2-1-1995

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet February 1995

Portland State University Faculty Senate

THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

TO: Senators and *Ex-officio* Members to the Senate
FROM: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **February 6, 1995,** at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the January 9, 1995, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

1. President's Report
2. Provost's Report

D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators
2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report
2. Interim Report, Freshman Inquiry

F. Unfinished Business

1. Proposal for Conversion of Undergraduate Curriculum to a Four-credit Model - Faculty Senate Steering Committee

G. New Business

1. Motion to refrain from purchasing - Talbott

H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of the January 9, 1995, Senate Meeting
E Report of the December 1994 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting
F1 Proposal for Conversion of Undergraduate Curriculum to a Four-credit Model
G1 Motion to refrain from purchasing

Secretary to the Faculty
341 Cramer Hall (503)725-4416 E-mail: sarah@po.pdx.edu

THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes:	Faculty Senate Meeting, January 9, 1995
Presiding Officer:	Loyde Hales
Secretary:	Sarah E. Andrews-Collier
Members Present:	Abrams, Bluestone, Bodegom, Bowlden, Bowman, Brenner, Cooper, DeCarrico, Feeney, Fosque, Franks, Goldman, Gray, Greco, Hales, A. Johnson, Dav. Johnson, Jolin, Kosokoff, Lall, Liebman, Limbaugh, McBride, Miller, Novy, Ogle, Rhee, Svoboda, Talbott, Tinnan, Bulman, Watanabe, Weikel, Wetzel, Wollner.
Alternates Present:	Kosuge for Barton, Rad for Kocaoglu, Wineberg for Seltzer.
Members Absent:	Becker, Etesami, Falco, Hakanson, Dan. Johnson, Kenny, Krug, Lendaris, Lieberman, Manning, Maynard, Raedels, Robertson, Smith, Watne.
Ex-officio Members Present:	Andrews-Collier, Desrochers, Diman, Goslin, Kaiser, Koch, Oshika, Reardon, Toulan, Ward.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by Loyde Hales.

The Faculty Senate Minutes of December 5, 1994, were approved after the Vice President's report, with the following correction: on E.6. (p.18) Report from the December 1994 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting, by COOPER, will be attached to January 1995 Minutes, not December 1994 Minutes.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- Changes in Faculty Senate and committee rosters since 12/5/94: SENATE: Claudine Fisher replaces Dan Johnson, effective Dec. 7, 1994, for the remainder of his term, until June, 1995. COMMITTEE: Paul Latiolas has resigned from Curriculum Committee, effective 12/30/94.

- 1995 All-university Calendar Committee Appointments:

1) Curriculum: Henry David Crockett, SBA, Chair: Richard Wattenberg replaces E. Young, FPA; Sherrie Gradin replaces M. Terdal, CLAS; Teresa Bulman reappointed, CLAS.

2) Library: Gina Greco, FLL, Chair; Duncan Carter, ENG replaces Martinez; Sandra Wilde, ED replaces Etesami; John Settle, SBA replaces Dav. Johnson; Jane Kristoff, ART reappointed; William Savery, ME appointed.

3) Scholastic Standards: Mary Constans, ART, Chair; Alan Raedels, SBA replaces Fu Li; Robert Mercer, CLAS replaces O'Connor

4) Graduate Council: Lewis Goslin, SBA, Chair; Marjorie Burns, CLAS replaces Dodds; Dundar Kocaoglu EAS replaces Spolek; Russell Miars, ED replaces Peterson; Marty Zwick, SYSC appointed AO.

• Reminder: Faculty Senate Steering Committee meets 3-4:30 p.m.Thursday, January 12, 1994.

• President Ramaley, in accordance with normal governance procedure, accepted the "reduction of credits required for the baccalaureate degree to 180 credits," effective immediately. The President accepted the motion "1) that the cumulative GPA required for good standing at PSU be changed to 2.00 at 12 credits hours; and, 2) that the current usage of "academic warning" be changed to "academic probation." The President accepted the remaining Graduate and Undergraduate New Courses and Course Changes, effective Fall 1995, including the Master of International Management. The President approved the motion regarding Measure #8 (listed in this month's minutes).

1. <u>President's Report</u>

DESROCHERS reported on the current status of the next Higher Education budget (the President was out of town). The Governor's budget is close to that recommended by Gov Roberts with two exceptions. The tuition increase will be reduced to 4% and $4-6 million in lottery funds will be shifted to K-12. There is an overall decreased of 14.7%. This is a $4.-4.5 mil. reduction, per year, if nothing changes from today. The Governor is seeking salary increases for categories "below market." Hopefully, Higher Education faculty is included in this group. Certain programs, including the joint School of Engineering, have been shifted to general fund, rather than lottery funding. We have requested certain special projects be considered for lottery funding, including the Urban Center building, but the outcome is not decided. Pending the Measure #8 lawsuits, $17. million per year from Higher Education will be put in a trust. Depending upon the outcome, these funds could potentially be used for salary enhancements. We are also requesting the Chancellor for "mission related" adjustments.

LIEBMAN asked what is the base number for the 95-97 budget, and is there a prospect that dollars can be raised outside the general fund. DESROCHERS stated $4.5 million is 17% of a $55.million cut, which is based on several machinations, including productivity increases. TOULAN asked what is the Board's timeline for the budget.

DESROCHERS stated the budget was accepted in May and accepted by incoming Governor Kitzhaber with adjustments. The allocations to individual campuses are not yet forthcoming. We also don't know how specific the Chancellor will be about allocating spending, as opposed to the last round. BOWLDEN asked if the two tier retirement proposal is really cost saving. DESROCHERS stated that Kitzhaber is planning it, and expects he assumes some savings.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions from the Floor to Administrators or to the Chair.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report, Curriculum Committee

BULMAN reported that Curriculum, subsequent to Course and Program approvals in November and December Senate, approved the SLA Program and will complete approval of Environmental Studies in January. HALES accepted the report for Senate.

2. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report

OSHIKA reported on the 16 December presentation by Tony Wilcox representing IFS at the State Board Meeting. There were approximately 150-200 faculty in attendance from as far away as OIT. BURNS distributed materials he put together describing Oregon faculty salaries, based on "Academe" (attached to these minutes).

3. Report on Four-credit Course System

OSHIKA, for University Planning Council and Curriculum Committee, reported on their joint preliminary investigations (E2, 2 part), and distributed a summary document which outlines their discreet conclusions (attached to these minutes).

4. Report on Four-credit Course System

GOSLIN, for Graduate Council, reported on the their preliminary recommendation (E3), and urged the Senate to consider this as a formal motion.

JOHNSON MOVED the Graduate Council recommendation. Dav. JOHNSON requested the motion be reworded in "positive" language. There was no second. HALES ruled the motion out of order.

HALES accepted the two committee reports for the Senate, and opened the floor for discussion. REARDON stated research/evidence on retention towards graduation shows that fewer required courses improve graduation rates. He asked how the Senate proposes to continue investigating the issue of student productivity.

LIEBMAN raised three issues: 1) There is the question of the "use" of a mandate. What would it be? 2) There is a problem in using only the English Pilot Project as an example. Exploration in other departments is needed. 3) It is imperative to act quickly as Fall planning has started. Paths are needed for departments to move ahead. Pedagogic or productivity improvements must be used as the standard for measurement.

WINEBERG asked if other universities were surveyed for a norm. REARDON stated the three credit quarter system is the minority pattern. OSHIKA stated that if we put ourselves in the reverse position, we would encounter the same questions; the issue is what is the effect of change itself.

REARDON stated answers should be sought in relation to the issue of student success, and urged a focus on that issue. OSHIKA stated that the two norms are not that far apart, but it is a matter of how committed we are to a change. Dav. JOHNSON asked if English could report on progress other than procedural difficulties. OSHIKA yielded to REECE, who stated that English students and faculty were surveyed. Students overall support the change. The faculty is somewhat less positive about the change, due partly to adjustments required in course contents; however, they are in favor of having fewer preparations per term. Dav. JOHNSON asked if there would be more information after another quarter. REECE stated mixed scheduling is an issue, as well as other related nuts and bolts issues. TALBOTT asked if there were fewer classes in English. REECE stated yes, it was organized that way in last Spring's proposal to the Senate.

LIEBMAN stated that Freshman Inquiry students are at five credits and next year will be at four. This cohort group will become accustomed to a new model.

WINEBERG asked how three credit system students would transfer, and how did English handle 410/510's. REECE stated that faculty who taught 410 courses were consulted in developing the schedule.

REARDON stated there are several issues to contend with. From 1971 to the present the university has decreased by 85 FTE. There has been a shift from undergraduate to graduate education. There are no plans to enlarge the faculty.

The four credit course system could free up faculty resources for future growth of graduate teaching.

HALES called time on the discussion. Dav. JOHNSON asked when Steering would return the issue to Senate. OSHIKA commended Barry Anderson for his leadership in prioritizing the issues for UPC. HALES closed discussion on the reports, and declared the issue returned to Steering.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Constitutional Amendment, Art. IV, Sec. 4, 4 (F1), which provides for Budget Committee representation on UPC, and standardizes minor language.

   The AMENDMENT PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Constitutional Amendment, Art. IV, Sec. 4, 4 (F2), which provides University Planning Council membership for All Other faculty).

   The AMENDMENT PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Proposal for Department of Architecture, SFPA (G1) OSHIKA presented the recommendation for approval, and stated the only action subsequent to University Planning Council deliberation was a final vote by the Art Department held the previous week, of 11 out of 14 in favor.

   Dav. JOHNSON/WOLLNER MOVED establishment of the Department of Architecture, SFPA.

   WINEBERG requested a breakdown of the Art Department vote. OSHIKA yielded to SESTAK, Art Chair, who stated the vote was 11 in favor, 1 against, 2 abstentions. SESTAK stated there was some Art faculty concern that Art would be weakened by the change, due to course requirement changes and budget. LIEBMAN asked if Architecture accreditation was possible without the change. SESTAK stated there was no example, nationally. LIEBMAN stated the accreditation factor makes for a compelling argument in favor. SESTAK added that an architect cannot be licensed in Oregon without graduation from an accredited program.

   OSHIKA clarified that UPC is recommending approval as a matter of university policy.

SESTAK stated that school and university curriculum committees will review related program and course proposals.

The question was called.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Other New Business

TALBOTT/KOSOKOFF MOVED "the Senate urges the University not purchase from companies which provide financial support for Measure 8."

DeCARRICO asked for clarification of the legal implications of such a motion. BURNS asked if the source for those companies would be the list generated by OPEU. REARDON reminded Senate that purchasing is done department by department. TOULAN reminded Senate that a public institution cannot legally engage in boycotts. BULMAN reminded Senate that some of these vendors provide grants and donations to departments which would be jeopardized by a boycott. COOPER reminded Senate that we can't legally distribute such a vendor list.

It was determined there was not longer a quorum.

H. ADJOURNMENT

HALES adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m., and invited those in attendance for refreshments at "K" House.

E

Meeting of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate at Oregon Health Sciences University on December 2 and 3, 1994

IFS was greeted by Leslie Halleck, Provost of OHSU, who explained why OHSU is seeking legislation to become a public corporation. She pointed out that the educational programs at OHSU are funded and staffed by the Clinical operation, which now has to be run like a business in competition with other medical services in the Portland metropolitan area and run as part of a health maintenance organization. The OHSU proposal is more radical that the Higher Education Efficiency Act that is being proposed by the System of Higher Education. Both OSSHE and OHSU want to be free from the state government's Administrative Services, but OHSU wants also to be able to use services other that the state government's and to establish relationships with businesses, such as business contractors. The OHSU proposal would keep the academic enterprise under the supervision of the State Board of Higher Education and would still allow cooperative programs with the other institutions such as PSU.

The next speaker was Les Swanson, Chair of the State Board of Higher Education. He saw the defeat of Measure 15 as a defeat for the Oregon Education Association and a success for Higher Education, which had worked to defeat it. He believes that Governor-elect Kitzhaber wants there to be stable funding for Higher Education for the next biennium. With respect to Measure 8, he believes that we cannot raise faculty pay to compensate for it. The money is simply not available. The system does want the 6% deduction for PERS to be pre-tax dollars, which will benefit those faculty who are not already having the maximum deduction made for tax-deferred annuities. He and the Chancellor disagree with OHSU on the advisability of OHSU's becoming a public corporation, for a number of reasons, including the problem of being in competition with OHSU for state funding. His next remarks were of particular interest to PSU. He pointed out the lack of visibility of higher education in the Portland area. He did not believe that PSU, while it would be the center of all higher education activities in the Portland area, could fill all the needs, and he believed that UO and OSU should be in this area in a bigger way, in cooperation with PSU. Larry Curtis, of OSU, pointed out that commuting from Corvallis to Portland was not something that faculty would want to do for long, and Beatrice Oshika of PSU denied that PSU could not be the institution to serve the area. Swanson, however, thought that the needs of the metropolitan area could not be met by fine tuning what we have but rather by a radical solution, such as having one university with three campuses. He also believed that the Chancellor's office needed to be looked at critically and that it should function as a policy and planning center and not as an operational center.

The next speaker was Gratten Kerans. He argued that there are some good results from the election: the defeat of Measure 5 was a victory for

representative democracy, the fact that one party is in control of the legislature will force it to accept responsibility, and, for the first time since Neil Goldschmidt, we have a governor elected by a majority. The bad news was the passage of Measure 8, whose status, he believed, will continue to be ambiguous even through the court decision, and the passage of Measures 10, 11 and 17 will eat up all of the increased revenue received by the state. The Republican caucus does not have any strong advocates or detractors of higher education, but the Interim Legislative Task Force on Higher Education, the Schoon Committee, gave high marks to Higher Education for responding well to the demands for access and to Measure 5. Higher Education will address the Legislature unapologetically, insisting on the needs of higher education in the state.

Finally, Clyde Calvin of PSU addressed the IFS on the subject of PERS, arguing that Measure 8 was a wake-up call that should alert us to the fact that PERS does not meet the needs of faculty, and encouraged faculty to switch to TIAA/CREF and to consider establishing its own retirement system.

Saturday, December 3
IFS President Bill Danley reported on the last meeting of the State Board, reporting on a generally tough, questioning attitude by board members toward the Chancellor and his staff. There is a desire to have the faculty up to 12% minority members by 2000 AD, although the Chancellor's Office may massage those figures by including women faculty as representing a minority. Considerable attention and money is being devoted to the development of a Higher Education Center at Bend.

IFS discussed the issue of the public corporation for OHSU, but it was not prepared to take a position.

A good deal of the morning meeting was spent discussing Measure 8 and the appropriate faculty response to it. It was clear from all senators that the measure has provoked universal and high indignation on all campuses. Senators were also disappointed at the lack of vigorous response by the Board. IFS decided on the following actions. It passed these motions:

To ask the Board to rethink its legislative strategy and to give the highest priority to faculty salaries and the reduction of tuition.

To ask the Chancellor's Office to discuss its legislative strategy with IFS during the strategy's development.

It was also decided that faculty from all institutions should be encouraged to attend the December 16 Board meeting and, by their presence, to make known to the Board the depth of faculty concern over the effects of budget cuts and Measure 8 on higher education and faculty morale. IFS will attempt

to get a representative on the agenda of the Board meeting to express our concerns. Tony Wilcox of OSU was chosen to be the spokesperson.

Along with AOF, IFS is interested in having faculty representation on the State Board, and passed the following resolution:

IFS resolves to pursue legislation to add two faculty members to the State Board of Higher Education and to seek the support of the Board in this effort.

A number of housekeeping amendments were made to the Constitution. One substantive change has the retiring President act as a member of the Executive Committee.

The following officers were elected:
President: Sam Connell from OHSU
Vice President: Martha Sargent from WOSC
Secretary: Dennis Swanger from EOSC

Other members of the Executive Council:
Beatrice Oshika, PSU
Eric Wakkuri, OIT

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Cooper

PROPOSAL FOR CONVERSION OF UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM TO A FOUR-CREDIT MODEL*

The Senate recommends the University adopt a four-credit course model for undergraduate curriculum, to take effect Fall 1996, with the following provisions: 1) Academic departments will undertake course/program revisions with the objective of pedagogic improvements, where accreditation requirements permit; 2) Academic Requirements Committee will establish recommendations for policies applying to the baccalaureate degree, transfer credit, and enrollment; and, 3) University Planning Council and Curriculum Committee will establish protocols for implementation and approval to proceed during 1995-96. The above commitees will provide interim recommendations at the June 1995 Senate Meeting.

*For background information, see the following: 1) March 1994 Faculty Senate Minutes, C.2. Provost's Report; 2) June 1994 Faculty Senate Minutes, C.2. Provost's Report; 3) April 1994 Faculty Senate Minutes, G.3., and English Department "Emergency Approval of Pilot Project;" 4) May 1994 Faculty Senate Minutes, G.1.; 5) January 1995 Faculty Senate Agenda, E3(2 parts); and, 6) January 1995 Faculty Senate Minutes, E.3-4., and attached Oshika/UPC memorandum.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate affirms its commitment to the individual rights of all faculty and staff to determine where they wish to spend their money, and we support the personal decision to not patronize businesses which supported Measure 8.

Further, be it resolved that we recognize and affirm the right to refuse to personally use or accept any or all paper products produced by Boise Cascade or Weyerhauser; and that the decision to make hotel accommodations at facilities other than the Shilo Inns or Monarch Motor Hotel in Clackamas is a personal decision which the Faculty Senate supports.

OSSHE FACULTY SALARIES
1993 - 1994 SUMMARIES

SOURCE OF DATA: "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Professor, 1993 - 1994", Academe, March/April Issue, 1994. "Compensation" category listed below includes salary plus retirement, medical, dental and social security contributions by the state. Percentiles are listed as "%". Salaries are given in 1000's of dollars and are averages. If this survey was done this year, all percentiles for the Oregon institutions would be lower since there have been no salary increases this year. Measure 8 does not affect salaries, but it reduces compensation by 6%. Percentiles for the Category II institutions are rounded off to the nearest 5 percentile.

CATEGORY I UNIVERSITIES: Below is information on Oregon's three universities listed in this category: Oregon State University, University of Oregon, and Portland State University. The data have been summarized and compared to the other 182 universities nationally in this grouping which includes 146,118 faculty members. This category includes all universities that provide bachelor, masters, and Ph.D. degrees and award more than 30 Ph.D. degrees per year.

UNIV.	SALARY %			COMPENSATION %			COMPENSATION % AFTER MEASURE 8		
	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Assis. Prof.	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Assis Prof.	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Assis. Prof.
OSU	26	41	43	36	55	57	22	39	33
Uof O	26	27	19	36	40	32	22	19	11
PSU	10	21	27	16	30	41	8	14	18

UNIV.	SALARIES			COMPENSATION			COMPENSATION		
OSU	59.7	47.3	40.0	76.2	61.5	52.2	71.6	57.8	49.1
Uof O	59.7	44.6	37.5	76.2	57.9	48.8	71.6	54.4	45.9
PSU	54.4	43.7	38.2	69.3	56.4	49.8	65.1	53.0	46.8

January 9, 1995

To: Faculty Senate
From: Beatrice Oshika x5-4141
Chair, University Planning Council
Subj: Three to four credit conversion of undergraduate courses

During the Fall94 term, the Senate Steering Committee referred consideration of an OAA proposal to change the base for undergraduate courses from 3 credit hours to 4 credit hours to the Academic Requirements Committee, Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council and University Planning Council. To coordinate their efforts, the chairs of these committees, Sandra Rosengrant (ARC), Teresa Bulman (Curriculum), Dean Frost (Graduate Council) and Oshika (UPC) met regularly to exchange information on their committees' discussion of this issue. ARC decided the topic was more central to the other committees and did not pursue further formal discussion. Each of the remaining committees independently reached its own conclusions as described in their annual reports.

Although it might appear on the surface that the committees produced very different recommendations:

- UPC: conversion is feasible and implementation should proceed, with significant provisos;
- Curriculum: conversion should not proceed but should be reconsidered after results of the English Department pilot project are available;
- Graduate Council: there should be no mandatory conversion and flexibility and autonomy of individual graduate programs should be maintained;

a review of the discussions shows that common themes emerged:

- there may be pedagogical benefits, e.g., depth of courses;
- there may be productivity benefits, e.g., fewer course preparations for faculty and fewer courses required for graduation for students;
- such benefits are ill-defined;
- the possible benefits may not outweigh other impacts of the conversion, such as effect on coverage of topics for a major, scheduling of night courses, etc.
- autonomy of programs to make such decisions in their best curricular interests is imperative.

E2

Memorandum

30 November 1994

TO: Faculty Senate Steering Committee

FR: University Curriculum Committee (UCC)
Members: Teresa Bulman (Chair, CLAS), Leah Bosell (ASPSU), Deborah Kubichek (ASPSU), David Crockett (SBA), David Holloway (CLAS), Paul Latiolais (CLAS), Cheryl Livneh (SES), Andrew Tolmach (EAS), Marjorie Terdal (CLAS), Liz Wosley-George (ED), Emily Young (SFPA), Jerome DeGraaff (LIB), Pauline Jivanjee (SSW), Gerard Mildner (USP)

RE: Recommendations concerning proposal to convert to 4-credit-hour system

At the request of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and concurrently with the University Planning Council (UPC), Academic Requirements Committee (ARC), and the Graduate Council (GC), the UCC deliberated on the proposed conversion to a 4-credit quarter system. We solicited input from the English Department concerning its pilot project and from OAA. Our focus was on the impacts of the proposal on the undergraduate curriculum.

Recommendations:

1. The UCC does not recommend conversion to a standard 4-credit course system at this time for the reasons discussed below. Nonetheless, we have made several additional recommendations that may facilitate further consideration of the proposal.

2. The UCC recommends that further consideration of the 4-credit proposal be undertaken after the preliminary results of the pilot project are available (at least one term) and that there be rigorous assessment of the pilot project.

3. The UCC recommends that if the 4-credit system is adopted, departments be encouraged to revise courses and programs but not be mandated to do so. Individual department and accreditation considerations need to be accommodated. At this time, we strongly encourage individual departments to continue their deliberations on the substantive merits and impacts of such a conversion on their programs. Such a conversion requires a great deal of planning and deliberation. We are aware that a number of departments are in the process of evaluating programs with 4-credit courses in mind.

4. The UCC recommends that in the event a conversion to 4 credits is adopted, that clear guidelines for such a conversion be put in place before departments restructure courses and programs (see attached example from University of Oregon). We further recommend that it not be implemented any earlier than Fall 1996 in order to give departments enough lead time to carefully restructure programs.

5. The UCC recommends that the goals and objectives of "increased faculty productivity" be carefully defined and examined in order to ensure fairness should a 4-credit conversion be adopted.