5-1-1984

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet May 1984

Portland State University Faculty Senate

portland state university

MEMORANDUM

To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate April 20, 1984

From: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on May 7, 1984, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the April 2, 1984, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

1. Spring Term Registration Up-date -- Blumel
*2. Budget Committee, Annual Report -- Rad
*3. University Athletics Board, Annual Report -- Walker
*4. University Scholars' Board, Annual Report -- Bartlett
*5. Teacher Education Committee, Annual Report -- Nelson

F. Unfinished Business -- none

G. New Business
1. Advisory Council Discussion -- Blankenship

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

*B Minutes of the April 2, 1984, Meeting
E_2 Budget Committee Annual Report**
E_3 University Athletics Board Annual Report**
E_4 University Scholars' Board Annual Report**
E_5 Teacher Education Committee Annual Report**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members Only

SENATORS ARE URGED TO READ THE ATTACHED MATERIALS BEFORE THE MEETING

Please note: ***Special Senate meeting on April 30 has been cancelled.***

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 7, 1984
Presiding Officer: Fred Waller
Minutes by: David Wrench

Members Present: Becker, Bentley, Burns, Cabelly, Campbell, Chapman, Constans, Cooper, Crampton, Cumpston, Dunbar, Fisher, Forbes, Gatz, Gerity, Harmon, Hillman, Howard, Jackson, Johnson, Jones, Karant-Nunn, Kirrie, Kosokoff, Kristof, Lall, Lutes, Mandaville, Martinez, Newberry, L. Nussbaum, Olson, Petersen, Pinamonti, Reece, Robertson, Rose, Savery, Sheridan, Shimada, Smeltzer, Sonnen, Spolek, Swanson, Tamblyn, Tang, Waldroff, Waller, West, Williams, Wilson, Wolk, Wrench, Wurm, Wyers.

Alternates Present: Stipak for Cease, Roseberry for Dunkeld, Danielson for Limbaugh, Lockwood for Tracy, Smith-Goldman for White.

Members Absent: Anderson, Brenner, Carl, Elteto, Featheringill, R. Nussbaum, Walton.

Ex-officio Members Present: Bogue, Corn, Dobson, Edgington, Erzurumlu, Harris, Heath, Howard, Leu, Morris, Schendel, Trudeau, Williams.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the April 2, 1984 Senate meeting were corrected by inserting the word "Institute's" before the word "Advisory" on line 9 of page 39. They were approved with that change. KARANT-NUNN commented that this meant that there had been less broad faculty participation in the search for the Director of the Institute for Trade and Commerce than she had thought when she thought that it was the Advisory Council which had participated in the search. BOGUE responded that each finalist brought to campus was spending two days talking with a broad range of faculty.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. TUFTS reported that 12,851 students have paid fees this Spring term. This represents a 1.47% increase in headcount and a 0.7% increase in student FTE as compared with Spring term last year.

DRESSLER announced that the minutes of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate would be circulated and that the new officers of the IFS were now having regular communication with the Chancellor.

2. RAD presented the Budget Committee Annual Report. The presiding officer commended the committee and its chairperson on doing an excellent job.

3. WALKER presented the University Athletics Board Annual Report.

4. BARTLETT presented the University Scholars' Board Annual Report. It was noted that the change of the program to the University Honors Program has been approved by the Educational Policies Committee and the President.

5. NELSON presented the Teacher Education Committee Annual Report. WALLER asked whether this large committee had ever managed to assemble all of its members at one time and place. NELSON noted that almost everyone was able to attend on Fridays at noon.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None.

NEW BUSINESS - None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

E-2

April 3, 1984

TO: The Portland State University Faculty Senate

FROM: The University Budget Committee

Subject: Annual Report

Since the Budget Committee's last report to the Senate, April 5, 1983, the Committee has continued to deal with budgetary problems facing PSU. During the past 12 months, important items affecting PSU's budget were the State System Budget as approved by the Legislature and the cuts due to enrollment decline, revenue shortfall, a new budget allocation model developed by the Chancellor's office, the OSBHE's action on cuts for the PSU biennial budget, and the program elimination/reduction plan presented by the president. A brief chronological report on these activities as related to PSU budget and the Budget Committee's work is presented below:

1983-85 Legislatively-Approved Budget for the State System

In last year's report to the Senate, a detailed description of the ODHE biennial budget request, as well as the Governor's budget request, was presented. Included in the Governor's Budget Request was a net reduction of $6.4 million due to projected enrollment declines in 83-85: $1.5 million for 83-84 and $4.9 million for 84-85. Additionally, because of insufficient state revenues, the legislature reduced the Governor's Recommended Budget by $4.4 million. (PSU's share of this budget shortfall is $324,200 per year).

A summary of the State System Budget is given below:

1. Full funding of all salary increases granted in 82-83
2. Inflation adjustment - - 4% for 83-84, 5% for 84-85 for S&S; 10.6% for books; 8% for telephone each year; and a variable amount for energy
3. $20.6 million of General Fund to freeze all instruction fee rates
4. Economic Development - - $2.67 million
5. Facilities Maintenance - - $3 million
6. Libraries - - $1 million ($0.180 million to PSU)
7. New Building Operation and Maintenance - - $0.32 million
8. International Trade and Commerce Institute - - $0.23 million
9. Discretionary Salary Fund - - $0.2 million
10. Other items totaling about $0.65 million

The Budget Allocation System (BAS) Model

The Chancellor's office has studied alternative formulas for allocating resources to the institutions and has designed a Budget Allocation System Model. As stated by the Office of Administration of OSBHE, the use of such a model would permit allocation of funds on a basis that recognizes differential costs of various fields of study rather than rely on State System average costs by lower division, upper division, and graduate levels of student populations. The Model also permits comparison of Oregon funding with external and normative data. The legislatively approved budget will finance 79.23% of the BAS Model in 83-84, and 79.91% in 84-85. The factors considered by BAS are: instruction, research, academic support, student services, physical plant operation and maintenance, and institution support. A summary of the BAS Model is given in Appendix A.

PSU Biennial Budget

In July 1983 the OSBHE was faced with cutting the State System budget $1.5 million for 83-84, and $4.9 million for 84-85 due to the projected enrollment declines. At the July 12, 1983, meeting, the OSBHE staff recommendation to the Board regarding the PSU cut was as follows:

> A reduction of $687,623 in 1983-84 and an additional $772,736 reduction in 1984-85. These reductions represent approximately 1.8% of the budget in 1983-84 and 2.1% in 1984-85. The Portland State University budget compared to the BAS Model and the Systemwide average is:

	1983-84		1984-85	
	Before Adjustment	After Adjustment	Before Adjustment	After Adjustment
Percent of BAS Model	87.01%	85.44%	88.23%	84.88%
Percent of Systemwide Average	109.26%	107.83%	108.04%	106.23%

> Between 1981-82 and 1984-85, Portland State University is projected to lose 15.5% of its enrollment. The budget will have been reduced about 9.0% during this time.

At a subsequent meeting on July 21, 1983, the Staff presented the following alternatives for PSU cuts to the Board:

		1983-84	1984-85
A.	Original Staff Recommendation	($687,623)	($772,736)
B	Variable Cost per Student Basis	($37,623)	($397,736)
C.	Use of BAS to Adjust All Institutions	($3,405,540)	($226,760)
D.	Prorata Reduction, i.e. Across the Board % cuts	($238,519)	($554,269)
E.	Approximately 2/3 of Original Recommendation and 1/3 of Across the Board % Cuts for '83 and 2.5% of Base for '84	($503,843)	$(1,015,650)

The Staff recommended alternative E, and the Board adopted it for 83-84; however it postponed the final decision for 84-85 until late Fall 1983 when better enrollment data would be available. Thus the predicted reduction for 84-85 became $0.324 (see page 1) + $0.504 + $1.016 million = $1.844 million.

Committee's Recommendations to the President

The Budget Committee spent the months of July through October 1983 learning the budget and the BAS Model, gathering data, making projections, analyzing various options, and intensively deliberating a series of qualitative and quantitative recommendations to the President. The text of the Committee's recommendation to the President on October 12, 1983, is attached to this report (Appendix B), without its two lengthy appendices. (The essential conclusion of the two appendices wereincluded in the report to the President).

President's Program Elimination/Reduction Plan

The President announced his provisional and final plans for program elimination/reduction on October 26 and December 2, 1983, respectively. Full reports were distributed to all faculty and will not be repeated here.

Considering the individual unit cuts as percentages of unit budgets, a comparative analysis between the Committee's recommendations and the President's plan revealed that in most cases there was reasonably close agreement between the two. The aggregate unweighted average cut recommended by the Committee was 10.73% while the president's final plan average was 5.18%. The three areas of major difference were Education, Performing Arts, and Systems Science.

New Enrollment Data and Its Effect on PSU

Last July, the projected PSU enrollments were 8301 FTE and 8146 FTE for 83-84 and 84-85 respectively. Based on actual enrollment data last Fall, the projected FTE numbers were revised to 8621 nd 8478. This increase, plus other changes in allocations to other institutions, reduced PSU's 1984-85 cut from $1,015,650 to $875,650, or by $140,000. This reduction in the cut changed PSU's support to 83.53% of full BAS parity, and our standing within OSSHE to 106% of the Seven Institutions Average.

Evolution of BAS and Its Future Utilization

In the last round of cuts, the BAS Model developed by the Office of Administration was used as a compass in budget allocations. Over the past half-year, this Model has experienced some significant modifications and some finetuning based on additional data, comments from various institutions, and committee studies. Currently, productivity ratios related to a few disciplines, and the budget allocation for equipment, AV, libraries, and student services are under consideration. No institution within OSSHE is fully satisfied with the BAS Model, with each hoping to gain an advantage for its own budget improvements. Even though the BAS Model may continue to undergo changes in the future, as well as not being fully embraced by all institutions, the fact remains that it is a more precise model compared to the previous FTE-driven formula and it does appear that it will play an ever more important role in institutional budget allocations. As such it may be incumbent upon us to scrutinize our educational delivery; faculty, part-time faculty, and teaching assistants mix; and class schedules, among other factors, in order to maximize BAS gains for PSU.

On the other hand, the Committee recognizes that a system of higher education cannot and must not rely solely on the application of enrollment driven formulae in budget allocation. Given their tenure and other inertial characteristics, universities do not permit incremental, short-term increases or reductions in response to annual adjustments for enrollment trends. There must exist some corridors in the allocation process in which no adjustments would be required, similar to the 1% policy that we used to have before the Governor abandoned it.

The Need to Develop Internal Allocation Models

As for the use of the BAS Model for internal unit allocation, there are two problems to be addressed. First, some of the data regarding productivity ratios must be internally evaluated and adjusted; and second, it should be used as no more than a guide, alongside other important factors related to research, service, goals and mission, and long range plans.

The Budget Committee still adheres to the belief that productivity measuring criteria must include the three basic areas of instruction, research, and service. In the area of instruction, guidelines need to be established in assessing instructional effort that include other factors in addition to student

credit hours. For research and service, institutional procedures need to be established for the collection and analysis of data relevant to research and service productivity. Last year's Budget Committee report described in detail various aspects of each category, and we recommend continuation of efforts along these lines.

Conclusion

As compared to this time last year, three significant changes have come about. First, a new Budget Allocation System (BAS) Model has emerged. The Committee believes that not only may we have to learn to live with it, but that we must strive to maximize its positive effects on PSU. Second, after an 18-month-long deliberation, a plan has been produced by the Strategic Planning Task Force. We recommend that it be scrutinized within appropriate bodies in the University and placed on the road to implementation. Last but not least, given the improvement in revenue forecasts, as well as a potential stabilization in PSU enrollment, attention this year should be focused on systematically and methodically developing internal allocation models that incorporate workload measures related to instruction, research, and service.

Respectively submitted,

The University Budget Committee:

Franz Rad, Civil Engineering, Chairman
Ann Alexander, Health Service
Tom Benson, Geology
Oma Blankenship, Health and Physical Education
Sheldon Edner, Urban and Public Affairs
Jack Featheringill, Theater Arts
Jerry Frey, Social Work
David Johnson, History
Hal Jorgensen, Education
Robert Lockerby, Library
Charles P. O'Connor, Student Member
John Oh, Business Administration
Thomas Palm, Economics
Arnold Pickar, Physics
William A. Rux III, Student Member
Baxter Wilson, Englisn

Consultants:

Margaret Dobson, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Ken Harris, Director of the Budget
Jim Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration
Roger Edgington, Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration
Lou Merrick, Assitant Director of the Budget

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF THE BAS MODEL

Instruction

1. Twenty-five Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) disciplines
2. Four levels of instruction (LD, UD, Masters, Doctorate)
3. Faculty productivity by HEGIS discipline
4. Faculty salary averages and rank mix by discipline
5. Support staff: technical support and administrative/clerical support
6. Services and supplies
7. Staff development
8. Equipment replacement
9. Differentials: Small school productivity, university/college salary differential, graduate assistants

Research

1. Allowance based on percent of instructional faculty salaries
2. University/college differential

Academic Support

1. Library holdings determined by formula for: Base number of volumes, volumes per faculty and per student
2. Acquisitions are a prescribed percent of holdings as determined by formula which includes the number and levels of degree programs
3. University/college per volume price differential
4. Library staffing, core staff, plus additional staffing based on headcount and levels of degree programs
5. Binding
6. Services and supplies
7. Other instructional support activities
8. Academic deans and division heads
9. Equipment
10. Museums

Student Services

1. Core staff and support costs
2. Allowance based on instruction function budget and headcount

Physical Plant Operation and Maintenance

1. Building maintenance based on replacement costs and type of construction
2. Building rehabilitation and remodeling
3. Utilities distribution systems
4. Janitorial service and window washing
5. Grounds maintenance based on acreage and four levels of intensity of use
6. Physical plant administration
7. Services and supplies
8. Equipment
9. Utilities

Institution Support

1. Core staff and support costs
2. A prescribed percent of budget
3. Dollar amount according to: Fall term student headcount and three-term FTE academic/classified staff
4. State assessments

APPENDIX B

October 12, 1983

Memorandum To: President Blumel

From: The University Budget Committee

Re: Recommendations on Budget Reduction

Since late July when we became aware of the magnitude of cuts for 83-84, and the potential cuts for 84-85, the Budget Committee has been wrestling with the question of how and where such cuts could be made to minimize the pain to the University, an exercise only too familiar to the Budget Committee in recent years.

After a good month of deliberations, on August 29, 1983, the Committee submitted to you a set of general recommendations to be followed by more specific recommendations. Most of September was spent gathering, generating, and consolidating data to serve as the basis for specific recommendations. This exercise has proved to be extremely difficult and disheartening. During the hundreds of man-hours of work and Committee deliberations, it became increasingly obvious that our task of trying to "squeeze blood out of a turnip" was indeed just that!

The Committee unanimously holds the fundamental belief that this University can no longer withstand further cuts without irreversibly affecting its very muscles and bones. In the strongest terms, we urge you to continue to resist any further cuts, as we believe the viability, and indeed the credibility, of our institution are at stake.

However, given the Committee's charge, we would only relinquish our responsibilities if we did not provide you with specific advice, as you requested. We attach the Committee's recommendations, unanimously supported by the members who inspected it today (two members are out of town this week).

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT FROM THE BUDGET COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 12, 1983

I. Magnitude of Reductions

Reduction imposed by OSBHE for 83-84	$0.504 Million
Legislative under-funding	0.324 M
Potential reduction by OSBHE for 84-85	1.016 M
Total	1.844 M

Academic Area Budget, 83-84:	
Sum of Academic programs, other instruction, research, public service, academic support	$32,364,679
Less Summer Session, Library Books and Binding[1]	$ 3,392,439
Net	$28,972,240
Total Education and General	$43,522,000
Academic Area/Total	74.36%
Cut assigned to the Academic Area = .7436 x 1.844M =	$1.371 M
Add 2% for contingency 1.02 x 1.371 =	$1.398 M

Academic Programs Budget (9 Programs)

Total Academic Area Budget (less Summer Session & Library Books)

$= \frac{21,972,064}{28,972,240} = 75.84\%$

Pro-rated reduction for the 9 Academic Programs = 0.7584 x 1.398 M = 1.061M

Estimated permanent reductions carried over to 84-85 = 0.061M

Net reduction assigned to the 9 programs 1.000M

II. Projection of Student FTE's

To be used as basic data for our decision making process, the Committee endeavored to reach a reasonable estimate of student FTE that various programs could expect during this biennium. Five approaches were utilized considering the actual data base since 1975-76.

1. Trend Method. This method considers the overall trend over the past 8 years, determines the experienced upper and lower limits, the band width, and assumes mid-line intertwined with judgment, as the most probable estimate. For brevity, full details are not given here, but are available for your inspection in Appendix 1.

2. Rate of change using first-order polynomial. This method applies weight factors proportional to a first-order polynomial, thus placing more emphasis on more recent experience.

---

1 Assumes summer session to be self supporting and funds for Library Books not to be cut.

3. Rate of change using second-order polynomial. Same as method 2, except that it uses a second order polynomial, thus placing relatively more emphasis on more recent experience.

4. Seemingly Unrelated Regression Equation (SURE) Method. This method uses a regression analysis on student FTE numbers as percentages of the total university FTE. The 1975-76 academic year was used as the base.

5. SURE Method, using 1978-79 as the base.

Table 1 shows a summary of results by the various methods employed, all adjusted to the total FTE of 8301 for 83-84, and 8146 for 84-85, as determined by the OSBHE.

Appendix 1 contains details of Projections. The Committee used the average figures determined by the five methods.

III. Rationale for Recommending Reductions

The Committee considered four models.

Model 1 Full conformity to BAS

Rationale: Bring budget allocation to a constant fraction of the norm as determined by the Chancellor's Office. Future institutional funding is to be closely related to BAS; hence, maximizing future BAS-driven revenues makes economic sense.

Model 2 Consider criteria other than BAS

Rationale: Consider important criteria related to program quality, adherance to the university mission and goals, demand, student growth vs. faculty growth, relation to general education, and other important criteria in budget allocation. Given the shortness of time, a rational,systematic and justifiable analysis of various programs considering these criteria was deemed too time-consuming to be accomplished. The Committee had no choice but to assume that the current levels of funding for the various programs have been determined with due consideration of the above mentioned criteria. This implied that an across-the-board cut would adhere to these criteria to the same extent as the current budgeting process. A further rationale for using this model is that it distributes the budget cuts evenly among all programs, thus lessening the severe pressure points.

Model 3 A compromise model that adheres half-way to Model 1, and halfway to Model 2.

Rationale: Consider the rationale of Models 1 and 2, half-way each.

Model 4 Model 3 modified such that it redistributes the funds due the programs to receive additional support, among the remaining programs.

Rationale: Those programs that are to receive additional support using Model 3 would forgo these additional supports and these funds are then redistributed to the programs that are to lose support. The redistribution to be in accordance with budgets assigned under Model 3. The basic philosophy here is to lessen the financial pressure on programs that would lose funds, by redistributing the additional funds from those programs that are to receive additional support.

After extensive deliberation, the Committee decided to use Model 4 as the basis for its recommendation.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the necessary computations to develop models 1, 2, 3, and 4; and the Committee's recommendation is summarized in columns 7 and 8 of Table 3.

It should be noted that these tables are based on our best estimates of student FTE projections for 1984-85 at this time. As better estimates are determined as we approach the 84-85 academic year, proper adjustments of the figures in these tables will become necessary.

It should be further pointed out that the Productivity Ratios are based on the information provided to the Committee by our consultants (See Appendix II for details of the BAS allocation). Yesterday, the Chairman of this Committee was informed that the ratios used for Urban Studies should be changed. This has been done in Appendix II, as well as the values in the Tables. However, this morning the Committee was informed that some productivity ratios in PA and HPE should also be modified. Once the specific ratios are arrived at, the necessary modifications in Appendix II and the related Tables should be made. The procedure employed by Model 4, however, remains unchanged.

IV. Further Recommendations

The Committee urges you to seriously consider the following in an effort to further reduce the $1.0 million reduction targeted for the academic programs.

1. To the extent practicable, the University should encourage a policy of attrition through retirement and the like.
2. New programs that encourage early/phased retirement should be devised.
3. A program of educational leave should be revived.
4. Sabbatical leaves should be encouraged at this time.
5. The Division of Continuing Education should be guided to go beyond self-support, and thus have a positive impact on the University budget.
6. The legality and economic feasibility of utilizing incidental fees for the purposes of budgeted student-support activities should be investigated and pursued.
7. Further administrative consolidation, which make academic and economic sense, should be considered.
8. Since the BAS Model will become increasingly significant in allocation of funds to the Oregon institutions of higher education, the mix of full-time resident faculty, part-time faculty, and teaching assistants, as well as the mode of instruction, should be fully studied in an attempt to increase BAS-generated revenues.

BUDGET COMMITTEE
TABLE 1

Projection of Student FTE's

Program	Method	83-84 1	2	3	4	5	Avg.	84-85 1	2	3	4	5	Avg.
Liberal Arts & Sciences		5,398	5,309	5,317	5,260	5,408	5,338	5,323	5,202	5,217	5,143	5,343	5,246
Business Administration		1,158	1,164	1,151	1,243	1,108	1,165	1,142	1,140	1,115	1,237	1,053	1,138
Education		394	438	444	400	405	416	350	412	424	369	377	386
Engineering & Apld Sci.		438	447	451	424	437	439	467	481	489	447	464	470
Health & Physical Ed.		316	329	318	396	349	342	272	299	278	384	319	310
Performing Arts		196	225	228	206	200	211	194	228	234	204	196	211
Social Work		177	169	170	169	176	172	177	169	169	167	176	172
Urban & Public Affairs		217	211	213	194	211	210	217	208	213	188	211	207
Systems Science, PhD		7	9	9	9	7	8	4	7	7	7	7	6
TOTAL		8,301	8,301	8,301	8,301	8,301	8,301	8,146	8,146	8,146	8,146	8,146	8,146

BUDGET COMMITTEE
TABLE 2

Instructional Area	1 83-84 Beginning Budget	2 84-85 St. FTE Est.	3 82-83 Student FTE	4 Full BAS 82-83	5 Full BAS 84-85 =2/3 x 4	Model 1: 6 .7965 x 5 = ave. BAS support for each unit	Model 1: 7 Cut or Add = 6 - 1	8 % Cut or Add =7/1 x 1
Liberal Arts & Sciences	$12,964,616	5,246	5,477	$16,635,739	$15,934,105	$12,691,905	($ 272,711)	(2.10%)
Business Administration	2,633,084	1,138	1,200	3,120,749	2,956,654	2,355,047	(278,037)	(10.56%)
Education	1,658,241	386	469	1,999,544	1,645,680	1,310,824	(347,417)	(20.95%)
Engineering & Applied Science	1,336,083	470	419	2,062,889	2,313,981	1,843,143	507,060	37.95%
Health & Physical Education	750,863	310	362	914,455	783,097	623,756	(127,107)	(16.93%)
Performing Arts	905,597	211	225	772,097	724,055	576,728	(328,869)	(36.32%)
Social Work	592,926	172	173	880,478	875,389	697,269	104,343	17.60%
Urban & Public Affairs	903,700	207	216	1,095,375	1,049,734	836,139	(67,561)	(7.48%)
Systems Science, PhD	226,954	6	10	77,949	46,769	37,253	(189,701)	(83.59%)
TOTAL	$21,972,064	8,146	8,551	$27,559,275	$26,329,464	$20,972,064	($1,000,000)	(4.55%)

$$\frac{\text{Assumed 84-85 Budget}}{\text{Full BAS Support}} = \frac{21,972,064 - 1,000,000}{26,329,464} = \frac{20,972,064}{26,329,464} = 79.65\%$$

Average BAS support for PSU = 79.65%

BUDGET COMMITTEE
TABLE 3

		Model 2	Model 3			Model 4			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Instructional Area	83-84 Beginning Budget	Across the Board Cut (4.55%) for all	½ BAS & ½ Across the Board Cut or Add	% Cut or Add =3/1x100	Budget based on Model 3 1 + 3	Unit Alloc. from Redistn Table 4	CUT 3 + 6	%CUT 7/1x100	% Var. Model 3 6/3
Liberal Arts & Sciences	$12,964,616	($ 590,051)	($ 431,381)	(3.33%)	$12,533,235	$174,703	($ 256,678)	(1.98%)	40.50%
Business Administration	2,633,084	(119,838)	(198,938)	(7.56%)	2,434,146	33,930	(165,008)	(6.27%)	17.06%
Education	1,658,241	(75,470)	(211,444)	(12.75%)	1,446,797	20,159	(191,285)	(11.54%)	9.53%
Engineering & Apld Sci.	1,336,083	(60,808)	223,126	16.70%	1,559,209	(223,126)	0	0%	100.00%
Health & Physical Ed.	750,863	(34,174)	(80,640)	(10.74%)	670,223	9,346	(71,294)	(9.49%)	11.59%
Performing Arts	905,597	(41,216)	(185,042)	(20.43%)	720,555	10,053	(174,989)	(19.32%)	5.43%
Social Work	592,926	(26,985)	38,679	6.52%	631,605	(38,679)	0	0%	100.00%
Urban & Public Affairs	903,700	(41,129)	(54,345)	(6.01%)	849,355	11,834	(42,511)	(4.70%)	21.78%
Systems Science, PhD	226,954	(10,329)	(100,015)	(44.07%)	126,939	1,780	(98,235)	(43.28%)	1.78%
TOTAL	$21,972,064	($1,000,000)	($1,000,000)	(4.55%)	$20,972,064	0	($1,000,000)	(4.55%)	34% avg.

BUDGET COMMITTEE
TABLE 4

	Model 3 Budget	Distr. Factor	Funds to be Redistr.	Unit Allocation
Liberal Arts & Sciences	$12,533,235	.6673	$ 0	$174,703
Business Administration	2,434,146	.1296	0	33,930
Education	1,446,797	.0770	0	20,159
Engineering & Apld. Sci.	--	--	223,126	(223,126)
Health & Physical Ed.	670,223	.0357	0	9,346
Performing Arts	720,555	.0384	0	10,053
Social Work	--	--	38,679	(38,679)
Urban & Public Affairs	849,355	.0452	0	11,834
Systems Science, PhD	126,939	.0068	0	1,780
TOTAL	$18,781,250	1.0000	$261,805	$ 0

UNIVERSITY ATHLETICS BOARD
ANNUAL REPORT
TO
FACULTY SENATE (Insert #E3)

May 7, 1984

Several memoranda, documents and recommendations have been studied and forwarded during 1983-84, and we will continue to look at matters concerning athletics for the remainder of the academic year. The past year's activities included:

1. Revised and forwarded Eligibility Requirements for Intercollegiate Athletics Programs at Portland State University. In general, PSU regulations are more stringent than those required.

2. Forwarded a memo supporting the Athletics Department's efforts to develop a positive relationship with the local business and political community. VAA activities have definitely increased.

3. Reviewed and made recommendations to the Incidental Fee Committee (ASPSU) on all budgets receiving monies from that source, including Inter-collegiate Athletics, Intramurals, Club Sports, and Student Recreation.

4. Discussed and forwarded a preliminary draft of a report on the possibility of combining the responsibilities for Recreation, Intramurals, and Club Sports under one position. Work will continue during Spring quarter on this project.

5. Subcommittee meetings and information gathering sessions were held throughout the year.

I would like to commend all who served on this year's University Athletics Board; meeting attendance was excellent and participation was of the highest caliber.

University Athletics Board Members
Frank Terraglio, Engineering and AS
Mary Kinnick, Education
Robert Vieira, OSA
Robert Scruggs, HPE
Robin Pflugrad, Student
Andrea Labby, Student
Craig Nichols, Community Representative
Robert Walker, Chair, Television Services

Ex-Officio
James Todd, Vice President for Finance & Administration (end 12/31/83)
Charles Becker, HPE Intramurals
Bob Casteel, Faculty Representative for NCAA
Zola Dunbar, Faculty Representative for NCAA
Roy Love, Director of Athletics
Betty Rankin, Associate Director of Athletics
Jack Schendel, Dean, School of Health and PE
Sylvia Moseley, Program Director, HPE, Student Recreation

Consultants
Megan Boyle, Educational Activities, Sports Club Advisor
Ruth Fitzpatrick, Student, Program Director for Club Sports

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARS' BOARD

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

May 7, 1984

During the 1983-84 academic year, the University Scholars' Board solicited proposals for Visiting Scholars' Colloquia for 1984-85. Requests were sent to faculty members and thirteen proposals were submitted. The Board reviewed the proposals and selected the colloquia to be offered:

Fall 1984

Theory and Structure of Modern Society: Professor Shotola; Visiting: Professor Anthony Giddens, Department of Sociology, Cambridge University.

History of Written Forms: Mr. Wheeler; Visiting: Professor Gunnlaugur SE Briem, Central College for Design and Art, London.

Michelangelo and Religion: Professors Hamilton and Kimbrell; Visiting: Professor Leo Steinberg, University of Pennsylvania.

Winter 1985

Power and Knowledge I: Nietzsche and Foucault: Professor Reardon; Visiting Scholars in Spring Term.

Spring 1985

Power and Knowledge II: Professors Nunn, Reardon, Walton; Visiting: Professor Tetsuo Najita, Department of Asian Studies, University of Chicago; Professor Dennis Grafflin, Department of History, Bates College; Professor Benjamin Keene, Professor Emeritus of Latin American Studies, Northern Illinois University.

Commitments have been made by the Visiting Scholars to participate; each will deliver public lectures and meet with groups both from PSU and the larger community. Funds for the Visiting Scholars have been contributed to the University Scholars' Program by the Rose E. Tucker Foundation.

In April the University Scholars' Program served as host for the annual meeting of the Western Regional Honors Council, held this year at PSU. The conference was attended by approximately one hundred and eighty students from twenty-seven schools.

No decisions were required relating to personnel. No student appeals were heard by the Board. Forty-five students have been admitted to the Program during 1983-84; eight received degrees at Fall and Winter commencements; twenty-one have applied for Spring commencement. Currently one hundred and seventy-two students are active in the Program.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger W. Bartlett
Chairperson

University Scholars' Board Members

Roger W. Bartlett, Chairperson	Business Administration
David Cressler	Psychology
Claudine Fisher	Foreign Languages
Bruce Jensen	Mathematics
Marjorie Kirrie	English
Daniel Newberry	Library

A REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

Teacher Education Committee

April 5, 1984

Members: Carl Bachhuber, Physics; Ann Bennett, Social Science; Steve Brannan, Special Education; Carol Burden, Education; Richard Byrne, Mathematics; Michael Carl, Education; Jean Glazer, Art and Architecture; Jomar Lacoco, Speech;Carl Markgraf, English; Linda Neklason, Health and Physical Education; Ted Nelson, Mathematics; Leonard Robertson, Business Administration; Stan Stanford, Music; Eric Swenson, Foreign Languages; William Tate, Theatre Arts; Aaron Bodor, student; Julie Hiefield, student; ex-officio members: Donald Leu, Dean, School of Education; Kathleen Greey, Education Librarian; George Guy, Assistant Dean, School of Education and Secretary To The Committee.

The Committee met monthly during the 1983-84 academic year. Its discussions and business can be classified as follows:

1. Communication Between The School of Education and Other University Departments. One primary charge for the Committee is to serve as a communication link. At different meetings the following people were invited to give reports and to respond to questions:

   a. Forbes Williams, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, reported on the new high school graduation requirements, the new state system requirements for admission and the impact of both upon higher education at P.S.U.

   b. Zola Dunbar, the P.S.U. liaison to TSPC, discussed the origin and history of the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, the autonomous body responsible for program approval and certification.

   c. Don Leu, School of Education Dean, presented a summary of the numerous reform studies that have been published recently concerning the condition of public education in the United States.

   d. Mike Carl, Head, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, gave a comprehensive report on the experimental Portland State University, Beaverton School District Cooperative Professional Education Program, a new model for preparing teachers.

2. Review of the Major Reform Studies on Education. At least 32 reports on the condition of public education have been released in the past year. The Committee is reviewing and reacting to the most prominent of those reports. A list of concerns and possible implications for teacher education at P.S.U. will be communicated to next year's Committee for continued study.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Nelson

Ted Nelson, Chairperson

portland state university

MEMORANDUM

To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate May 21, 1984

From: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on June 4, 1984, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 7, 1984, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

a. Question for President Blumel or Vice President Dobson, submitted by D.G. Howard:
"Now that Post-tenure Review Committees have reported and requests for Faculty development funds have been made, what are the procedures for allocating money to these requests and when will the Faculty members and their departments be notified of the decisions?"

b. Question for Vice President Dobson, submitted by R. Forbes for the Steering Committee:
"Several departments have reported that it has taken over a month for the Graduate Admissions Office to forward to them completed graduate application materials. What can be done to speed up matters?"

c. Question for Dean Miller, submitted by F. Waller:
"In an 'In My Opinion' article in The Oregonian for May 23, 1984, entitled 'Parochial Politics Constrain Education,' James E. Reinmuth, Dean, College of Business Administration at the University of Oregon, raises some questions about the proper roles of PSU & UO relative to business education in Portland (e.g., he alleges that PSU is the 'Oregon version of the City College of New York in terms of education for the fully employed'). What do you think are the merits, if any, of his position?"

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE SENATE, 1984-85

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

*1. Advisory Council, Annual Report -- Blankenship
*2. Committee on Committees, Annual Report -- Chapman
*3. Educational Policies Committee, Annual Report -- Savery
*4. Research and Publications Committee, Annual Report -- Smejtek

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO TEM, 1984-85

F. Unfinished Business -- none

ELECTION OF SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE, 1984-85

G. New Business

*1. Use of P/NP and Differentiated Grades for Graduate Degrees - Dunbar
*2. Sense of the Senate Resolution -- Gaffuri, alternate for Wrench

DIVISIONAL CAUCUSES TO ELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBERS, 1984-86

Divisions electing two-year terms: AO, BA, CLAS (2), ED, SW, UPA

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

*B Minutes of the May 7, 1984, Meeting
E_1 Advisory Council Annual Report**
E_2 Committee on Committees Annual Report**
E_3 Educational Policies Committee Annual Report**
E_4 Research and Publications Committee Annual Report**
G_1 Use of P/NP and Differentiated Grades for Graduate Degrees**
G_2 Sense of the Senate Resolution**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members Only

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes:	Faculty Senate Meeting, June 4, 1984
Presiding Officer:	Fred Waller
Secretary:	Ulrich H. Hardt
Members Present:	Bentley, Brenner, Burns, Cabelly, Campbell, Cease, Chapman, Constans, Cooper, Cumpston, Dunbar, Fisher, Forbes, Gatz, Gerity, Harmon, Hillman, Howard, D. Johnson, Jones, Karant-Nunn, Kirrie, Kosokoff, Kristof, Lall, Mandaville, Newberry, L. Nussbaum, R. Nussbaum, Olson, Petersen, Pinamonti, Reece, Rose, Savery, Sheridan, Shimada, Smeltzer, Sonnen, Tamblyn, Tang, Waldroff, Waller, West, White, Williams, Wilson, Wolk, Wurm, Wyers.
Alternates Present:	Roseberry for Dunkeld, E. Enneking for Swanson, Gaffuri for Wrench.
Members Absent:	Anderson, Becker, Crampton, Danielson, Elteto, Featheringill, Jackson, Lockwood, Lutes, Malter, Martinez, Robertson, Spolek, Walton.
Ex-officio Members Present:	Blumel, Bogue, Corn, Dobson, Dueker, Edgington, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Miller, Nicholas, Schendel, Trudeau.
Newly Elected Senators Present:	Cawthorne, Grimes, Hakanson, Tayler, Bennett, Diman, A. Johnson, Moor, Scheans, Edner, Dressler for Sommerfeldt, Brusseau for Metcalf.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the May 7, 1984, Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. In response to HOWARD's question regarding allocation of funds for post-tenure faculty development, Vice President DOBSON read from Article 13 concerning the intent of the institutional career support -- peer review process in the collective bargaining agreement. She pointed out that the review process was complementary to the existing guidelines established for other personnel decisions in the areas of promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases, and that committee and and department head recommendations would be sent forward along the usual channels. The bargaining agreement purposely is not explicit regarding the nature of enhancement activities. Proposed plans should be judged on their own merits for funding and could include such activities as travel, summer support, special research grants, or attendance at seminars and workshops. Allocation of funds is through the usual channels.

In answer to the second part of the question about when the faculty members and their departments will be notified of the decisions, DOBSON said that the President will make his decision known as soon as possible. She pointed out, however, that the Vice President has yet to receive the deans' recommendations from CLAS, EAS, SPA, and UPA, due April 30. HEATH has called for weeks as a follow-up. HOWARD wanted to know who would get the funds. DOBSON said that criteria were purposely general and BLUMEL added that initially it had to be a judgment call. HOWARD complained that the timeline was too slow and funds would be too late for this summer, hence he said the value was questionable. R. NUSSBAUM wanted to know if a list would be published showing how funds were divided. BLUMEL answered in the affirmative.

2. DOBSON was pleased to address the question regarding the Office of Admissions. For over 1 1/2 years Dean F. Williams has been reviewing all aspects of the office, including admission processing procedures, organizational structure of the office, personnel assignments and locations, and processing interrelationships between academic units and selected academic programs. Tied to that is the Vice President's review of the Office of Graduate Studies and Research, to include graduate admissions. It is the opinion of the Office of Admissions that the present system is obsolete and should undergo radical change; progress has been made in the last several months through increased use of computer processing, and redefinition in personnel position and increase in clerical personnel. Some of the steps have been eliminated, and the office is no longer waiting for all of the information. Up to 70 applications are processed each week. ROSE added that Admissions is now only computing one GPA and only waits for the posting of the B.A. A. JOHNSON reported there were complaints about the delays of two to three months it took the University to send letters and suggested the departments send letters of admission first.

3. WALLER asked Dean Miller to respond to UO Business Dean Reinmuth's article in The Oregonian, "Parochial Politics Constrain Education." MILLER said the article had few, if any, merits. UO is facing problems in that they are depending mostly on traditional students straight out of high school, and the numbers of those students are declining. PSU has those students too, but also many others. UO is uttering a plaintive cry, because they are definitely at crossroads; PSU is beyond the crossroads, the University of the future. UO wants to organize an institute in the Portland area, but they did not do a financial study of the cost of such a project. A meeting held by the presidents and business deans of the three universities explored the possibility of collaboration among the institutions. OSU and PSU rejected the contention that UO was the only university now prepared to launch such an institute; if it were to come about, PSU would clearly be the one to manage the program. It would not be economically feasible for UO to move into the Portland area, nor would it be in the best interest of the state of Oregon. MILLER said that UO can be proud of the PSU Business School and the job it is doing. A response has been sent to

The Oregonian through the PSU Information Service in which PSU was complimentary to the other two business schools.

4. In a question from the floor WALLER was asked to comment on a report in The Oregonian regarding the ECC recommendation for future development of PSU. He felt it was unacceptable to make PSU's admission requirements lower than those of the other two universities. BLUMEL added the recommendations were not highly specific at this time. Part of the ECC's concern was that there were 26 degree-granting institutions in the Portland area, and this situation should be analyzed and taken into consideration. The President reminded the Senate that the ECC has no formal authority; nevertheless, PSU will follow the progress of these deliberations and will testify at appropriate times.

ELECTION RESULTS

Throughout the meeting, eletions were held with the following results:

Presiding Officer:	Nancy Tang	
Pro-tem:	David Smeltzer	
Steering Committee:	Rod Diman	)
	Ansel Johnson	) elected
	Don Moor	)
	Grover Rodich	)
	Steve Kosokoff	

Divisional causcuses for Committee on Committees:

EAS	B. Lall (1 yr.)
AO	R. Tayler (2 yrs.)
BA	A. Cabelly (2 yrs.)
CLAS	J. Mandaville (2 yrs.)
	D. Scheans (2 yrs.)
ED	K. Kempner (2 yrs.)
SW	R. Yoshikami (2 yrs.)
UPA	S. Edner (2 yrs.)

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. BLANKENSHIP presented the annual report of the Advisory Council. R. NUSSBAUM complained that the report was irrelevant because it only listed topics discussed. GATZ wanted to know if the PSU meeting with Chancellor Davis had been rescheduled. BLANKENSHIP responded that it should happen first thing during fall term. L. NUSSBAUM wanted to know about the status of DCE. The reply was that no decision had been reached, though long and serious discussions have been held.

2. CHAPMAN presented the annual report of the Committee on Committees.

3. The annual report of the Educational Policies Committee was accepted.

4. SMEJTEK presented the annual report of the Research and Publications Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

1. DUNBAR moved adoption for the Graduate Council that all courses submitted for a graduate degree must be taken for differentiated grades. A. JOHNSON, BEESON, OLSON, JONES, WOLK, HOWARD, GATZ, and MANDAVILLE all argued against the motion. They agreed that P/NP was especially useful for 501, 503, 505, and 507 courses, as well as for Creative Writing. There was a strong feeling that departments should have autonomy on this issue. BRENNER and HARMON rejected the argument that differentiated grades for reading and conference courses would inflate the GPA, saying that not all reading and conference students are "A" students; A-F gives more of a range for grading than P/NP.

   MANDAVILLE moved to table the motion and refer it back to the Graduate Council, and the motion was passed by a strong voice vote.

2. GAFFURI, speaking for the Committee on Committees, presented a sense of the Senate resolution that "where the Constitution provides that [committee] membership recommendations to the President should be made by an administrative officer, as in the case with the Human Subjects Research Review Committee, ...that officer should consult with the Committee on Committees in making the recommendation." The resolution was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

WALLER expressed regrets at lifting the gavel for the last time but thanked the Senate for its humor, wisdom, civility and for allowing the democratic process to function. BRENNER and HEATH moved a formal vote of thanks to Waller for four of the best years of the Senate under his leadership. The motion was enthusiastically applauded by all.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

The Council met weekly throughout the year. Several meetings focused on the biennial budget and the problems of program reduction and/or exigency; these areas were discussed in committee and with the President:

1. rationale that program reduction be used rather than financial exigency.

2. media attention as a means to provide information to the citizen/consumer regarding the impact of this round of budget cuts.

3. the provisional plan.

4. a task force for faculty receiving lay-off notices.

5. faculty response to the temporary retrenchment plan and presentation of the final plan.

6. educational leave for the next fiscal year.

The Council prepared a report and presented it at the October Faculty Forum. The report detailed the advantages and disadvantages of program reduction and/or exigency. The Council's rationale for recommending program reduction was also included.

On several occasions the provisional program/reduction-elimination plan and the potential impact of the forthcoming strategic plan on the retrenchment plan were discussed.

The President expressed a desire that an internal effort be mounted to boost morale by focusing on the positive things that are happening at PSU.

The Council discussed the University fund raising activities and goals. The Council suggested that a multiple year fund raising campaign be considered, with specific objectives and themes which might help focus positive attention on PSU internally as well as externally.

Discussed sponsored research incentive plan.

The Council discussed general faculty reaction to criteria and procedures used in selecting candidates for the legislative faculty excellence awards.

Discussed the strategic plan and its distribution.

The Council once again took up the proposal concerning regulation of tenure and academic salaries of administrators returning to teaching.

A decision to invite Chancellor Davis to meet with the advisory council was approved.

Met with the Chancellor and asked questions in nine identified categories.

The Council reviewed questions submitted by faculty for the meeting with the Chancellor on February 15, 1984.

Presented a written report of the meeting with the Chancellor in PSU Currently.

Discussed the advisability of asking the Chancellor to come to speak to the faculty at large on topics covered in the February 15 meeting.

Prepared for the upcoming open faculty senate meeting with Chancellor Davis.

Asked the status of the DCE Committee report.

Committee members:

Steven Brenner	BA	Alice Lehman	HPE
Mary Cumpston	Placement	Ann Weikel	HST
John Gruber	Physics		

Respectfully submitted

Oma Blankenship

els

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

1983-84

The Committee on Committees recommends to the President the appointment of faculty to serve as members and chairpersons on constitutional and administrative committees. During the fall and winter terms, the committee made 24 recommendations for appointments to calendar year committees, and 14 recommendations for replacements due to leaves or resignations. We are currently in the process of filling approximately 40 positions on academic year committees, as well as recommending chairs for 12 committees.

As in past years, our recommendations are greatly assisted by faculty response to the questionnaire regarding preference for serving on committees. The questionnaire was sent out to 975 faculty members, returned by 250-300, and the responses computerized. In making recommendations to committees, we respond to individual preferences when possible, while adhering to the following guidelines:

1. To involve as many of the faculty in committee assignments as possible; if possible, individuals should serve on no more than one university committee.

2. Except for those committees with mandated divisional representation, to make committee membership representative of the university as a whole. Based on past evidence that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences tended to be under-represented on committees, efforts have been made to increase the number of recommended appointments from that college.

There are a number of committees on campus whose appointments are made without the advice of the Committee on Committees or of any other faculty body. It has been brought to our attention that the Human Subjects Committee, which is appointed by the Office of Graduate Studies and Research following federal HHS guidelines, does not always represent the departments whose research proposals form the bulk of those coming before it. This has caused serious problems for at least one department. It appears appropriate that appointments to such a committee be made with the advice of the faculty, and that the Committee on Committees be the advisory body.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy J. Chapman

Nancy Chapman, Urban and Public Affairs, Chairperson

Mary Constans, Art & Arch.
John Cooper, English
Jack Featheringill, Theater Arts
Jane Kristof, Art & Arch.
Jon Mandaville, History
David Martinez, Education
Daniel Newberry, Library
Richard Petersen, Biology
Guido Pinamonti, Social Work
Loarn Robertson, Health & Phys. Ed.
William Savery, Mechanical Engrg.
Justin Shimada, Management
Ken Waldroff, DCE
William Williams, Student Affairs

E 3

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

Annual Report

to the

Faculty Senate

June 4, 1984

The Educational Policies Committee met 17 times during the 1983-84 academic year. Several issues were considered and decided.

1. The first several meetings extending through the end of November were focused upon the problem of retrenchment caused by the state system budget crisis. The committee reviewed the situation, attempted clarification of its role relative to organizational and program change and established guidelines for dealing with budget cuts. Early during this period the committee voted in favor of a planned program reduction rather than a declaration of financial exigency as the preferred approach. There was unanimous opposition to the concept of across-the-board cuts.

2. In subsequent October and November meetings the committee considered the Provisional Plan as proposed by the President. Although alternative reorganizational plans were considered, the committee voted in concurrence with the provisional plan particularly in regard to the System Science Program and the Center for Public Health Studies reductions and reorganizations.

3. A continuing responsibility of the committee throughout the year has been monitoring the comprehensive cooperative education program supported by a large federal two-year grant which began in September 1983. The Cooperative Education Policy Board met regularly and reported to the EPC. A report from the Cooperative Education Policy Board summarizing their activities for the academic year is appended as Appendix A.

4. The committee considered the proposal from Dean Paudler to the Office of Academic Affairs that the name of the Scholars Program be changed to "Honors Program." The committee voted unanimously to approve the proposed change.

5. A further and expanded consideration of the health programs at the university was deemed necessary and undertaken by EPC. The organizational aspect of allied health studies was studied by an Ad Hoc Committee on Allied Health Programs. The report of this committee which was accepted by the EPC is appended to the report as Appendix B. The principal recommendation was for the location of health science/education program within the School of Health and Physical Education.

6. The committee met with the President for a briefing on the forthcoming program improvement proposals. All proposals discussed centered upon the state economic development incentive.

The Educational Policies Committee

C. William Savery, Mechanical Engineering, Chair
Mary Cumpston, Placement Services
Colin Dunkeld, Education
Stanley Hillman, Biology
Daphne Hoffman, Library
Daniel Johnson, Geography
Jerry Lansdowne, Urban Studies and Planning
Alice Lehman, Health & Physical Education
Nancy Matschek, Dance
Earl Molander, Business Administration
Morton Paglin, Economics
Ray Sommerfeldt, Physics
Charles Tracy, Administration of Justice
Fred Waller, English
Norm Wyers, Social Work
Anne Marie Philbrook, Student
Candace Wakeman, Student
Margaret Dobson, Academic Affairs, Consultant

Appendix A

April 17, 1984

TO: The Educational Policies Committee

FROM: Cooperative Education Policy Board

Chad Karr, Roger Moseley, Bill Olsen, C. William Savery, Forbes Williams, Mary Cumpston, Chair.

Mary Cumpston

Activities:

The Board has met regularly since late November, spending much of its time being briefed by Bill Olsen on program plans, procedures and areas of concern. The following policies have been implemented, subject to review after Spring Quarter:

1. A maximum of 12 PSU COOP credits may be applied toward a baccalaureate degree.
2. A maximum of 12 PSU COOP credits may be applied toward a graduate degree.

In addition:

3. Beginning Summer Quarter, the numbers 410 X and 510 X (with departmental prefix) will designate cooperative education field placements.

   A search is currently underway for a more appropriate systemwide discreet number, but no resolution is anticipated before W-85.

Areas of concern and projected involvement:

1. Job development activities and budget.
2. Policy re conversion of practica and/or jobs held by students.
3. Policies concerning program evaluation, including reallocation of resources based upon participation by units.

ATTACHMENT: Report by Program Director covering the period September 1, 1983 - April 11, 1984.

April 13, 1984

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM REPORT TO COOPERATIVE EDUCATION POLICY BOARD:
9/1/83 - 4/11/84

PORTLAND
STATE
UNIVERSITY
p.o. box 751
portland, oregon
97207
503/229-4718

cooperative
education
program

FUNDING: Telephone notification of Comprehensive Demonstration Grant Award was received from the USDE, Cooperative Education Branch on August 12, 1983. The University's initial funding request of $650,000 for three years was reduced to $350,000 for the years 1983 through 1985. The amount of a third year award will be contingent upon appropriations from the Congress. PSU was advised to negotiate a revised grant budget if the University elected to accept the award. Budget negotiations were completed, the revised budget was approved, and the official Grant Award Notification was received by October 15, 1983, with the first year funding retroactive to September 1, 1983.

STAFFING: Program staff and faculty coordinator positions were reviewed and hiring practices initiated for one full-time program secretary, two part-time program coordinators, and seventeen part-time faculty coordinators. Program staff positions were filled by November 1, 1983, and faculty coordinators were identified and hired effective January 3, 1984.

DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES: Program orientation sessions were conducted for all faculty coordinators in early January. The Program staff continued to hold orientation meetings winter term with other campus personnel in the offices of Handicapped Student Services, the Equal Opportunity program, Women Studies, Admissions, and Student Affairs. Placement office personnel cooperated with the implementation of program orientation seminars for students during winter term as well. Student seminars are now conducted on a weekly basis.

Five thousand program brochures describing the new comprehensive Co-op program at the University were printed this year. Copies were sent to faculty coordinators in all the academic units following the first publication Cover letters and program brochures were also mailed to approximately 600 local employers inviting their participation with the program.

TRAINING: Faculty coordinators and deans attended the first cooperative education training session held on campus February 9, 1984. Two program consultants were employed to address sessions topics: 1) Why Cooperative Education is an Academic Program, and 2) Community College Cooperative Work Experience activities throughout the State of Oregon. Program coordinators also prepared remarks on PSU's Co-op program policies and practices.

(Revised 4/26/84)

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA: AY 9/1/83-6/15/84

1. Number of students counseled/interviewed by program staff:

CLAS:	165
Prof. Schools:	73
Total:	238

2. Number of employers contacted by program staff:

CLAS:	205
Prof. Schools:	302
Total:	507

3. Number of paid Co-op placements developed:

CLAS:	15
Prof. Schools:	122
Total:	137

4. Number of non-paid Co-op placements processed:

CLAS:	20
Prof. Schools:	4
Total:	24

5. Student credit hours generated through Co-op placements:

Ungrd:	325
Grad:	249
Total:	574

6. *Total amount of tuition paid by Co-op students for course credits:
*No distinction was made between resident and nonresident fees. Graduate fees were calculated at $98.00/credit hour, and undergraduate fees were calculated at $63.00/credit hour.

Ungrd:	$20,500
Grad:	$24,500
Total:	$45,000

7. *Total amount of compensation received by Co-op students through their placements:
*Figure represents income and/or other compensation reported by students on Co-op Field Experience Agreement.

Total: $124,000

8. Placement Status:

(a) New Placements: Total: 118

(b) Conversions of prior jobs or practica:
1. Business Administration: 25
2. All Others: 6
Total: 31

(c) Continuing from a previous term:
1. Social Work: 11
2. Engineering: 1
Total: 12

* = qualifying information

Appendix B

TO: Educational Policies Committee April 17, 1984

FROM: Ad Hoc Committee on Allied Health Programs

Stan Hillman, Alice Lehman, Earl Molander, Chuck Tracy, Daphne Hoffman, Chair

RE: Administrative location of allied health programs at Portland State University.

After a careful review of the issues outlined in "Portland State University, a Strategic Plan for the 1980's" (Strategic Decisions # 35 and #41), the committee considered the problem of administrative location of health-related offerings. A brief survey of the current literature brought perspective to the issue. The administrative structure of academic areas at PSU was analyzed in order to identify possibilities for locating the administrative component of allied health programs. Consultation with key administrators provided information on the practicality of the various scenarios considered by the committee. Careful attention was given to the quality of support which could be anticipated in the respective academic units and the degree of interest in the promotion of health-related offerings. In addition to program support and promotion, image and visibility of the health-related programs were considered most important.

The committee's recommendation is as follows:

1. That existing health science/education programs be located administratively within the School of Health and Physical Education (HPE).

2. That allied health offerings within other academic units and professional programs on campus be examined and coordinated through the health programs office within HPE. In addition, this office should monitor, to the extent practical, all cooperative relationships between PSU and other educational institutions and community agencies engaged in health education/services.

3. That the health programs office in HPE develop a mechanism and plan for the promotion of PSU-sponsored health-related courses with the community at large.

4. That consideration be given to changing the name of the School of Health and Physical Education to reflect the growing trend to a more comprehensive view of health and human performance.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
May 9, 1984

TO: The Faculty Senate

FROM: Pavel Smejtek, Chair, Research and Publications Committee

SUBJECT: Annual Committee Report, 1983-84

The Research and Publications Committee solicits and evaluates proposals from the faculty and then develops funding recommendations to distribute designated funds for faculty research and scholarship.

The Committee met in the Fall and made functional revisions in guidelines and grant application forms. It announced availability of research and scholarship funds in two issues of PSU CURRENTLY and set the deadline for the submission of proposals to February 24, 1984. Guidelines, evaluation forms and applications were available in departments or in the Office of Graduate Studies and Research.

The Committee received 50 proposals amounting to $88,745.50. The proposals were evaluated by two review groups, one for sciences and engineering, and one for humanities. The consensus of the Committee was that the quality of proposals noticeably improved compared to the previous year. The Committee recommended 46 proposals to be funded, typically at reduced levels. The distribution of proposals recommended for funding can be summarized as follows:

Area	Number of awards	Amount
Natural Sciences	25	19,337.
Social Sciences	5	3,929.
Arts and Letters	5	4,540.75
Engineering	8	6,600.
Social Work	2	2,050.
Health and Phys. Ed.	1	900.

The Committee recommendation representing $37,356.75 was forwarded to the Office of Graduate Studies and Research. Furthermore, the Committee made a minor revision of existing guidelines to improve their clarity and to streamline the evaluation process in the next year.

Respectfully,

Pavel Smejtek, Chair, Research and Publications Committee
Dennis Barnum, Head, Science subcommittee
James Nattinger, Head, Humanities subcommittee
Robert English
Don Gibbons
Robert Harmon
Wendelin Mueller
Daniel Johnson
Leonard Palmer
Tom Gerity
David Guzman
Loyde Hales
Spero Manson

G 1

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Graduate Council
May 14, 1984

To: Faculty Senate

From: Graduate Council
Zola Dunbar, Chairperson, Sally Althoff, Thomas Dieterich, Pieter Frick, Adriane Gaffuri, Susan Karant-Nunn, Joseph Kohut, George Lendaris, Joan McMahon, Anthony Rufolo, Wilma Sheridan, Phil Smith, Mary Taylor, Lynn Thompson. Consultants: Stanley Rauch, Robert Tufts, Robert Nicholas

Subject: Use of P/NP and differentiated grades for a graduate degree

The Graduate Council has adopted the policy that all courses submitted for a graduate degree must be taken for differentiated grades. This policy would apply to all courses taken Fall 1985 and thereafter.

ZD/b

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION

It is the understanding of the Senate that the Committee on Committees is charged by the Constitution with making recommendations concerning the membership of all ongoing committees, both constitutional and administrative. Where the Constitution provides that membership recommendations to the President should be made by an administrative officer, as is the case with the Human Subjects Research Review Committee, it is the sense of the Senate that that officer should consult with the Committee on Committees in making the recommendations.