation because of their access to confidential information. BEESON then asked if the Budget Office definition would be a problem for them. RICKS thought this would be fine, but that the AAUP definition would exclude them. SVOBODA wanted a motion that would be inclusive, but this one excludes some people in UPA. He wondered what we could do to be inclusive of most people.

BRENNER/BOWLDEN moved to delete the phrase, "or administration," from both places in the Article. BRENNER thought that Senate representation was an issue of the people, and that the Senate represents only those individuals. She felt that members of the administration have their own mechanisms for being heard and recognized. MOOR, however, thought that President, Provost, etc. would now be excluded not only from the Senate, but also from being called members of the faculty. He also noted that department heads are permitted to be voting members of the Senate. BRENNER/BOWLDEN then withdrew the amendment.

MOOR/SVOBODA then proposed to insert the words "Who are certified by the Provost to have academic qualifications sufficient to justify appointment at one of the above mentioned ranks," after the words Portland State University in the second sentence. MOOR stated that the rationale is that the definition of PSU is changing, and that this gives freedom to the Chief Academic Officer to determine who best fits into members of the faculty. The Provost would determine who has the appropriate rank. This task has begun in the issue of the academic professional ranks.

BOWLLEN moved to TABLE the Amendment until June. The motion PASSED, but not unanimously.

2. INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE STRAW POLL—Cooper. OSHIKA noted that this issue is that of parity of representation in the IFS, every institution having either two or three members. Straw polls are desired before this comes formally to the IFS. The sense within the IFS is that this change should not be made, that this would create divisiveness, and that even the individual who made the motion in the IFS is not strongly in favor. The sense of the PSU Faculty Senate is to keep the representation as is; the vote was UNANIMOUS.
3. ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT—Bowlden. In response to a Senate request, the Advisory Council reported that the OAA had exceeded its authority in approving certain courses for distribution requirements.

#### NEW BUSINESS

1. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MOTION—Bulman. BULMAN/PARSHALL moved the enclosed motion. A. JOHNSON asked what the current course make up is. PARSHALL said that most courses meet for five hours, although not all do. She wanted to provide consistency: five hours and five credits for all. The motion PASSED unanimously.

#### ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:45 PM.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 6, 1994  
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika  
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Abrams, Andrews-Collier, Barna, Beeson, Bjork, Bowlden, Brenner, Cooper, Farr, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Gray, Greco, Hales, A. Johnson, Jolin, Kenny, Kimball, Kocaoglu, Lall, Lansdowne, Liebman, Limbaugh, Midson, Miller, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Potiowsky, Rhee, Svoboda, Talbott, Tama, Vistica, Watne, Westover, Wetzel, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Bleiler for Bjork, Dieterich for DeCarrico, Goslin for Gillpatrick, Robertson for Krug.

Members Absent: Barton, Briggs, Etesami, Falco, Hakanson, D. M. Johnson, D. Johnson, Manning, McGuire, Raedels, Reece, Schaumann, Seltzer, Smith, Visse, Watanabe.

Ex-officio Members Present: Barna, Bleiler, Cabelly, Constans, Davidson, Desrochers, Diman, Erzurumlu, Krug, Graff-Haight, Kaiser, Kosokoff, Ramaley, Reardon, Vieira, Ward.

OSHIKA reminded Senators that this is likely to be a long Senate meeting, and that Senators in attendance include both outgoing and incoming Senators.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOOR suggested the following correction to the minutes: p. 58, line 3, delete the words *these people*, and insert the words *people who have unclassified appointments without faculty ranks*. The minutes were then approved as amended.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

OSHIKA made the following announcements:

1. Administrators have received a questionnaire asking them to identify any ad hoc committees that report to them. Those should be returned to the Secretary as soon as possible.
2. The Secretary should be informed of elected members to the Committee on Committees before June 9.

3. The new Senate roster was corrected. Additional corrections should be given to the Secretary.

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1994-1995

ANDREWS-COLLIER/WOLLNER nominated Loyde Hales. Nominations were closed; HALES was ELECTED by ACCLAMATION.

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO-TEM, 1994-1995

JOHNSON/VISTICA nominated Steve Kosokoff. Nominations were closed; KOSOKOFF was ELECTED by ACCLAMATION.

ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE, 1994-1995

WESTOVER/ANDREWS-COLLIER nominated Oren OGLE

J. BRENNER/A. JOHNSON nominated Elaine LIMBAUGH

BOWLDEN/J. BRENNER nominated Carol FRANKS

A. JOHNSON/ANDREWS-COLLIER nominated Annette JOLIN

J. BRENNER/BOWLDEN nominated Pat WETZEL

S. BRENNER/KENNY nominated Alan RAEDELS

The following were ELECTED to serve on the FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE for the 1994-95 academic year:

Annette JOLIN

Elaine LIMBAUGH

Oren OGLE

Pat WETZEL

They will serve along with the PRESIDING OFFICER, PRESIDING OFFICER PRO-TEM, SECRETARY to the FACULTY, and CHAIR of the Committee on Committees (ex-officio)

OSHIKA thanked each of last year's members of the Steering Committee by name. She noted that it had been a very active year, and the members had all performed many useful tasks for the University and the Senate.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY noted that there are many changes in the present situation at PSU that make it difficult to know how we can prepare for the future.

1. The first is the economy. This is becoming increasingly difficult to predict.
2. Next, there are many "acting people" coming into office. This includes Chancellor Cox, and Presidents at UO, SOSC, WOSC. This will change many of the relationships and the dynamics of those relationships. These new leaders will have many impacts, e.g., on public investments within this state. We will need an early fall gathering at PSU to bring

the entire campus up to date with our new circumstances and respond to public policy questions.

There will also be many new players in the legislature. The reality is that we do not know who will be in leadership roles in the near future, nor what budget implications will be.

RAMALEY next thanked the Senate and Senators for its help during an active year, and helping prepare for more strategic decisions next year.

We should also be more aware of public corporation issues. J. BRENNER asked if the Chancellor's departure will have an impact on the "public corporation" question. RAMALEY said that there is system-wide desire to do this, to give us more flexibility. The Board, as well as Acting Chancellor Cox, are all interested in this opportunity.

### PROVOST'S REPORT

1. REARDON noted that many Task Forces are presenting their reports. These include the examination of instructional and curricular reform; its report has been completed, and will be circulated in an abbreviated version. The Task Force examining university- community involvement has also completed its work; its report will be circulated.
2. The conversion from a three to four credit hour system is beginning. There is the hope that this again be studied in the Faculty Senate. This is arising from UO, and primarily from SOSC. Consequently, the proposal will be made. SOSC desires this, whether or not it is system-wide. However, the Board will probably say, "all or nothing." The proposal arose in regards to productivity plans. Most Provosts are interested in this. If it surfaces this summer, the Senate will return to session. However, we will not begin work unless prior approval is assured. Semester conversion examination is also being considered; however, we should still look towards moving to 4-credit courses, which is halfway.

OSHIKA noted that the IFS is interested in this issue. A. JOHNSON asked for a straw poll to see if the semester system is desired. All those present were permitted to vote. The result was 35-12 in favor of moving to semesters. GOSLIN thought that we should speak with our customers, the students.

### QUESTION PERIOD

BEESON asked where the 400 seat course issue might fit in with curricular changes. REARDON thought that this would be best if we had a mix of various types of classes and classroom sizes. We currently do not have the space to provide this mix. We are trying to build in a wide array of options. BEESON also noted that General Administrators teach large classes.

LIEBMAN asked how the semester conversion impacts productivity. REARDON said that we were asked to examine the issue of improved education. It reduces the number of courses students take, gets them through quicker, and thus improves productivity. This will also give us the flexibility to have 5-week courses.

BOWLDEN asked about plans to change the Shattuck auditorium into a large classroom, believing that we are getting negative feedback on this, directly hurting members of the Dance Program. We might simply change a good auditorium into a bad classroom. REARDON noted that he has recently spoken with the dance students, and will ensure that they will be allowed to graduate. The Dance program has been dropped as part of budget reduction; individual courses will remain. The classroom question results because most people view Lincoln Hall as unsatisfactory. The Deans say we need a 200 seat lecture hall. Of all options, this is the best. Further, the new joint architecture program with UO will need a similar space.

#### E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report, Teacher Education Committee. GRAFF-HAIGHT gave the report as distributed. OSHIKA accepted the report for the Senate.
2. Annual Report, Advisory Council. BOWLDEN gave the report as distributed. He noted that the outgoing members are Marvin Beeson, Larry Bowlden, and Nancy Chapman; incoming members are Alan Cabelly, Beatrice Oshika, and Joan Strouse. They will join Steven Brenner, Jack Cooper, and Ansel Johnson. OSHIKA accepted the report for the Senate.
3. Annual Report, Committee on Committees. MIDSON gave the report as distributed. He thanked Kathi Ketcheson, Barbara Wiegele, and individuals in Computing Services for their assistance in compiling the Committee on Committees questionnaires. He directed everyone's attention to the new committee, the Advisory Committee on Information Technologies. He notes committee recommendations #1 and #2, finding ways of providing retired faculty the opportunity to assist with the Senate's committee work, and of developing a Procedures Manual in which committee policies and procedures be recorded. (The full text of the recommendations is in the report.) SVOBODA asked about whether committee minutes are normally retained. OSHIKA noted various meetings of committee chairs, who agreed that no central place is used for storage, but that this was necessary. OSHIKA accepted the report for the Senate. A. JOHNSON/BLEILER moved to direct the 1994-95 Steering Committee to study these recommendations.
4. Annual Report, University Planning Council. SVOBODA gave the report for Weikel. The Council was concerned about the fact that this and other major university committees are bypassed in favor of some ad hoc committees.

REARDON asked if the UPC saw itself as a working committee, or overseer. SVOBODA noted that UPC should be consulted; occasionally, as appropriate, it should

do the actual work required. OSHIKA thought that ad hoc committee formation should be run past the UPC. MOOR said that Ad Hoc committee work should be reviewed by standing committees. BLEILER thought this would cause gridlock, because of significant overlap. SVOBODA did not want to slow down the process, but thought that deliberate advice is appropriate even if cumbersome and laborious. OSHIKA accepted the report for the Senate, endorsing the recommendation that appropriate communication should occur when educational policy matters are discussed.

5. Semi-Annual Report, Faculty Development Committee. BLEILER noted that we continue to be "hideously underfunded," and are seeking to improve this. He thanked Marjorie Enneking, Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, who gave significant help to the committee throughout the year. The committee is proposing a Constitutional Amendment to cut their membership in half. J. BRENNER asked about the decision to have next year's grants focus on seed money. BLEILER said this was made in consultation with OAA. J. BRENNER then asked if this was a policy decision; BLEILER said it was in the committee's charge to develop criteria. J. BRENNER thought the Senate should review this in a timely manner, and BLEILER thought this was appropriate. He noted that the history of the committee is new.

J. BRENNER thought the Steering Committee could look into this. OSHIKA accepted the report for the Senate. OSHIKA thought that the changes could be submitted to the Senate in a timely manner. A. JOHNSON thought this should be discussed at the October Senate meeting. OSHIKA said that this will occur.

6. Report on Evaluation of Reorganization of Library and School of Business Administration. OSHIKA noted that the report is still being written at this time. It is included in its entirety in the minutes.
7. General Education Task Force Report. An update on the Education Task Force for Gen Ed was given by LIEBMAN.

Oshika noted that the Task Force will make an additional report to the Senate in the fall, and that anyone having comments should contact Liebman. In response to A. JOHNSON's question, OSHIKA noted that the ARC will see the report before it is distributed because the chairs of ARC, UPC, and the Curriculum Committee are all on the task force. OSHIKA accepted the report for the Senate.

8. IFS report. Cooper gave the report, which is included in its entirety in the minutes.

DESROCHERS asked about the "Education First" ballot measure. This occurred in California in 1988, guaranteeing funding to K-12, putting a real squeeze on higher education. She also noted that the Public Corporation issue is related, as it impacts implementation. COOPER concluded that we should get out the vote, and talk to ordinary citizens. BURNS noted that the Chancellor's office still does not have a

document explaining the Public Corporation; the IFS thought this should be done. DESROCHERS said this document will soon be available.

S. BRENNER asked about the PERS measure, and the fact that Eugene teachers have entered into an agreement increasing their salary in exchange for PERS, shortly before the election. COOPER thought that contracts protects some people, as long as they are in effect. S. BRENNER asked what the legislators had in mind. OSHIKA thought the PERS item was contractual, so a decision of voters would be challenged. She thought there was much indeterminacy in all these issues.

#### F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Constitutional Amendment (Membership of the Faculty). OSHIKA clarified the process of Constitutional Amendments, and removed F1 from the table.

S. BRENNER asked about the meaning of "public service." OSHIKA thought this impacted many people in some research institutes. She noted that this language has already been added.

MOOR suggested that the word "AND" be added to the third line of the bottom paragraph, p. 58, after the word *ranks*. This was done.

BOWLLEN asked Moor what would be accomplished by the amendment to add the Provost's certification. MOOR thought that, after the Extended Studies addition, similar individuals would be added across campus; REARDON agreed that this would occur. MIDSON asked if people would be decertified by the Provost; REARDON was uncertain. Most people in this category would be on grants; MOOR thought that someone doing clerical tasks, but who is unclassified, could be decertified by the PROVOST. MIDSON thought this might undo the Extended Studies amendment; MOOR thought this simply looks at academic issues. SVOBODA asked who would be excluded; MOOR noted that his own wife in the past was unclassified, and would be excluded by this latest change. He thought academic qualifications are appropriate. S. BRENNER asked the point of the overall amendment; we could change the Senate's title to "University Senate," but not call more people faculty.

FORBES suggested that this body addresses curriculum and instruction; he thought that faculty rank is necessary to do this, and that Moor's amendment does this. J. BRENNER thought that an academic degree might not be crucial. She asked Moor if he was concerned about the credentializing process, or function. MOOR said this is not just about degrees, but that people should have appropriate qualifications. FORBES said that the language in F1, along with Moor's amendment, covers function and qualifications. WOLLNER disagreed, saying this might delete people working within academic programs

who are called faculty within the collective bargaining agreement. MOOR said this amendment follows the contract.

The Question was called. The amendment PASSED 30-1.

F1, as amended, now goes to the Advisory Council for consideration, and will return to the Senate in October.

#### G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Constitutional Amendment (Faculty Development Committee). BLEILER noted that the committee costs \$7200/hour, at an hourly rate of \$30/hour for 24 members. He never was able to get more than 14 people to attend at one time. This Amendment now goes to the Advisory Council for consideration, and will return to the Senate in October.
2. Scholastic Standards Committee Proposal. Constans. This is a change in deadlines. CONSTANS explained the proposal as noted. A. JOHNSON asked if we could also move the drop deadline back from 8 weeks. We get "killed" by "shopping" students. FOSQUE asked whether this change would negatively impact the Deadline Appeals Board. In response to JOLIN's question, CONSTANS thought this would actually help. BOWLDEN thought this change would hurt good students; we should give them more flexibility.

TUFTS thought many similar changes are being studied, and that only this one came to the Senate. The six week/four week issue causes confusion. Auditing students also cause problems, because the community does not realize this is a student who might be failing. GRECO thought that if the student is doing well, a "Pass" does not hurt.

S. BRENNER discussed other options that might also be available. MOOR thought this question was quite important for students. As a practical issue, from a budgetary standpoint, we should not allow drops when no one else can add, or when adds do not count. FARR agreed with Bowlden, while being concerned about grade shopping. This might increase the number of appeals. CONSTANS wanted students to take some responsibility. ANDREWS-COLLIER wanted to give students feedback earlier. BLEILER thought late changes delete personal commitment. Students should be in for the duration, if we are a quality university. FORBES agreed, but asked about petitions that are as much as one year late, thinking these are intolerable/unbelievable.

OSHIKA suggested that these issues be referred back to the Deadline Appeals Board and the Scholastic Standards Committee, working in concert with Bob Tufts. A. JOHNSON/BLEILER moved this. It PASSED unanimously.

3. Constitutional Amendment (University Honors Program Board). A. JOHNSON noted that this is an old issue. The University Planning Council unanimously voted in favor of this,

placing this program under normal university governance procedures. There were no questions. This Amendment now goes to the Advisory Council for consideration, and will return to the Senate in October.

#### ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 5:25 PM to a rousing cheer and applause, and wished luck to the new officers.