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TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate  
FR: Alan Cabelly, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on June 6, 1994, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 Cramer Hall.

The “regular” agenda appears on the third page of this mailing; this page describes procedural items that occur at this time.

SENATE ELECTIONS
The Presiding Officer, The Presiding Officer Pro-Tem, and Faculty Senate Steering Committee for 1994–1995 are elected at the June 1994 meeting of the Faculty Senate. The Constitution requires that all candidates for these positions be 1994–1995 Faculty Senators. Members of the 1994–1995 Faculty Senate nominate candidates for these positions, and vote in a secret ballot.

SENATORS ARE ENCOURAGED TO CAREFULLY CONSIDER POTENTIAL NOMINEES FOR THESE IMPORTANT POSITIONS, AND TO DISCUSS CANDIDATES WITH THEIR COLLEAGUES. MANY VITAL ISSUES WILL REQUIRE SENATE ACTION, AND A REPRESENTATIVE SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE WILL HELP GUIDE THE PATH.

The next page is the list of 1994–1995 Senators.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
The following Constitutional rules describe the process for determining Committee on Committees representation:

"When a division has an opening on the Committee on Committees, the division shall caucus to elect its representative(s). The meeting will be called by the outgoing representative on the Committee on Committees.... Normally, the caucus will take place after Senate election results are announced in May.... A majority of all division Senators or their alternates shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Within three days after the June Senate meeting, the Secretary to the Faculty shall be informed, in writing, of the Committee on Committees representative(s), along with the names of those present at the meeting."

Most new Committee on Committees members are elected for a two-year term (the Extended Studies and Library representatives are elected for one-year terms). The divisions shown below elect members (number listed in parentheses) at this time. I have sent a memo asking the person noted below to conduct the caucus for that division.

All Others, Gene Hakanson (one)  
Business Administration, Don Watne (one)  
Education, Loyde Hales (one)  
Extended Studies, Tony Midson (one)  
Liberal Arts and Sciences, Pat Wetzel (two)  
Library, Jim Kimball (one)  
Social Work, Harold Briggs (one)  
Urban and Public Affairs, Annette Jolin (one)
TO: 1994-95 Members of the Faculty Senate

FR: Alan Cabelly, Secretary to the Faculty

The enclosed list shows all PSU Faculty Senators for 1994-1995. As outlined in the agenda for the June 6, 1994, Faculty Senate meeting, Senate elections will take place on June 6. Please use this list as you prepare to nominate people for Presiding Officer, Presiding Officer pro tem, or Steering Committee member. If questions arise, please call me at 5-3789.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Others</th>
<th>Business Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lendaris, George</td>
<td>SYSC 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakanson, Eugene</td>
<td>CAPS 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krug, David</td>
<td>ED 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falco, Ruth</td>
<td>ED 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hales, Loyde</td>
<td>ED 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone, Joe</td>
<td>SFPA 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, Rudolph</td>
<td>SFPA 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosque, Walton</td>
<td>SFPA 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaoglu, Dundar</td>
<td>EAS 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lall, Kent</td>
<td>EAS 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Trevor</td>
<td>EAS 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodegom, Eric</td>
<td>PHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Ansel</td>
<td>GEOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosokoff, Stephen</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieberman, Devorah</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard, Hugo</td>
<td>PSY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinnin, Robert</td>
<td>BIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weikel, Ann</td>
<td>HST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeson, Marvin</td>
<td>GEOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowlden, Larry</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franks, Carol</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greco, Gina</td>
<td>FFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, David</td>
<td>HST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbaugh, Elaine</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe, Suwako</td>
<td>FFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, John</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeCarrico, Jan</td>
<td>LING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rhee, Ma-Ji (for Fisher)</td>
<td>FLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebman, Robert</td>
<td>SOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Daniel M.</td>
<td>GEOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vistica, Rita</td>
<td>FLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetzel, Patricia</td>
<td>FLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollner, Craig</td>
<td>HST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interim appointments
The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on June 6, 1994, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 Cramer Hall.

**THIS WILL BE A BUSY, FULL MEETING, WITH MANY VOTES THROUGHOUT. SENATORS ARE ASKED TO KEEP THEIR SCHEDULES CLEAR FOR THE ENTIRE TWO HOUR TIME PERIOD, AND, IF CONFLICTS EXIST BECAUSE OF EXAMS OR OTHER COMMITMENTS, TO HAVE THEIR ALTERNATES ATTEND.**

**AGENDA**

A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 2, 1994, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. President's Report
   2. Provost's Report

**ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1994–1995**

D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

**ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO-TEM, 1994–1995**

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   1. Annual Report, Teacher Education Committee—Graft-Haight
   2. Annual Report, Advisory Council—Bowlden
   3. Annual Report, Committee on Committees—Midson
   4. Annual Report, University Planning Council—Weikel
   5. Semi-Annual Report, Faculty Development Committee—Bleiler
   6. Report on Evaluation of Reorganization of Library and School of Business Administration—Oshika

**ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE, 1994–1995**

F. Unfinished Business
   1. Constitutional Amendment (Membership of the Faculty)—Beeson

G. New Business
   1. Constitutional Amendment (Faculty Development Committee)—Bleiler
   2. Scholastic Standards Committee Proposal—Constans
   3. Constitutional Amendment (University Honors Program Board)—A. Johnson

H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:

- B Minutes of the May 2, 1994, Senate Meeting
- Advisory Council report on distribution requirements
- E1. Annual Report, Teacher Education Committee
- E2. Annual Report, Advisory Council
- E3. Annual Report, Committee on Committees
- E4. Annual Report, University Planning Council
- E5. Semi-Annual Report, Faculty Development Committee
- F1. Constitutional Amendment (Membership of the Faculty)
- G1. Constitutional Amendment (Faculty Development Committee)
- G2. Scholastic Standards Committee Proposal
- G3. Constitutional Amendment (University Honors Program Board)
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 2, 1994
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika
Secretary: Alan Cabelly


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


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, REAR DON 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.
BOWLDEN 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.
TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: The Advisory Council

At the March meeting of the Senate, there was a request that the Advisory Council look into the directive from OAA to the Registrar's Office allowing several 199 courses to satisfy distribution requirements. The courses in question were the Freshman Seminar courses and two cross-disciplinary courses.

We (the Advisory Council) sent a letter to Provost Reardon on Nov. 2, 1993 asking about the exemption of these courses from the exclusionary list. We have received no reply.

It is clear in the Constitution that the Faculty has the authority to decide on curricula:
Article III, Section 1: The Faculty shall have power to act upon matters of educational policy, to enact such rules and regulations as it may deem desirable to promote or enforce such policies, and to decide upon curricula and new courses of study.

Furthermore, there are specific provisions for emergency approval of changes listed in the same section:
University-wide academic requirements shall not be suspended or modified without prior consideration by the Faculty Senate. In an emergency, the Academic Requirements Committee and/or the Graduate Council; the Advisory Council, and the Presiding Officer of the Senate shall first be consulted. Notification of any change made shall be submitted to the Senate immediately with a request for ratification.

No such emergency request was made, nor was there any after the fact attempt to notify or get approval from the above listed bodies.

It is the conclusion of the Advisory Council that OAA exceeded its authority in approving these courses for distribution requirements.
Annual Report of the
Teacher Education Committee
April 27, 1994

Chair: Dawn Graff-Haight, PHE

Members:
Ronald Babcock, MUS
Carol Burden, COUN/ED
David Cox, ED
Mary Gordon-Brannon, SPHR
Kathleen Greey, LIB
Elaine Limbaugh, ENG

Jeanette Palmiter, MA
Cathy Smith, PSY
William Tate, TA
Richard Thoms, GEOL
Rita Vistica, FL
Emily Young, ART

Ex Officio: Robert Everhart, ED
Dave Krug, ED

The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) met once during fall term and once during winter term during this academic year thus far. At the fall meeting, we received an update from the Teachers Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC). The TSPC update included an overview of the PSU Licensure Program offerings and a status report on the Beginning Teacher Assessment Model Pilot Study. No action items were introduced at this meeting.

The winter term meeting was called at the request of Vice-Provost Dalton Miller-Jones for the purpose of examining the role of PSU in the Oregon School Reform Agenda. Vice-Provost Miller-Jones presented a summary of activities in which PSU is engaged regarding the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM). Following this summary he solicited ideas from the TEC for coordinating information related to current PSU faculty and program involvement in the Oregon School Reform Agenda, and how to further involve PSU faculty in this reform. No action items were introduced at this meeting.
The Advisory Council met on Mondays from 2 to 4 p.m. This year, in addition to meeting often with President Ramaley (eight to ten times over the course of the year), we also met several times with Provost Reardon and once each with Vice Provost Miller-Jones, Vice President Desrochers, and AAUP President Wollner.

Over the course of the year, we discussed a variety of topics with administrators including, of course, the ever-present no-news on the budget, many issues around the new general education program, faculty morale, productivity, and methods for the President to meet informally with students. We felt that our interchanges with administrators were good this year, and that we were sought out for advice on important issues.

We advised the Senate on several constitutional amendments and constitutional interpretations. At the request of the Senate, we ruled on the constitutionality of OAA's suspension of exclusionary status for several 199 courses, concluding that OAA had exceeded its authority. During this period of curricular reform, we urge all concerned to follow the constitutional procedures for curricular changes.

We also made recommendations to the President for filling the positions of Faculty Advisor, Secretary to the Faculty, and search committee positions for a new V.P. for Student Affairs.
We were given a unique charge this year, sent to us jointly by the AAUP Executive Council and the Administration. The 1993-95 Collective Bargaining Agreement contains the following Memorandum of Understanding:

*The University will request that the Advisory Council study the employment conditions and practices as they relate to fixed term faculty.*

We have struggled mightily with this request, both with its meaning and with means for carrying out our charge. We are not yet in a position to report to the Senate, and it appears that we may have to carry over at least parts of this task to next year and to the new Council.

An additional note: David Johnson was elected to the Council last Spring, and he was a member until his many duties forced him reluctantly to resign. In accordance with constitutional provisions, Steven Brenner was appointed to fulfill the vacancy on February 7, 1994.
Membership:
Harold Briggs (SSW), Richard Forbes (CLAS), Walt Fosque (FPA), Gene Hakanson (AO), Loyde Hales (ED), Janice Jackson (SBA & Chair Sept 93–Dec 93), Annette Jolin (UPA), Ansel Johnson (CLAS), Jim Kimball (LIB), Tony Midson (XS and Chair Jan 94–June 94), Trevor Smith (EAS), Suwako Watanabe (CLAS), Don Watne (SBA), Patricia Wetzel (CLAS), Craig Wollner (CLAS).

Changes to Committees
1. Calendar year and academic year constitutional and administrative committees were filled as their terms rotated. Individual vacancies were filled from time to time as the need arose.

2. A new committee, the Advisory Committee on Information Technologies, was formed by action of V. P. Lindsay Desrochers. This is to replace two previous committees, the Advisory Committee on Computing Services and the Committee on Instructional Media, which are to be eliminated June 1994.

   This Committee advises the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration on: 1) programmatic requirements of instructional and administrative areas of the University, 2) appropriate University policies on computing, and 3) policies on the delivery of media services for instruction and professional training.

   Composition was provisionally set at 11 faculty so as to give adequate representation, though this number should be reconsidered in a year or so. In addition, there will be one representative each from the Office of Academic Affairs, Library, Technology Services, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, Business Office, and two from Enrollment Services. Consultants are the VP for FADM and the Director of Academic and Administrative Technology Services.

3. It was recommended in the June 1993 Committee on Committees report that the Teacher Education Committee membership be re-examined. David Krug, Acting Dean, indicated that although the committee had little work to do this year, there is a potential increase next year in response to the statewide CIMS and CAMS graduation changes and that the review of this committee could be appropriately postponed one more year. A full slate of names was thus selected for next year, excepting a representative for the now defunct Business Education program, but retaining a representative for the Health Program which lives on, despite the demise of the School of H&HP.

4. No appointments have been made to the Honors Program Board, pending results of a motion anticipated at this June meeting to eliminate the board.

5. After partially completing appointments to the Faculty Development Committee another constitutional amendment materialized for this June meeting. The intention is to reduce membership to 50% of the present size. Consequently, unfilled positions
Recommendations

1. Ways of providing retired faculty with an opportunity to assist with committee work of the Senate was discussed at the request of the PSU association of retired faculty. It was deemed a pity both to waste talents, especially in times of shortage, and not to benefit from the experience of "wise heads". In many cases individual faculty who were key players in previous policy developments, for instance, might be useful as consultants.

Some former faculty who have devoted many years to the service of this institution wish for a continued meaningful association with PSU. As aides to committees they might advise students, review or screen petitions, research and organize data, and perform other useful duties. We are not proposing at this point that they be voting members, but we do caution against giving them merely clerical work. This may be a partial answer for committees who find they have too few members to operate effectively during the summer.

The committee suggests that a pool of volunteers be drawn up by the retired faculty association, and those names be available to chairs of committees who should be encouraged to draw upon volunteers, as needed, for fixed periods of time.

The committee would welcome a Senate discussion and motion to vote on this issue.

2. The committee is concerned with the inefficient and random way in which committee culture and procedure is passed on from year to year. We request that the Secretary to the Faculty annually invite selected committees to establish or modify a Procedures Manual in which accepted policies and practices be recorded, together with forms, suggestions, and previous policy decisions. Master copies of such manuals should be retained by the Secretary. This is not intended to curb the right of any committee to conduct business as it wishes, but merely to provide a useful continuity and the inheritance of helpful procedures.

3. In order to fully inform faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty is urged to publish in future Faculty Governance Guides information about all currently active special or ad hoc committees that deal with academic matters including, for each committee: title, charge, membership, terms of membership, method of selection, person or body to which they report, date of origin, and termination criteria.

The Secretary is also requested to adjust the Governance Guide to display missing charter requirements for appointments to the Helen Gordon Child Development Center Advisory Board and the Publications Board.

4. The Committee discussed the possibility of combining and enlarging the (underworked) Academic Appeals Committee and (overworked) Deadline Appeals Committee. Though this did not meet with instant approval by incumbents of Deadline Appeals, the Committee on Committees still feels this proposal has merit and should be considered more thoroughly in future.

Submitted May 1994 by Tony Midson, Chair.
UNIVERSITY PLANNING COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 1993-1994

COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP
Chair, Ann Weikel (HST); Sy Adler (UPA), Barry Anderson (PSY), Kevin Corcoran (SSW), Darrold Barrow (COMP), Mary Cumpston (CARC), Laurel Kirsch (TA), Elaine Limbaugh (ENG), Robert Lockerby (LIB), Judy Patton (SFPB), Rolf Schaumann (EE), Milan Svoboda (PHE), William Greenfield (ED), Richard Thoms (GEOL) Ellen West (SBA) Paul Wurm (XS), Donald Nasca (graduate student), Michael Reynolds (student), Ansel Johnson (Budget Committee Chair).
Consultant: Provost.

COUNCIL FUNCTIONS: art 4, Sec 4, m of the Faculty Constitution states that the UPC shall 1) in consultation with appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-range plans and priorities for the achievement of the mission of the University 2) serve as the faculty advisory body to the President and the Faculty Senate on matters of educational policy and planning for the University 3) receive and consider proposals from appropriate administrative officers or faculty committees for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities, undertake matters falling within its competence on either its own initiative or by referral from the President, faculty committees, or the Faculty Senate.

During the year, the UPC has participated in writing a special section of the accreditation report dealing with the Impact of Measure 5. That activity has been completed for this year.

Although the UPC on its own initiative informally discussed an early report of the General Education Working Group, it was disappointed that it did not receive the final report or catalogue revisions in time to make a recommendation to the Senate.

In December the UPC reviewed and commented on a draft of the proposed University District Concept. The concept was announced to the community in April.

In January the Provost presented his final plan for hiring priorities for the next academic year (1994-1995) and explained the process he and the deans had followed in arriving at the 11 positions.

The UPC reviewed and prepared written comments on two position papers by President Ramaley. The first paper outlined some basic planning assumptions for the future of PSU after the last round of measure 5 cuts. The other was a draft of a position paper calling for a study of new ways of measuring the success of urban universities with their diverse student populations.

The May 1994 meeting of the Faculty Senate referred the matter of the Honors committee to the UPC. The Honors Committee had reported that its oversight function was now being carried out by the Dean
of CLAS and therefore it no longer had a reason to exist. On May 5, after hearing from the Director of the Honors Program and the Chair of the Honors Committee as well as consulting the Associate Dean of CLAS, the UPC agreed. Ansel Johnson has volunteered to collect the necessary signatures to amend the Faculty constitution.

Having consulted with the UPC, the chair participated in a meeting of other committee chairs in October with the President, Provost and Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate on the current problems facing this committee and other senate committees. The UPC notes with regret that the anticipated local PEW round table on faculty government has not taken place during this academic year. The UPC feels that it is not functioning as the Faculty constitution intends. To be effective the UPC should be consulted early in any planning process. Instead ad hoc committees have been carrying on serious educational planning efforts outside the regular committee structure. The whole process of establishing the general education requirements and the structure for administering the requirements in CLAS was developed without significant consultation with this committee (m, 3 and description of activity above). At present there are 3 task forces (educational assessment, instructional support, and community\university projects) which seem to have significant educational policy implications but the UPC has not been involved (m 2). The UPC members recognize the reasons for ad hoc committees, but at the same time, when there are specific educational issues or problems they feel the UPC should be consulted or at least informed about the issues, the formation of the committees and their progress. If the Faculty Senate and members of the administration will consult the UPC earlier than they have in the past, the UPC will be able to be more productive in the future.
Portland State University

MEMORANDUM

May 5, 1994

To: Faculty Senate

From: Steve Bleiler-MTH, Chair- Faculty Development Committee

Re: Semi-annual report of the FDC


Consultants: Michael Reardon-OAA, Roy Koch-OAA

Report: The Faculty Development Committee recently awarded $100,000 in funding through the Faculty Development Program. Funding was provided to some 33 separate proposals, few of which were funded fully due to budget constraints. As in the past, requests totaled nearly three times the available resources, so many fine proposals had to go unfunded or were awarded very limited funding. The complete list of funded proposals should be appearing shortly in PSU Currently. The Committee has also completed its recommendations for funding under the Institutional Career Support-Peer Review program and has sent these recommendations on to the Provost for final action.

The Committee wishes to take this opportunity to thank Marge Enneking and the staff of the Office and Research and Sponsored Projects for their valuable assistance with the administration of the Faculty Development Program.

As this report is being prepared, the committee is designing next year’s Development Program. While many details are at the moment unavailable, the program deadlines have been established. Proposals must be received in the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects by Nov. 15, 1994 and the committee intends to announce program awards in mid-April 1995. Forms for this program will be distributed to all Faculty at the close of the Spring 1994 term and will be available from the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

The procedures for tracking the outcomes of the 93-94 Faculty Development Grants are now in place. Principal investigators of projects funded under that program are reminded that the report to the committee on the outcomes of their project is due in the Office of Research and Sponsored projects on Aug. 1, 1994.

Finally, the Committee has developed a more efficient structure for itself which is being proposed as an amendment to our Faculty Constitution. The Faculty Development Committee unanimously recommends this change and hopes that the Senate will act on it swiftly. You will find this packaged separately.
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

Text to be deleted is struck out. Text to be added is written in bold italics.

Article II
"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. Unclassified members of the School of Extended Studies Portland State University whose full-time equivalent is at least fifty percent teaching, research, public service, or administration at Portland State University shall also be included in the faculty 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."

Note: This text differs from that originally signed by ten Senators and submitted to the Secretary. Changes reflect those made at the May 2, 1994 Faculty Senate meeting.
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

We, the ten undersigned members of the PSU Faculty Senate, present to the PSU Faculty Senate the following Amendment to the constitution of the Portland State University Faculty.

Text to be deleted is struck out. Text to be added is written in **bold italics**.

**Article IV, section 4.4.g. Faculty Development Committee.** This committee shall consist of ten **five** faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, **two one** from each of the other instructional divisions, **two one** from the Library, **two one** representing All Other Faculty, and as consultants, the Provost or his/her representative.

---

signature

signature

signature

signature

signature

signature
May 11, 1994

To: Beatrice Oshika  
Presiding Officer, Faculty Senate

From: Mary Constans  
Chair, Scholastic Standards Committee

The Scholastic Standards Committee discussed the deadline for changing grade options and felt that the current six week deadline is too generous and causes problems. It was proposed to move the deadline to the fourth week of the quarter, which agrees with the deadline for dropping classes without instructor approval. By pairing these two deadlines it is hoped that more students will remember them and there will be fewer petitions for retroactive grade changes.

We propose that the Time Schedule language on page 2 be changed

From: The last day to:

Change grading option - A 6th week deadline (Spring term: May 6, 1994)

To: The last day to:

Change grading option - A 4th week deadline (Spring term: April 22, 1994)
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Amend the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty by deleting the following entries noted below:

Article IV Organization of the Faculty
Section 4. Faculty Committees.
4) Standing Committees and Their Functions.

[ i) University Honors Program Board. This board shall consist of a chairperson and a membership representative of various academic units of the University. In addition, two students shall serve on the Board; at least one student shall be from the University Honors Program. The Director of the University Honors Program shall be an ex-officio member. The Board shall:

1) Formulate and propose policies regarding the University Honors program and give it general supervision, such as advising the Director on personnel appointments, developing curricular policy and approving University Honors Program course proposals.

2) Determine the bases for selection, retention and matriculation of University Honors Program students and serve on admissions committees. Review for graduation all students nominated by departments and directors and receive appeals and requests from students in the University Honors Program.

3) Receive from the Director at each meeting a summary of the operations and development of the program. A copy of all memoranda and office records shall be made available to members of the University Honors Program Board upon request.

4) Report to the Senate at least once a year.]

Delete the corresponding entry on page 56 of the Governance Guide

UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM BOARD

Signed by 10 senators:
Rationale:

The elimination of this board has been recommended for the last several years. The program is a part of CLAS, and the director reports through the Dean of CLAS. All oversight functions thus follow the same procedure as other departments in CLAS. Under these circumstances there is no reason to have an added board for oversight. The University Planning Council approved this recommendation without dissent.