TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate May 20, 1991
FR: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on June 3, 1991, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA
A. Roll
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 6 and 13, 1991, Meetings

President's Report -- Diman

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE SENATE, 1991-92
E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   *1. Advisory Council, Annual Report -- Enneking
   *2. Committee on Committees, Annual Report -- A. Johnson
   *3. Educational Policies Committee, Annual Report -- Lall
   *4. Research and Publications Committee, Annual Report -- Ogle
   *5. University Planning Council, Annual Report -- Mandaville

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO TEM, 1991-92
F. Unfinished Business
   *1. EPC Recommendations re Budget Reductions -- Lall
   *2. Budget Committee Recommendations re Budget Reductions -- Ellis
   3. Update on Strategic Planning Document -- Kocaoglu
   *4. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article IV, 4, 1, n, o -- A. Johnson

ELECTION OF SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE, 1991-92
G. New Business
   *1. ARC Report re Course Requirement in Cultural, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity -- Maynard
   *2. EPC Recommendations for Introduction of +/- Grades and New GPA Computations (undergraduate and graduate) -- Lall
   *3. Graduate Council Recommendations re Program Changes and Early Childhood Endorsement -- Brennan
      (Complete documentation is in the Reserve Library)
   *4. Sexual Harassment Policy -- Edner

DIVISIONAL CAUCUSES TO ELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBERS, 1991-93
Divisions electing: EAS, FPA, HPE, LIB, and CLAS (3)

H. Adjournment
*The following documents are included with this mailing:
B Minutes of the May 6 and 13, 1991, Senate Meetings*
E1 Advisory Council, Annual Report**
E2 Committee on Committees, Annual Report**
E3 Educational Policies Committee, Annual Report**
E4 Research and Publications Committee, Annual Report**
E5 University Planning Council, Annual Report**
F1 EPC Recommendations re Budget Reductions*
F2 Budget Committee Recommendations re Budget Reductions*
F3 Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article IV, 4, 1, n, o*
G1 ARC Report re Course Requirement in Cultural, Ethnic and Gender Diversity*
G2 EPC Recommendations for Introduction of +/- Grades and New GPA Computations*
G3 Graduate Council Recommendations re Program Changes and Early Childhood Endorsement**
G4 Sexual Harassment Policy*

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only.
TO: Faculty Senate
FR: Rick Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty
RE: Extra Meeting

Day: Monday, June 10, 1991
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Place: 150 CH

Purpose: Questions for Morris Holland (see over)

Complete the 6/3/91 agenda (please bring your 6/3/91 mailing)

Discuss Draft of Strategic Plan (please bring copy mailed to you on 5/24/91)

UHH/b
June 4, 1991

TO: Morris Holland

FR: Rick Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The questions below are submitted to you by David Johnson for your response at the June 10, 1991, Senate meeting.

In order to clear up confusion arising from the May 29, 1991, Vanguard report, please answer the following questions:

1. Is there a position description for the newly created Assistant Dean of Student Affairs described in the May 29, 1991, Vanguard (p. 5)? If so, was the position description submitted to, and approved by, the Affirmative Action Office, consistent with OAR regulations?

2. Is this a new position? If so, why is it necessary?

3. What hiring procedures have been followed in filling it? Was the search carried out nationally, regionally, locally, or internally? What attempts were made to seek qualified minority candidates?

4. Was a search committee appointed? If so, who was on it? If not, why not?

5. Were finalists interviewed? If so, how many and by whom?

6. Were applications encouraged from Student Affairs personnel who this winter were notified of their termination? If so, how were they encouraged? If not, why not?

7. What are the minimal qualifications for the position according to the approved job description, and do any of the terminated personnel meet those qualifications?
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Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 3, 1991
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present:

Alternates Present:
Etesami for Koch, Cheifetz for Tuttle.

Members Absent:
Daily, Duffield, Finley, Kocaoglu, Lutes, Manning, Nattinger, Petersen, Stern, Wurm, Zwick.

Ex-officio Members
Present:
Erzurumlu, Frank, Hardt, Holland, Laguardia, Ramaley, Reardon, Savery, Sheridan, Sivage, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

Newly Elected Senators
Present:
Barna, J. Brenner, Burke, Farr, Goekjian, Lansdowne, Midson, Moor, Reece, Sestak, Schaumann, Visse.

June 10, 1991, Meeting

Members Present:

Alternates Present:
Falco for Arick, Amato for Burns, Cheifetz for Gray, Etesami for Koch, Oshika for Nattinger, Clark for Petersen, Pollock for Settle.

Members Absent:
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the May 6 and 13, 1991, meetings were approved as written.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. President RAMALEY expressed her appreciation for a very fine first year at PSU. Her assumptions about the quality of the faculty have been more than amply rewarded.

2. The Transition Team recommendations have been revisited in light of budget reports. Admissions to the undergraduate Physics program have been reopened, since that program had been reviewed and evaluated last year. Other suspended programs will be reviewed in full as soon as possible.

3. The Introspect Team is completing round one of its review of campus operations. The report should be completed by August and will be shared with the Senate in October.

4. A working draft of the Strategic Plan is out, and the mission statement will be the first part to be reviewed. Next year we will be looking at longer-term changes.

5. Administrative committees have been reviewed, and a few of them will be eliminated or combined.

6. Development activities have been successful. Giving has more than doubled from $1.2M in April 1990 to $3.1M in April 1991. Other activities are in the development stage; e.g., the President's Associates are working on proposals for professorships.

7. There is preliminary talk of $53M add-backs for OSSHE from the legislature. Among things to be funded are items from the Governor's Commission Report: the Portland Action Plan @$2.5M and $5M for a joint graduate school of engineering. Other monies are to go to retention of faculty, increasing student access, and reduction of tuition costs.

8. President RAMALEY announced senior appointments: Morgan Pope, Acting Vice President for Development and External Affairs; Lanny Proffer, President's Assistant for Legislative Relations. One more candidate for vice president for finance and administration will visit the campus this week; selection should be made by July 1. Provost candidates will be on campus this summer, and faculty will be informed at home by mail.

9. PSU is back within the enrolment corridor, thanks to efforts by many people.
10. The University has received its first Mellon fellowship. There are also Fulbright and Marshall fellowships. The women's softball team is third in the nation. All in all, it's been a good year, and the President is getting ready for an exciting fall term.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. EDNER announced the following campus election results:

IFS -- John Cooper
Advisory Council -- Marjorie Burns, Ulrich Hardt, Linda Parshall. Steve Brenner will replace Rod Diman who becomes acting Dean of Fine and Performing Arts.

2. Gene ENNKING gave a report of the May 31/June 1 IFS meeting. The full report is attached to these minutes.

3. EDNER announced the strong possibility of an additional Senate meeting next Monday at 1:30.

ELECTION RESULTS

Throughout the meeting, Senate elections for 1991-92 were held, with the following results:

Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Presiding Office Pro Tem: Eileen Brennan
Steering Committee: Steve Kosokoff
                      Beatrice Oshika
                      Shelley Reece
                      Ann Weikel

Committee on Committees: Gavin Bjork -- CLAS
                         Greg Goekjian -- CLAS
                         Barbara Sestak -- SFPA
                         Oren Ogle -- LIB
                         Still to be named are 1 member each from CLAS, EAS, and HHP.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. M. ENNEKING presented the annual report of the Advisory Council.

2. A. JOHNSON presented the annual report of the Committee on Committees. MIDSON asked about the elimination of the Affirmative Action Committee. JOHNSON said an ad hoc committee has been set up and has taken over the responsibilities.

3. LALL presented the annual report of the EPC.
4. OGLE presented the annual report of the Research and Publications Committee. A. JOHNSON asked if the committee had any input in decisions regarding distribution of the provost's $100,000 for faculty development. JOHNSON observed that the committee only had $40,000. FRANK said that discussion was underway to put all the money together. WEIKEL suggested that the committee should be given the proposal. FRANK thought that was an interesting possibility, but other groups are also reviewing ideas. REARDON said the current proposal calls for the Research and Publications Committee and the Committee on Effective Teaching to oversee all faculty development in a faculty council on development.

5. MANDAVILLE presented the annual report of the UPC.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. LALL presented a list of EPC recommendations regarding program review.

GOSLIN/BRENNAN moved "the adoption of the EPC recommendations regarding currently suspended programs."

BOWLDEN argued that passing this motion would be inconsistent with last month's Senate vote.

The motion was defeated.

ASHBAUGH moved "the acceptance of the EPC recommendations regarding future policy of program review."

KARANT-NUNN wondered if policies and criteria for program review were in place. Who had seen them? What are the standards departments had to live up to? LALL said criteria were in place but were still being revised. Dean Toulan and CADS had been involved. TANG said the form and general outline was available, but B.M.5 had meant the suspension of 7 reviews this year.

COOPER/LENDARIS moved "to delete item 'c' from the recommendation."

The motion was passed.

TOULAN questioned how many master's and doctoral programs would survive having to graduate more than five students annually. These guidelines may only be appropriate for undergraduate programs. LENDORIS agreed. MILLNER argued for also eliminating item "b" of the motion.

BUNCH/ASHBAUGH moved "to table the motion."

The motion was defeated.
MILLNER/BOWLDEN moved "to eliminate item "c" from the motion. The motion was passed.

The discussion now centered on program/department reviews on a seven-year cycle. BRENNER asked for a definition of "program." BURKE wanted to know if external reviewers have the same authority as accrediting agencies. ENNEKING asked if all departments had to meet the same criteria. WEIKEL thought the recommendation was redundant. TANG agreed, saying it had been in place for three years.

ENNEKING/WEIKEL moved "to table the motion."

The motion was passed.

2. ELLIS distributed the Budget Committee Recommendations on Suspension of Degrees and Program Eliminations.

ELLIS/WEIKEL moved "that the following recommendations be accepted for the academic year 1991-92 only:

"That each department review its utilization of FTE for maximizing (i.e., optimum) production of SCH;

The major portion of carryover monies and one-time savings be allocated for extra wage sections;

Departments should review late afternoon and evening offerings for opportunities to increase SCH, and provide for increased accessibility.

We recommend this emphasis on the use of additional lecture sections as an emergency measure. In the long-run, a strategy which utilizes lecture sections at the expense of full-time faculty positions is contrary to the goal of the University."

FISHER asked about the number of frozen positions. ELLIS said Ken Harris had talked about 15, but there were other vacant positions as well. RUFOLO asked about SCH creation, and ELLIS emphasized that the Budget Committee encouraged maximizing SCH. MILLNER found that worrisome, and BEESON offered a friendly amendment to change "maximizing" to "optimum."

ELLIS pointed out that the Budget Committee had also encouraged departments to be creative in class scheduling and to review their offerings. KARANT-NUNN saw no problem with rising to a temporary problem, but she warned against canonizing something for all time. BRENNAN reminded Senators that the recommendations by the Budget Committee were prefaced by "for the academic year 1991-92 only."
The motion was passed.

3. The proposed constitutional amendment, Article IV, 4, 1,n,o was passed. It combines the functions of EPC and a newly designed UPC. The Budget Committee will continue.

NEW BUSINESS

1. EDNER presented the final draft of the official Policy on Combating Sexual Harassment and the Consensual Relationship Policy. BRENNER thought it was a good policy which nevertheless presented a few problems. What would PSU couples do where one member is in the bargaining unit and the other not? He was also concerned about the consequences of false accusations. MILLNER said it was none of the University's business to deal with consenting adults. LAGUARDIA urged Senators to look at the language carefully. There is room for consenting adult relationships in this policy, but someone else has to do the evaluation. Power imbalance is a fact of life, and the courts have ruled.

MOOR thought it unwise for the Senate to approve these policies now, without revisions. He noted that the definition of "consensual relationship" is inconsistent. The policies need to also be negotiated in the bargaining agreement, because they are hiring issues. LAGUARDIA said that AAUP has been sent copies. BUNCH observed that the Senate could therefore not do anything with the policy. EDNER said the Senate could do anything it wanted.

McKENZIE asked from which official body this policy was coming. LAGUARDIA responded, Affirmative Action Office, the President, the Advisory Council. ENNEKING said that AAUP and AFT were consulted and added the disclaimer sentence which has been included, but ASHBAUGH thought AAUP had not taken action yet.

BRENNAN/COOPER moved "to send the item to the Senate Steering Committee for review."

The motion was passed.

At this point it was 17:02, and the meeting was adjourned until June 10, 1991.

June 10, 1991, Senate Meeting -- 13:30

The following minutes were written by Earl Rees, who served as secretary pro tem for this meeting.
NEW BUSINESS

1. KOSOKOFF reminded the Senate that at the June 3 meeting the entire sexual harassment and consensual relationship policy (Item G4) was referred to the Senate Steering Committee for their consideration.

KOSOKOFF/FISHER then moved "that the first part of the document, Official Policy on Combating Sexual Harassment, which apparently is not controversial, be considered by the Faculty Senate."

They moved "that part two, Consensual Relationship Policy, be considered by the Senate Steering Committee."

There are two aspects: one to reconsider the vote of June 3, and the second to act on the motion.

The motion was passed.

KOSOKOFF/MAYNARD moved "to adopt the sexual harassment policy." COOPER asked about policy passed by the Senate several years ago concerning disciplinary action brought against faculty. Are these consistent with what is being presented here? REARDON noted past process: select 3rd party - could be member of PSU faculty or someone from outside. Assume present procedures take precedence. BOWLDEN noted that this is part of AAUP work agreement. So, would the document have to be passed by AAUP? He also asked if the Senate vote was binding or advisory. REARDON said that if someone wanted to file a grievance, that option was still open.

The sexual harassment motion was passed.

2. Questions submitted by DAVID JOHNSON to Morris Holland. (See attached list of 7 questions.) HOLLAND said the series of questions, concerning the newly created position of Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, was stimulated by a Vanguard article of May 29, 1991. While the paper on balance does a remarkably good job, this article was garbled and incorrect. The search will occur in the next month or so, but the search process is not in place. There will be an open search, but in the interim the position is being filled on an acting basis by Ken Fox, an attorney who is currently the Coordinator of Student Services. HOLLAND said violations of the student conduct code have become increasingly complex and have stretched the capacity of his staff to respond. The primary responsibility of the office will be to administer the student conduct code and, thus, a strong legal background is necessary. There will be an open search, and those who have lost their positions are free to apply. The process will be completed by fall. Three different management positions were eliminated as part of the need to reduce the number of dollars going to the administration. BEESON asked if
the description included the need for legal expertise. HOLLAND said the description will describe responsibilities and preferred qualities - training in the law and knowledge of student affairs - but not specify that the applicant be a practicing attorney.

In response to question #2 submitted by D. Johnson, "Is it a new position?" HOLLAND said it could be described as a new position or a position resulting in a move toward fewer managers. M. ENNEKING asked about the procedure for selecting the search committee and the composition of same. HOLLAND said the search committee has not been selected, and the search process has not been put in place but that both staff and students will be involved. It was asked if there was a conflict of interest because there is now an attorney in the office. HOLLAND said the person acting now will be responsible for coordination of student services.

3. In presenting the ARC report regarding a graduation requirement in ethnic, cultural, and gender diversity, MAYNARD said the Senate must vote on the following ARC recommendation that "Portland State University establish a requirement for graduation of a minimum of six units of courses in cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. This requirement may be met by courses taken to meet the General Education Requirement or by courses taken as electives. The courses approved for meeting this requirement should be chosen by a committee appointed by the Faculty Senate. The ARC also recommends that the Senate arrange an evaluation of this requirement when it has been in place for two years, that evaluation to include its effect on transfer students." CUMPSTON/KOSOKOFF formally moved the recommendation.

BOWLDEN said he was concerned about the implications and impact on University resources and wanted to see a listing of courses with descriptions and enrollment potential. MAYNARD said it is rare to make a defense based on a study of any requirement, since most evaluations are based on what is called "content validity": if a student is forced to take history, it is assumed that he/she will learn history. The ARC was directed to take into account the existing financial situation of the University and that this is only an interim requirement. The possibility of offering a special course was discussed, but the ARC made a preliminary reconnaissance of the PSU bulletin and found 171 courses in 15 departments that would satisfy the requirement. FISHER said that requiring six units was not too much to ask of our students. R. JOHNSON asked about the nature of courses already being offered. Are most of them social science courses? A number of business majors working towards a BA degree find themselves very constrained in terms of electives. Would this be an additional constraint? Would certain international courses count toward fulfilling this requirement? MAYNARD reminded the Senate that the ARC did not select courses but did
recommended that be done by another group. He said that the ARC's preliminary scan showed that the courses would come mainly from the social sciences but that there were also courses in other areas: English, Foreign Languages, Dance, Art. No formal recommendation was made by the ARC. HOLLISTER said a number of students and faculty at PSU and some people from outside PSU will see this requirement as being "politically correct" and, therefore, it will be counter-productive and likely to provoke scorn and ridicule. MAYNARD said that possibility was discussed.

A. JOHNSON moved to amend the ARC recommendation to read that "the ARC should select the courses approved for meeting this requirement instead of 'a committee appointed by the Faculty Senate'." Seconded. ENNEKING said it would be easier to make a decision if a list of courses was available.

Motion to amend passed.

In further discussion of the original motion, STERN found it unusual to see a split of 3 to 2 in the vote of the ARC and wondered if other concerns surfaced during ARC discussions. MAYNARD said that selecting courses for cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity is a live issue and that fact is reflected in the close vote. BEESON asked about how many students are already taking classes that meet this requirement. MAYNARD said that Institutional Research was asked this very question but - catch 22 - could not answer it until a list of approved courses became available. LENDARIS said it would be difficult for him to advise students about these additional requirements without more detail as to what it entails. DECARRICO requested the floor for Johanna Brenner. BRENNER said helping the student through the maze of courses is difficult but that it is quite likely that some of the existing GED requirements would simultaneously fill this requirement. Departments, with the help of the ARC, could develop and change existing courses to include material that would make their courses satisfy this requirement. BRENNER urged support for the motion adding that it should be evaluated after two years. DIMAN asked the committee about the seven-year catalog limitation. MAYNARD said this facet of the requirement was not considered. COOPER thought the report was vague concerning what constitutes a course in cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity and wondered if the requirement would be effective. STERN, while supporting the concept of diversity, thought that asking for support of the motion was like asking one to sign a blank check. RUFOLO said a concern was the effect on transfer students. Another matter was not knowing if 10 or 200 courses would satisfy the requirement and that two more courses would be required for graduation. He noted the close vote - 3 to 2 - and that two people were not at the meeting and, therefore, did not vote. RUFOLO said that in checking four or five other universities, "gender" was not mentioned and,
therefore, that aspect would have to be considered unusual.
HOLLISTER asked if the ARC would be looking for a diversity of views. MAYNARD said there was an interest in a diversity of views on all subjects. DECARRICO requested that the ARC submit a list of courses and then have the Faculty Senate consider it.

LENDARIS moved to table the motion until the list of courses was available. Seconded.

The motion to table was defeated.

Motion to approve the motion as amended was approved.

4. LALL presented the EPC Recommendations for Introduction of +/- Grades and New GPA Computations (undergraduate and graduate).

A. JOHNSON/WEIKEL moved "the adoption of the plus/minus grading system.

LALL said that several schools were sampled, with the following four-point scale—the new system to become effective fall term 1992:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

resulting in the proposal of the +/- grading system. The cost of changing would be less than $1000, and computer compatibility is not a problem. RUFOLO said he thought this was a response to grade inflation and wondered if the EPC had looked at this general problem. LALL said this was not looked at directly. The scale precludes an A+ grade (4.3), even though some schools have such a grade. OGLE asked if the system would be retroactive. LALL said it would not be retroactive but would go into effect fall term 1992.

A. JOHNSON moved to amend the motion to indicate that the division between p/np would be pass C- (1.7) or higher and no pass, D+ or lower.

The amendment was approved.

The motion as amended was passed.

5. BRENNAN presented Graduate Council recommendations re program changes and the early childhood endorsement.

A. JOHNSON/BRENNER moved approval.
A. JOHNSON did not think it was possible to put a required course under an omnibus number, (USP 510 Computer Applications in Urban Studies), a course that has not been approved by the Faculty Senate.

M. ENNEKING moved to omit the second part of item 6: "USP 510 Computers Applications in Urban Studies increased from 1 to 2 credit hours, making a total credits for degree increase from 72 to 73." Amendment passed.

The original motion passed.

6. KOCAOGLU presented the draft document of the PSU Strategic Plan, urging the Senate to take action. He said the committee has been working on the plan for about eight months. This draft is the third and reflects input in the form of several hundred individual items from students, faculty, administration, various committees, as well as external groups. The objective today is to get input from the Faculty Senate. The task force chairs - William Savery, Jon Mandaville, Ed Grubb, working with Clarence Hein - are here to listen to all comments.

EDNER said it was his understanding that the Senate was being asked to endorse the broad focus and general direction of the report with the understanding that there will be changes.

A. JOHNSON/STERN moved to "endorse the plan with the understanding that subsequent changes and modifications will be made through the amendment process." There was no discussion, and the motion was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

EDNER thanked the Senate Faculty for their support and cooperation. The meeting was adjourned at 14:48.
The IFS met Friday afternoon, June 3, 1991 in the Blue Room of the Capital Building in Salem. During this portion of the meeting the IFS representatives heard from Senate President John Kitzhaber, Representative Tony Van Vliet, and Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark.

I. Senate President John Kitzhaber

Pres. Kitzhaber reviewed the Legislative budget process and adjustments to the Governor’s budget based upon revenue at hand. The improved May economic forecast now has Ways and Means in the process of allocating 'Add-Backs' to budget cuts due to Measure 5. His estimate of current thinking or reallocation totalled 47-50 million including

- 20 m for faculty retention
- 10 m for tuition surcharge offset
- 2.5 m for Portland Higher Ed initiative
- 5 m for joint engineering graduate school
- + several other items

He noted in general that the total budget of 571 m was 21 m more than last budget but was 30 m short of continuance. The State is "not whole but better than before--but not adequate".

Pres. Kitzhaber spoke at length about the retirees tax issue (Federal vs State) and the potential for lawsuits no matter what happens. If tax is applied across and board there is a potential for increased revenue in the amount of 90 m. At the same time there is talk of providing a benefit increase to PERS retirees.

The "REAL ISSUE" is replacement revenue. "The Speaker and I will attempt to do something after the session." In his view something needs to be on the ballot by May. Kitzhaber approach is two-tiered. First, put in place dedicated, restrictive, constitutional language assuring uses of replacement revenue for specific purposes. Second, seek replacement revenue under guidelines put in place in the first step.

Pres. Kitzhaber said that there were positive feelings about the Safety Net Bill’ allowing Higher Ed to delay giving termination notices. His concluding recommendations were for faculty to show how cuts will hurt and to help fight for replacement revenue during the next 18 months.

I. Representative Van Vliet

Rep. Van Vliet also reviewed the current state of the Legislative budget. He estimated 53 m in add-backs with 10 m offset against the surcharge. A separate 66 m salary package is in the process of negotiation with unions. This package will likely have a 2+2 or 3+3 percent increase within it. Van Vliet noted that salary money for merit would likely come from the 20 m faculty retention add-back component.

Rep. Van Vliet defended his budget note related to having administrators teach. He felt that it would gain considerable credibility with fellow Legislators particularly as the system is losing faculty and students can’t get into classes. When asked what Higher Ed could do during
the interim to help present its case Rep. Van Vliet suggested that we should get Legislators on campus to show them that there are good hard working people as in other agencies. In response to a question he said that the "best" Higher Ed argument for better funding was the need to provide educational access for Oregon's students, to create jobs in Oregon, make contributions to the Oregon economy and to show that Higher Ed is big business in the State.

III. Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark

Where is the System now? Planning. Currently the Chancellor's office is in the process of developing a vision statement which will help guide and focus planning. Where do we want to be or what do we want to be like 10 years out? Oregonians surely want Higher Education to be alive and well then. Critical issues include tuition and faculty workload issues before the Legislature and electronic, specialized, integrated libraries. They expect to get estimated reduction from the Executive Department in August for the next biennium (120 m figure??). There are deep concerns about planning for such possibilities becoming self-fulfilling or having a way of happening. Plans that target institutions are terribly damaging to morale and stature even if they don't happen. There is also a projected student increase during the next ten years.

V-C Clark has been attending meetings of a Progress Board which includes local government people appointed by then Governor Goldschmidt. This group seeks to project a vision for Oregon, to establish measurable benchmarks, make human investment strategies and plan human capital development.

V-C Clark talked in detail about the Legislative experience during this session for the System and about add-backs mentioned above. Institutions now have new enrollment targets. If more students come System will need more money for part-time instruction. The System would like to add more money to salary package (currently 2+2 or 3+3). They have had to provide evidence of Department Head teaching in response to questions about administrative teaching and the prospective budget note supported by Rep. Van Vliet. Oregon does as much and in many cases more than other institution outside Oregon.

On Saturday, June 2, 1991 the IFS met in the Board Room of the Oregon Police Academy on the Western Oregon State College campus.

The IFS was welcomed by President Myers who stated that IFS needs to become more active--faculty need to become more active in the state of its welfare. He also expressed concern about how the message of the next round of cuts would be articulated. Examples stating that cuts would total all of the budgets of the four small colleges are bad examples and very damaging to those institutions. The System must do something as a group.

Issues discussed by the IFS representatives included

1. Early retirement plans and implementation on the different campuses.

IFS, May 31 & June 1, 1991
2. Reports from Academic Council and Board meetings.

3. Report from a subcommittee comparing instructional vs administrative costs for the years 1980-81 and 1990-91. Representative were to evaluate the report for their own campuses.

4. Issues to bring to the Board’s Retreat on how faculty could be more productive. Items brought up included
   i) Full online access to computer networks.
   ii) Computers for faculty that need them.
   iii) Access to libraries, more streamlined interlibrary loans.
   iv) Copyright clearance--policy statements for certain types of materials.
   v) Ease of restrictions on equipment purchase.
   vi) Support staff for computing.
   vii) Better student advising--smoother access to student records.
   The above list was not intended to be complete but represented items presented in the short time permitted.

5. A motion to amend the Bylaws by shifting the start of officers terms to match the calendar year and nomination procedures to recommend committee members to the Board was introduced for discussion and vote at the next meeting. A motion to increase membership for colleges to three individuals matching that for the Universities was also introduced.


   President: Bonnie Staebler, WOSC
   Vice President: Jim Pease, OSU
   Secretary: Janice Jackson, PSU

   Representatives to the Board:
   Patty Guarney-Gibbs, UO Ed Brierty, SOSC
   Marjorie Burns, PSU; Donna Jensen OHSU;
   Eugene Enneking, PSU; Anna Penk, WOSC

   Alternates:
   Eugene Enneking, PSU

   Academic Council Representative: Eugene Enneking, PSU

   New officers would serve for one and one-half years during implementation phase of new election procedures.

7. Future meetings. The schedule for meetings during 1991-92 is

   October 4,5, 1991 Oregon Institute of Technology
   December 6,7, 1991 Oregon Health Sciences University
   February 7,8, 1992 Oregon State University
   April 3,4, 1992 University of Oregon
   June 5,6, 1992 Eastern Oregon State College

Submitted by Eugene A. Enneking

May 31 & June 1, 1991
Advisory Council
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
June 3, 1991

The Advisory Council met weekly throughout the academic year, generally meeting with President Ramaley on alternate weeks. The Council served as general advisory body to the President on matters of university policy and faculty welfare. Among various issues and activities considered, the Council:

* Reviewed strategic planning and budget review processes;

* Nominated members for the Provost Search Committee and the Dean of Fine and Performing Arts Search Committee and the corresponding Campus Screening Committees;

* Reviewed promotion and tenure guidelines;

* Reviewed and made recommendations on the Faculty Secretary position and university support for this office;

* Drafted the Constitutional Amendment on Faculty Authority in the Selection of Department Chairs;

* Recommended the establishment of Intra-University Visiting Professorships and Visiting Administrative Fellowships and criteria for these programs;

* Recommended candidates to serve as Special Assistant to the President;

* Reviewed a draft of the Sexual Harassment Policy;

* Reviewed and made recommendations to the President on policies and practices relating to part time faculty.

Marj Enneking, Steve Kosokoff, and Claudine Fisher (who finished Ron Cease's term) will be completing service on the Council at the end of this term. Rod Diman is also resigning from the Council because of his administrative responsibilities.

Rod Diman
Marj Enneking, Chair
Claudine Fisher
Susan Karant-Nunn
Steve Kosokoff
Don Moor
The Committee on Committees met irregularly throughout the year to handle committee appointments and recommendations. The committee made recommendations for the Calendar-year Committees and the Academic-Year Committees. A meeting was held with the President to discuss the appointment process for administrative committees. The committee was asked to review the administrative committees so that unneeded committees could be sunsetted Spring, 1991, and that some combinations could be made.

STATUS: Originally 23; After 15.

Committees Recommended to be kept. 13

ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING SERVICES
BIO-SAFETY COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON THE CARE OF RESEARCH ANIMALS
DEADLINE APPEALS BOARD
EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES ADVISORY BOARD
GRADUATION PROGRAM BOARD
HELEN GORDON CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER ADVISORY BOARD
HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE
PUBLICATIONS BOARD
RADIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE
SMITH MEMORIAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD
STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE

Committees recommended to be sunset. 5

ACQUISITION OF ART AND ARTIFACTS COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN EMPLOYMENT
FINANCIAL AID COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA
INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND ACTIVITIES BOARD

Committees recommended to be combined. 5

ACADEMICALLY CONTROLLED AUXILIARY ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES SPEAKERS PROGRAM BOARD
CAMPUS PARKING, ENVIRONMENT AND SAFETY COMMITTEE
TRAFFIC APPEALS BOARD Combine with Safety Committee
VEHICLE ACCIDENT BOARD Combine with Safety Committee
Discussions are continuing.
Educational Policies Committee
Annual Report to the Senate
April 29, 1991

Members: B. Kent Lall, Chair, Sarah Andrews-Collier, Jeannette DeCarrico, Edward Schafer, Alexander Gassaway, Ed Grubb, Leslie McBride, Robert Williams, Beatrice Oshika, Dan O'Toole, Richard Thoms, Nancy Koroloff, James Kimball, John Heflin

Consultant: Robert Frank

The activities of the Educational Policies Committee are listed in a chronological order as follows:

1. Approved name change for the Division of Continuing Education and Summer Session to School of Extended Studies.

2. Initiated reviews of programs/departments based on reports of external visitors. Two program/department reviews were completed, namely departments of Geology & Biology. Department of Music review could not be completed as the final report from the accreditation team was still awaited. This report has recently become available, and the committee will redirect its attention to the review process.

3. As the Committee was undertaking the examination of external reviews for the first time, it took considerable pains to define the criteria for its review:

   Step 1. The Committee recommended procedural guidelines to be followed as applicable to all academic units subsequent to a review. These guidelines recommend specific actions to be taken by the department, dean of the school/college, and the provost following a review.

   Step 2. The Committee reviews the external reports for addressing the criteria uniformly and accurately, as well as for adherence to the format. The Committee examines the fundamental issues identified and the set of recommendations. The Committee arrives at its own assessment of the issues and recommendations while seeking additional information as necessary. The Committee then arrives at specific recommendations which are proposed for implementation.

4. As the Committee gained experience with the examination of reviews, it felt the need to revise the criteria and the format of the questionnaire sent to external reviewers. This is essential in order to ensure uniform application of the criteria and to obtain a clearer picture of issues and recommendations. The Committee expects to revise the criteria in the coming year.
5. The Committee identified the following issues in its examination of the reviews thus far conducted:

(a) Pay for graduate students  
(b) Start-up support for new faculty  
(c) Reward mechanism for scholarly, teaching, and service activities  
(d) Scope of authority of department chairpersons and procedures for elections  
(e) Courses for non-majors  
(f) Strategic plan for a department: Should there be one, and if so, how does it relate to university’s mission?

Briefs on three of the issues identified above have been prepared and are currently under discussion.

6. The Committee considered the introduction of +/- grades for both undergraduate and graduate programs. After careful consideration, the Committee proposed to recommend its introduction during fall, 1992. Recommendation will be coming to the Senate as a separate action item.

7. The Committee approved in principle the establishment of an Institute of Metropolitan Studies.

8. The Committee reviewed the implications of the FY 91-93 budget recommendations and program actions. This report was presented to the Senate on May 1, 1991.
The Committee reviewed its guidelines and grant application form and made several modifications in addition to the customary updating of information. The Committee also decided on the format of a cover letter to be sent to each Portland State University faculty member, inviting the recipient to submit grant proposals by the February 4, 1991, deadline. Included in the letter were the names and phone numbers of persons available to answer questions. Announcements were published in the Fall 1990 issue of The P. J. and two issues of PSU Currently to further encourage submission of proposals by the said deadline.

Forty-eight proposals requesting a total of $84,913 were received. This represented a decrease from the previous year in which 53 requests totaling $160,830 were made, but more than received two years ago. Although no attempt was made to determine the reason(s) for the decrease in applications, it is believed that the pessimism generated by Ballot Measure 5 and the subsequent mid-year budget reductions made at PSU at that time may have been significant contributing factors.

Vice Provost C. William Savery informed the Committee that $40,000 was budgeted for institutional research funds for the 1991-92 academic year. The Committee met again as a whole, in late February, to discuss the evaluation procedures before dividing into two subcommittees (Humanities/Social Science and Engineering/Math/Science) to begin the assessment. Two proposals were deemed to be more appropriate for other funding considerations (1-Faculty Development Fund, 1-Committee for Effective Teaching). Another proposal was eliminated because the applicant had failed to comply with the Committee's announced guidelines. The quality of the remaining 45 proposals varied, but on the whole was quite high, considering the relatively small return that could be hoped for; the average award was $1,000. Two members of the Humanities/Social Science Subcommittee commented on the higher quality of the proposals submitted this year in comparison to the ones they had evaluated when they served on the committee previously.

On April 12, 1991, a memo was sent to Vice Provost Savery informing him of the Committee's recommendation to fund forty proposals at specified amounts; the Vice Provost concurred. Subsequently, the Committee learned one of the persons recommended for an award will not be at PSU during the 1991-92 academic year. The award has been redistributed based upon the Committee's recommendations.

TOPICS OF CONCERN:

- **Budget** - The Committee's designated budget has remained static for five years even though the PSU administration has placed an increased emphasis on research and publication, and costs associated with these activities have not been immune to inflation. It may be unrealistic to expect additional monies to be allocated as long as the crippling effects of Ballot Measure 5 loom in the distance. Nevertheless, the Committee feels responsible for reminding the administration that increased funding could be more than offset by the additional outside grants generated as a result of more adequate funding for these pilot projects.
(Topics of Concern, continued)

- **Departmental Support** - It was evident from the requests submitted this year that there are considerable differences among the various departments and schools at PSU regarding the support provided for faculty research. For example, some departments defray costs, within reason, of postage and telecommunication usage associated with research and publication efforts of faculty, while other departments expect faculty to either pay these costs out-of-pocket, or obtain funding from other sources. This issue requires further investigation, although the Committee was unsure with whom that responsibility lies.

- **Committee Staffing** - Thanks to the Committee on Committees, there was a better representation of women and Engineering/Math/Science faculty on the Committee. Even so, there were no women on the Engineering/Math/Science Subcommittee, and the Chair requested several of the committee members, who would have preferred participating on the Humanities/Social Science Subcommittee, to serve on the Engineering/Math/Science Subcommittee for balance.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Barnum</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudolph Barton</td>
<td>ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Bleiler</td>
<td>MTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Detlefsen</td>
<td>FLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Dueker</td>
<td>CUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Harrison</td>
<td>CMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harvey</td>
<td>GEOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan McMahon</td>
<td>SPHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
<td>HST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendelin Mueller</td>
<td>CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oren Ogle</td>
<td>LIB (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Peterson</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Reece</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Stern</td>
<td>SBA/MKTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Van Halen</td>
<td>EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Young</td>
<td>SSW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex-officio: C. William Savery, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research
The Planning Council met throughout the year to review progress of the ad hoc Strategic Planning Committee, and to review a proposed constitutional change concerning committees reorganization.

The reorganization of the Planning Council, the Educational Policies Committee and the Budget Committee has been an issue of concern before the Council since such action was first proposed in the fall of 1990. The Council feels that significant reorganization is needed to effectively carry out the currently very broad and over-lapping responsibilities allocated to each of these committees. It recommends that the Senate support such reorganization.

On May 15th the Planning Council reviewed the first draft of the proposed Strategic Plan. On the basis of that review, a number of changes were recommended. On May 21th a second draft of the Plan incorporating those changes were provided the Council. Having reviewed this document, the Planning Council recommends its acceptance by the Faculty Senate.

This has been an extraordinary year in PSU planning. A great deal was accomplished. The Administration in cooperation with city and state leadership produced the Governor's Commission Action Plan, which insures PSU a lead role in higher education in the Portland metropolitan region. The ad hoc Strategic Planning Committee has produced a planning document which provides the university with a promising direction and framework for action. Highlighted by the Introspect process, the Administration has undertaken a broad review of its internal operation to increase effectiveness. Concurrent to these activities, the necessary responses to severe budgetary cuts imposed in mid-year left their marks on all planning tracks.

The level and nature of planning activity is likely to continue through the 1991-1992 academic year, as focus
shifts to implementation and plan adjustments. Clearly defined, practical and broadly accepted roles for faculty groups in this process will be very important. With this in mind, The Council notes with appreciation the work of the Committee on Committees and the Senate Steering Committee on the review of current constitutional committees. The Council looks forward to playing a significant role in the planning process in the coming year.

Barry Anderson  CLAS  
Margaret Browning  AO  
Carol Burden  ED  
Marjorie Burns  CLAS  
Jeanette DeCarrico  CLAS  
Walter Ellis  UPA  
Robert Frank  OAA  
Lewis Goslin  BA  
Robert Jones  CLAS  
B. Kent Lall  EAS  
Nancy Matschek  FPA  
Steve Sivage  FADM  
Lyn Stone  BAO  
Milan Svoboda  (for Schendel)  HPE  
Janet Wright  LIB  
Norman Wyers  SW
In light of report to the Senate dated May 6, 1991, the Educational Policies Committee brings forward the following recommendations for adoption:

Reference: Currently Suspended Programs

1. The Educational Policies Committee recommends an immediate review of all currently suspended programs in general and B.A./B.S. in Philosophy in particular following procedures established by the Educational Policies Committee.

2. It also recommends that until the status of departments with suspension of degrees is resolved, these departments be eligible for consideration for additional positions if and when funding becomes available for those now frozen.

Reference: Future Policy

3(a). All programs/departments should be reviewed on a seven year cycle. This review may be conducted by an accrediting agency or a specially appointed panel of external reviewers. In case of a review panel, procedures adopted by the Educational Policies Committee for the conduct of reviews should be followed.

(b). All new programs should be introduced for a seven year period. A review suggested as Item (1) conducted in 6th year of program’s existence should become the basis for its continuation or deletion.

(c). An established program (in existence for at least seven years) graduating less than five students for three consecutive years should be reviewed immediately as provided for under Item (1). This review should become the basis for its continuation or deletion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Merge w/Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concur Retain 1 FTE-Extra Secs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Merge w/Soc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suspend MA degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. 1.33 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Retain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain Extra Secs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Suspend MFA degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. 2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeze 1 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Retain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain Extra Secs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Merge w/Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Merge 3 depts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. 4-yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. prog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase out STC prog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. 5FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHP</td>
<td>Change Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. School Concur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suspend BA/BS in Health</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suspend MA/MS in Health</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. BA/BS, in Performance &amp; Exercise Sci.</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. MA/MS in Performance &amp; Exercise Sci.</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocate Center for Pub. Health Stud.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Suspend degree</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. 2.33 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Suspend BA/BS Degree</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim. MAST/MST</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol Sci.</td>
<td>Suspend MA/MS</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Merge w/Anthro.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suspend MA/MS</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce 3 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Elim. EE option</td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Elim. CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>Elim. CJ</td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option in Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elim 2.22 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following changes have been made by the Transition Team since its initial recommendations were formulated in early February 1991. A number of these changes were made as a result of recommendations put forward by the Budget Committee. The eight points listed below are quoted from a memorandum written by Provost Frank to the Budget Committee Chair, dated April 10, 1991.

1. The Budget Committee recommended not suspending the MA degree in Anthropology. The Transition team changed its
recommendation to a reduction in faculty and courses at the graduate level.

- The Budget Committee recommended retaining the MFA in Art; the Transition Team changed its recommendation to suspension.

- The Budget Committee recommended that nothing be done to impair the program in Dance; the transition Team recommended that the departments of Dance and Music be consolidated rather than the departments of Dance and Theater.

- The Budget Committee recommended that the Standard Teacher Certification be phased out over a 5-year period; the Transition Team accepted the recommendation.

- The Budget Committee recommended retaining the athletic training minor and attaching the self-support Special P.E. Activities courses to the health studies unit; both recommendations are being considered.

- The Transition Team changed its initial recommendation to eliminate completely the School of Health and Human Performance. As a part of that change, it recommended that the Health programs and the tenured faculty in the Human Performance area be retained. That recommendation was accepted by President Ramaley.

- Consolidation of Sociology and Anthropology departments has been deferred until after external reviews have been completed.

- Provost Frank has written the chair of each department with a suspended degree program about planning for an external review as soon as possible AY 91-92, or, if an external review recently was performed, to plan with colleagues, the Dean, and where appropriate with others, to reinstate and/or reconfigure degree offerings.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
BY UCC, EPC, GC AND BC
The Educational Policies Committee has recommended an immediate review of all currently suspended programs in general and the BA/BS in Philosophy in particular. The University Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, and Budget Committee have recommended that currently suspended degrees be reinstated (noted as Retain in the above Table). The Budget Committee took no action on recommendations to suspend degrees in Physics and Political Science, in that no request for a hearing had been made at the time of its deliberations.

**FROZEN AND OTHER VACANT POSITIONS**

**AND OTHER COST SAVINGS**

At the present time there are approximately 15 faculty positions frozen in 10 departments, representing some $520,000.00. It is anticipated that the salaries and OPE for these positions will not appear in the University’s budget for FY 1991-92. The projected savings from frozen positions will be used to help meet the 4 million dollar budget reduction necessitated by Measure 5.

The provisional budget reduction plan for FY 1991-92 projects an approximate savings of $1,500,000 to be realized from not filling vacant positions and lecture sections, retirements, phased retirements that have been completed and non-renewal of contracts. Combined they represent nearly 31 FTE. Projected savings from these actions represent a large portion of the required budget reduction.

Each of the four committees is painfully aware of the negative impact that will likely occur on the curricular offerings in the affected departments as a result of vacant positions not being filled. The Budget Committee urges University administration to restore any lost positions to the respective departments and to authorize recruitment for vacant positions as soon as it is financially feasible to do. It is also the recommendation of the several committees that have reviewed the University’s plan for financial reduction, that departments having degrees suspended not be further penalized through a permanent loss of frozen faculty positions.

**EARLY RETIREMENTS**

Projected net savings from faculty opting for early retirement likely will not be realized for FY 1991-92. Faculty eligible for this option apparently have chosen to wait until 1992-93 before beginning retirement. Failure to realize these savings makes not filling frozen and
other vacant positions all the more critical in meeting the target budget reduction figure.

BUDGETARY IMPACT ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The net result of the budgetary cuts appears to mean more work and fewer resources for the affected departments. The initial assessment was that there would be fewer faculty positions and less money for lecture sections, necessitating fewer students served. The projected target enrollment for next academic year had been lowered from 9,438 FTE to that of 8,500 FTE. However, the Legislature has stated that the institution is not to reduce its enrollments, and has set an enrollment target of 9,120 FTE (approximately this year's enrollment at PSU). These figures represent a disparity of approximately 7.29% between the number of students we are obligated to serve and resources available for the staffing of classes. In light of these circumstances, the Budget Committee recommends the following considerations for AY 1991-92, only:

- That each department review its utilization of FTE for optimum production of SCH;
- The major portion of carryover monies and one-time savings be allocated for extra wage sections;
- Departments should review late afternoon and evening offerings for opportunities to increase SCH, and provide for increased accessibility.

We recommend this emphasis on the use of additional lecture sections as an emergency measure. In the long-run, a strategy which utilizes lecture sections at the expense of full-time faculty positions is contrary to the goal of the University.
X) University Planning Council. The University Planning Council shall advise the Faculty Senate and the President on educational policies and planning for the University. Membership of the Council shall be composed of the Chairperson of the Budget Committee, five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from each of the professional schools, one faculty member from the Library, one faculty member from the School of Extended Studies, one faculty member representing unranked faculty, one Management Services person, one classified person, and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate). The Chair shall be selected from the membership by the Committee on Committees. The Provost, the Budget Director, and a representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning shall serve as consultants at the request of the Council. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the Budget Committee.

The Council shall:

1. In consultation with the appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-range plans and priorities for the achievement of the mission of the university.

2. Serve as the faculty advisory body to the President and to the Faculty Senate on matters of educational policy and planning for the University.

3. Undertake matters falling within its competence on either its own initiative or by referral from the President, faculty committees, or the Faculty Senate.

4. Form subcommittees as needed to carry out its work.

5. Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each term.

6. Coordinate with the President's external advisory board by having the UPC Chairperson sit on the advisory board.

Rationale: The two committees, EPC and UPC, have evolved over years under various administrations. Faculty input into the governance process can be better obtained if educational policy and planning are focused into one committee. The issues of budget matters should remain with the Budget Committee.

Specific Changes to the University Planning Council make it conform to other constitutional committees in its composition, fold in the function of the Educational Policies Committee and give the committee the flexibility to form its own working committees and subcommittees for specific tasks.
On 1 October 1990 the Senate charged the Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) with the task of investigating the options for and effectiveness of a curriculum requirement which exposes students to “a diverse range of ethnic, cultural and gender based perspectives” and to “analyze current resources, curriculum structures, and circumstances at PSU relative to which options and alternatives best fit our local conditions.” We were also directed to invite the participation in our enquiry of appropriate persons at PSU.

In accordance with the last request, we have consulted with the following persons:

Johanna Brenner, Coordinator, Women’s Studies Certificate Program
Darrell Millner, Chair, Department of Black Studies
Maria Alanis, Chair, Minority Affairs Council
Dr. Carlos Cortés, Department of History, University of California, Riverside. Dr. Cortés is an expert on studies in cultural diversity who visited PSU on 17 May of this year. Additional consultations were made by telephone and by mail with the University of Oregon, San Francisco State University, Bowling Green State University and the University of Michigan.

We cannot say much about the effectiveness of courses on cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. We do not know of any study on the effect of such courses. If the Senate wishes to know the answer to this question it must be prepared to commission the study itself. We believe it should be the work of an ad-hoc group established for that purpose. The question will not be an easy one. The answer will require some decision on an adequate criterion of success for such courses. The study should include measures before and after the implementation of the courses and some comparison with a control population of students who are similar to students taking the courses. The work would be difficult and long. Probably that is why it has not yet been done.

In the present financial circumstances of the University, we do not recommend a special course in cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. This decision may be re-evaluated when the finances of the University allow.

For the present, the ARC recommends, by a vote of three to two, that Portland State University establish a requirement for graduation of a minimum of six units of courses in cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. This requirement may be met by courses taken to meet the General Education Requirement or by courses taken as electives. The courses approved for meeting this requirement should be chosen by a committee appointed by the Faculty Senate. The ARC also recommends that the Senate arrange an evaluation of this requirement when it has been in place for two years, that evaluation to include its effect on transfer students.

Marek Elzanowski, MTH
Hugo Maynard, PSY (Chair)
Darrell Millner, BST
Scott Wells, CE
Howard Wineberg, CENS
Carl Bergwall, Student Representative
Nancy Tang, OAA (ex officio)
Robert Tufts, RO (ex officio)
INTRODUCTION OF PLUS/MINUS GRADING SYSTEM

An explanation of credits and grades is included for the proposed introduction of plus/minus grading system.

Educational Policies Committee recommends that a plus/minus grading system be introduced for both undergraduate and graduate student grades beginning with the fall term of 1992. The four-point scale including pluses and minuses should be adopted as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
A &= 4.0 \\
A- &= 3.7 \\
B+ &= 3.3 \\
B &= 3.0 \\
B- &= 2.7 \\
C+ &= 2.3 \\
C &= 2.0 \\
C- &= 1.7 \\
D+ &= 1.3 \\
D &= 1.0 \\
D- &= 0.7 \\
F &= 0
\end{align*}
\]
All of the program actions below were passed by the Graduate Council at its May 22 meeting and are referred to the Faculty Senate for action at the June meeting. Copies of supporting documents are available for review at the Reserve Library.

Program Changes

1. MA/MS in Civil Engineering
   - Deletion of the requirement for candidates to have passed the national Fundamentals of Engineering examination.

2. MA/MS in Electrical and Computing Engineering
   - Requirement of a minimum of three credits of graduate seminar, taken at one credit per term.

3. MA/MS in Special Education
   - Revisions in School of Education Advisor's Handbook statements which outline the requirements for MA/MS in Special Education for each of two options: master's degree only or master's degree with certification.
   - Final project presentation to be evaluated by the master's committee of the School of Education, rather than a final oral examination committee.

4. MA/MS in Sociology
   - Elimination of the qualifying examination for the Master's degree in Sociology.

5. MS in Administration of Justice
   - Substitution in Core Requirements of PA 551 to replace USP 532 and 534, changing USP 530 to USP 630, and elimination of the requirement for SySc 511 and SySc 512, with addition of 9 hours of elective credits.

6. MURP in Urban and Regional Planning
   - New configuration of required workshop courses. Formerly USP 558 (6 credit hours), USP 557 (6 credit hours), and USP 509 (6 credit hours); replaced by USP 558 (8 credit hours), and either USP 557 (4 credit hours) or USP 559 (4 credit hours).
   - USP 510 Computer Applications in Urban Studies increased from 1 to 2 credit hours, making total credits for degree increase from 72 to 73.

New Program

Early Childhood Education Endorsement in the School of Education.
Program is designed to meet the goal of preparing teachers to effectively teach and guide young children. Will be offered through the departments of: Curriculum & Instruction; Educational Policy, Foundations, & Administration; and Special & Counselor Education. Program consists of existing courses and one new course. Configuration of courses will meet requirements of the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) for Early Childhood Education endorsement which has been recently approved. In anticipation of its approval, by TSPC, PSU has had the program and faculty in place for a number of years.
OFFICIAL POLICY ON COMBATING SEXUAL HARASSMENT

GENERAL STATEMENT AND APPLICATION

It is the policy of Portland State University to maintain the University community as a place of work and study for faculty, staff, and students, free of sexual harassment and all forms of sexual intimidation and exploitation. Because sexual harassment violates the trust and respect essential to the university and preservation of such a community, and because sexual harassment is a form of discrimination on the basis of sex,

+Portland State University specifically prohibits any act of sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment may constitute a violation of one or more civil rights and non-discrimination laws, including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972. It also violates Portland State University's policies and procedures on discrimination (IMD 1.501 to 1.508), and those of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

+The university is concerned and prepared to take action to prevent and correct such behavior.

+Individuals who engage in such behavior are subject to discipline.

Complaints about Faculty or staff by students should also be referred to OSA, which will provide information and mediation or refer to the Office of Affirmative Action.

Faculty and staff complaints not involving students should be directed to the Affirmative Action Office for information and assistance.

A PROTECTED PROCESS

Individuals who complain will be protected from intimidation, threats, coercion or discrimination resulting from filing a complaint, providing information, or participating in an investigation of alleged discrimination.

DEFINITION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The determination of what constitutes sexual harassment will vary with the particular circumstances, but it may be described generally as repeated and unwanted sexual behavior, such as physical contact and verbal comments or suggestions,
which adversely affects the working or learning environment.

Although it can take many forms, sexual harassment is typically the use of power or authority by one person to pressure another into accepting unwelcome verbal, physical, or sexual conduct and:

1. submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's education or employment;

2. submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for academic or employment decisions affecting that individual;

3. such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's academic or professional performance or creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive educational, employment or living environment.

Sexual harassment may occur in a variety of relationships, including faculty and students, supervisors and employees, co­employees and co-students. Sexual harassment may occur between people of the same or different gender. It is not limited to males harassing females.

WHAT TO DO:

If you believe you are being sexually harassed, there are a number of formal and informal measures that you can initiate. You can also use these measures to deal with the harassment of someone else.

Informal measures may include:

1. An individual may solve a problem of sexual harassment personally by means of direct discussion with the other party or by other informal avenues that he or she feels are appropriate. Professional staff within the Office of Student Affairs and Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) are available to listen and to advise at any time.

Literature about how to deal directly with the offender is available in CAPS.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT NETWORK

2. The Women's Faculty Caucus of PSU has developed a Sexual Harassment Network which will provide an informal communication system of faculty contact for individuals with concerns about sexual harassment.

For information concerning the Network, contact Counseling and Psychological Services.

3. In the event that such direct and immediate attempts are not successful or, in the view of the individual, are not possible, the individual should take the complaint to the Office of Affirmative Action.

4. Should you consider a formal complaint, carefully document all incidents noting dates, specific behaviors and witnesses, if any.
Keep good records of the incidents and their effects. In determining whether alleged behavior constitutes sexual harassment, the university will examine the record as a whole and all aspects of the circumstances, such as the nature of the sexual advances and the context in which the alleged incidents occurred.

Careful documentation will make this review easier should it be necessary to move to a formal grievance.

5. Any person alleging sexual harassment may informally present a complaint to the Affirmative Action Officer, or if preferred by the complainant, to a designated officer in the Office of Counseling and Psychological Services who is the same sex as the complaint.

The officer shall treat the allegations confidentially and attempt to resolve the complaint in an informal manner. Counsel and advice regarding formal steps which may be taken may also be obtained at this time.

Formal measures entail:

A. Contacting the Affirmative Action Office and presenting a formal grievance for review.

Other formal avenues include filing a complaint through external enforcement agencies such as the Equal Employment Opportunity commission for employment cases, and the Office of civil Rights of the Department of Education for student cases. In addition, actions can be taken through the court system. There are specific requirements and time lines for filing these complaints. The Office of Affirmative Action can give you information about specific procedures.

No amount of guidelines, details, and examples could adequately cover the possible range of human behavior, the difficult judgments that may need to be made, or the other dilemmas that may surround ethical issues such as sexual harassment.

If you encounter behavior on the part of any member of our campus community which you believe may be in violation of a University policy or code of conduct, seek advice from the Office of Student Affairs or the Affirmative Action Office.
**Consensual Relationship Policy**

Portland State University is concerned with those consensual relationships where there is a definite power differential between the two parties. Therefore, the University will view it as unethical if instructors, supervisors or other employees engage in amorous relations with students and employees enrolled in their classes or subject to their supervision, even when both parties appear to have consented to the relationship.

**Definition**

As used here, the term:

"instructor" means all who teach at the University---faculty members, academic staff instructional personnel, and graduate students with teaching or tutorial responsibilities;
"student" means any person studying with the instructor;
"supervisor" means any person with authority to hire and fire, grant raises and oversee task performance;
"employee" means any person working for the supervisor;
"consensual relationships" are those amorous, romantic or sexual relationships in which both parties appear to have consented.

**Rationale**

The University's educational mission is promoted by professionalism in campus relationships. Professionalism is fostered by an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Consenting romantic and sexual relationships between employee and student (where there is an instructional or an employment relationship between them) have the potential to harm this atmosphere and to undermine professionalism and hinder fulfillment of the University's educational mission.
Codes of ethics for most professional associations forbid professional/client relationships; the relationships enumerated in this section should be viewed in this context. In the case of student and instructor, for example, the respect and trust accorded the instructor by the student, as well as the power exercised by the instructor in giving grades, thesis advice, evaluations, recommendations for further study and future employment, greatly diminish the student's actual freedom of choice concerning an amorous or sexual relationship.

All instructors, supervisors and other employees should understand that there are substantial risks in even an apparently consenting relationship where a power differential exists. For example, amorous relationships between instructors and students are wrong when the instructor has professional responsibility for the student. Such situations greatly increase the chances that the instructor will abuse his or her power and sexually exploit the student.

An instructor who enters into a sexual relationship with a student (or a supervisor with an employee) where a professional power differential exists, must realize that if a charge of sexual harassment is subsequently lodged, it will be exceedingly difficult to prove immunity on grounds of mutual consent.

Voluntary consent by the student in such a relationship is suspect, given the power differential of the relationship. Moreover, other students may be affected by such unprofessional behavior because the instructor may appear to be advancing one student's interest at the expense of others, or it may appear that obtaining benefits is contingent upon amorous or sexual favors.

**Consensual Relationships in the Instructional Context**

No instructor shall have an amorous relationship (consensual or otherwise) with a student who is enrolled in a course being taught by the instructor or whose academic work (including work as a teaching assistant) is being supervised by the instructor.

**Consensual Relationships Outside the Instructional Context**

In relationships outside the classroom or work area, the instructor, supervisor or other employee may face serious conflicts of interest and should remove himself or herself from any decisions that may reward or punish the student or employee involved.
The person in position of power who fails to withdraw from participation in activities or decisions that may reward or penalize a student or employee with whom he or she has had an amorous relationship will be deemed to have violated his or her ethical obligation to the student, to the employee, to colleagues and to the University community.