

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Faculty Senate Monthly Packets

University Archives: Faculty Senate

3-1-1988

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet March 1988

Portland State University Faculty Senate

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

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.


Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet March 1988" (1988). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 177.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/177>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

To: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate

From: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty 

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on March 7, 1988, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the February 1, 1988, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

Question for Provost Martino, submitted by Ann Weikel:

"Please explain the new rules for the calculation of sabbatical pay.
What is the current status of the same?"

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees -- None

F. Unfinished Business -- None

G. New Business

*1. Motion regarding Constitutional Status of the University Planning Council

"That the University Planning Council become a Faculty Senate Committee with all the rights and duties attached thereto."

2. Discussion and Action regarding Plan for the '90s

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of the February 1, 1988, Meeting

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meetings, March 7 and 14, 1988
Presiding Officer: Marjorie Burns
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present: Alberty, Balogh, Bennett, Bowlden, Brenner, Burns, Chapman, Cheifetz, Cheshire, Cogan, Constans, Cumpston, Dahl, Daily, J., Daily, M., Dressler, Edwards-Allen, Etesami, Goekjian, Goslin, Gurtov, Hammond, Ingersoll-Dayton, Jackson, Jones, Kimmel, Kosokoff, Lendaris, Limbaugh, Lockwood, Lutes, Martinez, Matschek, Maynard, McBride, Midson, Moor, Morris, Nussbaum, L., Olsen, Parshall, Peterman, Poulsen, Powell, Reece, Ronacher, Rose, Sampson, Scruggs, Tang, Thompson, Walker, Weikel, Westover, Wetzel, Wyers, Wurm.

Alternates Present: Cabelly for Anderson, Van Halen for Badi'i, Herrington for Boyle, Hales for Heflin.

Members Absent: Ellis, West.

Ex-officio Members Present: Bogue, Diman, Edgington, Erzurumlu, Hardt, Harrell, Martino, Miller, Nichols, Reardon, Schendel, Sheridan, Stephens, Toulan.

March 14 Meeting

Members Present: Alberty, Badi'i, Bowlden, Boyle, Brenner, Burns, Chapman, Cheifetz, Cogan, Constans, Cumpston, Dahl, Daily, J., Dressler, Ellis, Etesami, Goekjian, Gurtov, Heflin, Ingersoll-Dayton, Kimmel, Kosokoff, Lockwood, Lutes, Matschek, McBride, Moor, Nussbaum, L., Olsen, Parshall, Peterman, Poulsen, Powell, Reece, Rose, Sampson, Scruggs, Tang, Thompson, Weikel, West, Westover, Wetzel, Wyers, Wurm.

Alternates Present: Cabelly for Anderson, Mohr for Goslin, Petersen for Hammond, Holloway for Limbaugh.

Members Absent: Balogh, Bennett, Cheshire, M.L. Daily, Edwards-Allen, Lendaris, Jackson, Jones, Martinez, Maynard, Midson, Morris, Ronacher, Walker.

Ex-officio Members Present: Bogue, Diman, Edgington, Erzurumlu, Everhart, Hardt, Harrell, Martino, Miller, Reardon, Ross, Schendel, Sheridan, Stephens, Toulan.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes of the February 1, 1988, meeting were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

HEATH reported that the State Board at its February meeting reaffirmed its decision to move to the semester system. The word is that most community colleges will not convert at this time, but the Chancellor thought that that would cause no problems. Certainly it will cause some inconvenience, as admissions personnel can testify. Departments should now move rapidly to convert and to prepare the documents which have been distributed. Questions about the process and forms should be circulated to Gordon Kilgour, Chairperson of the Curriculum Committee, which will be the review body.

QUESTION PERIOD

BURNS said she would start with the questions regarding the allegations of misuse of Foundation funds, so that non-Senators who were only interested in that item could move on out. She provided the following background: the Channel 6 report about what was happening with the Foundation funds caused quite a stir in the faculty and community, and following that the Steering Committee met in two sessions to draft a list of questions to the President. BURNS was at the President's house two weeks ago on Tuesday as ex-officio member of the Foundation Board, and there she heard the first report about the Foundation funds from the perspectives of Bill Lindblad and Judy Nichols. On Thursday she was back again at the President's house, and the President at that time told her that he would not be coming to this Senate meeting to answer the questions himself. BURNS then contacted Edgington who said he would come and respond to the questions, however uncomfortable a position that might be, but had to check that out first. Later that day he called to say that neither he nor Judy Nichols would answer the questions addressed to the President; rather, the questions would be answered in another form. BURNS then wrote a letter to Foundation President Bill Lindblad to see if he would answer the questions. As she was typing the letter, the President's official response arrived to say that he would not answer the questions; the letter also suggested that someone from the Foundation could provide the answers.

Lindblad on Friday said he was sure that he was coming. On Monday mid-morning he called to say that he would be very willing to come to the Senate and answer questions but that he did not wish to make a public forum out of such a meeting.

GOEKJIAN asked what it would take not to make a public forum out of such a meeting. BURNS said she inquired about that, and LINDBLAD said that it would be for Senators only, no students, no administrators, no AV persons operating the recording machines, and above all no media. GOEKJIAN wondered if that was legal, or if the Senate was governed by the Oregon open meeting law. BURNS reported that the Chancellor's Office had said that executive sessions could be held but were usually reserved for personnel matters. She added that the Senate would have to decide whether it wanted to hold a closed meeting even if it were legitimate.

BURNS read a portion of the President's letter: "As to your questions concerning use of Foundation funds, these issues were dealt with at length and publicly at the last meeting of the Foundation Board at which some PSU faculty members were present. The Foundation is a private organization and

I would think that if you desire more detail with respect to its use of funds it would be appropriate for you to request these details from the Foundation." BURNS said she explained how the Senate meetings were run to Mr. Lindblad, but he decided not to come.

Just before the meeting began, NICHOLS said that she and EDGINGTON would speak but would not answer the specific questions addressed to the President. EDGINGTON, however, said that when he finished maybe the questions will have been answered; if not, he was willing to respond to them directly, including the specific figures requested.

BURNS also reported that Lindblad had wanted to make a speech asking people to give money to unrestricted funds. BURNS reminded him that the major questions in fact dealt with the use of those funds, but he said nothing had been done improperly and that it would be paid back. No money had been diverted, but it would be paid back.

At this point BURNS began to read the first question, but EDGINGTON interrupted and said that he and Nichols would not respond to those specific questions. Instead they wanted to make brief statements. NICHOLS was given the floor, and she said she welcomed the opportunity to speak and to say that the Foundation's goals and the faculty's are one and the same. There are two goals: 1) To make the monies raised on behalf of the University grow, and 2) to fulfill our mission of gift stewardship, that people who give are comfortable with the checks and balances put on the system. NICHOLS admitted that it is of very real concern to all associated with the Foundation that, because of some allegations, we seem to have found ourselves in the position where this is being questioned. She said that there is no truth to the rumor that monies have been diverted, that in fact monies have been misappropriated, or that anyone who has made a gift to the Foundation need have a concern that that gift is not being used for the purpose designated.

NICHOLS said that a major concern in the Foundation was to provide private money for the future development of the University--for faculty and students. She reported that the national trend in giving is to restrict funds for specific causes. E.g., at the University of Oregon 89% of the gifts are restricted. That does cause a problem potentially, namely how do you find the seed money that raises other money to gifts, and how do you cover administrative and fund raising costs in the meantime. She said two documents dealing with guidelines for raising money had been distributed to Deans and Directors in December.

NICHOLS then talked about the fund labeled "President Sicuro's Expenses." She said that fund is mislabeled. Over time three different types of expenses have been attributed to that fund. All those expenses are legitimate; however, it would have been much better if the three types would have been separate out so they didn't appear to be part of a single entity. The three types are 1) direct compensations to the President, agreed upon in getting him to move from Southern Oregon to Portland State; this involved a continuation and enhancement of a \$500,000 life insurance policy, with Mrs. Sicuro and the Foundation being 50/50 beneficiaries, 2) business-related expenses, involving the use of a car and memberships at specific clubs where business can be transmitted, 3) development activities, such as

Advisory Board meetings, University Board meetings (e.g., Foundation, Alumni), faculty and visitor receptions. NICHOLS said that this third area was by far the largest expenditure.

BURNS said that Lindblad and Nichols had agreed that though the records of the Foundation were private, their whole existence was dependent upon the good will of the public and the records would therefore be open. She expressed hope that Edgington would therefore address the specific questions.

EDGINGTON reported that four weeks ago he was assigned the additional duty of supporting the Foundation for the business support/financial budget management. But since then the accountant for the Foundation took two weeks vacation and was sick for one week, giving EDGINGTON only one week to look at the records. However, he promised to give all the answers he had discovered and answer follow-up questions.

The amount receiving the notoriety was \$44,750--the "Natale Sicuro Expense Account." There was also about a \$2,000 figure identified to Mrs. Sicuro, for a total of \$46,764. An examination of all the records, the American Express charges, and all the details showed that \$22,354 tracks to the support package the Executive Committee had approved for the President for the two different years. They approved approximately \$20,000--but with no ceiling--for each of the two years, starting September 15, 1986, through June 30, 1987, and July 1, 1987, through June 30, 1988. The actual, true February 3 total was \$22,354. This figure breaks down as follows:

Car leasing (1986-87)	\$2,708	
(1987-88)*	<u>2,973</u>	\$5,681
Life, car, and liability insurance (1986-87)	\$1,624	
(1987-88)	<u>2,213</u>	\$3,837
Development and campaign costs (1986-87)	\$8,330	
(1987-88)	<u>4,506</u>	\$12,836
Travel L. Sicuro, Conferences (1986-87)	\$1,502	
Travel L. Sicuro, Italy (1987-88)	<u>1,791</u>	\$3,293
Entertainment/meetings/lunches (1986-87)	\$2,239	
(1987-88)	<u>2,715</u>	\$4,954
Symphony tickets		\$2,780
Dues/memberships (University Club, Willamette Athletic Club)		\$1,550

*Reflects the period July 1, 1987, to March 1, 1988

Furniture	\$13,000
Dinners (Advisory & Foundation Boards)	9,917
Baseball scholarship	300
Reception	270
Flowers for meetings	525
Books	118

EDGINGTON explained that the furniture replaced furniture purchased by the Women's Association and was either due for replacement or was of such bulk that it did not suit the Sicuro's entertainment style.

EDGINGTON offered to answer any questions the faculty still had. BURNS turned to the specific questions submitted to the President asked about expenditures made out of the Foundation for Sicuro and his family, and which would be considered additional income and perquisites. EDGINGTON said that certainly in today's environment auto leasing and the life insurance policy (notwithstanding the Foundation being 1/2 beneficiary) would be considered additional income and should be itemized. Most of the President's own expenses and his wife's travel would probably not be income. If he itemized, it would probably wash out. If he can't explain all of the travel to IRS, then he's going to pay tax on it EDGINGTON said.

BURNS then asked about other benefits coming to the President through using Food Services, work study students and security guards. She reported that at times three security guards were used at the President's home, leaving only one for the entire campus. EDGINGTON responded that the house is an extension of the campus, and the state employees are still employees of the state whether they work on campus or at the state-owned house. BURNS, however, questioned the need for three officers at the home to assist with direction giving for parking while the campus with thousands of students is left with only one guard. EDGINGTON countered that he did not know of any instance where the security on campus had been diminished; generally students are added, he said. BURNS still questioned other perquisites, such as food services, and insisted that they were costs and asked who paid for them. EDGINGTON said the state paid for them.

BURNS referred to question 4 regarding what reporting the Foundation did of these expenses. Did they report to the faculty, the public, the state? EDGINGTON explained that the Foundation is a private organization and only reported back to Foundation. Someone on the Foundation is probably looking to see that the President complies pretty much within the executive support package.

BURNS then asked about what restricted and/or designated Foundation funds have been spent on President Sicuro and his family. EDGINGTON thought that Nichols had already answered that question. GOEKJIAN recalled that Nichols had said that the reports in the media were wrong and he wanted to know how they had got it so wrong. EDGINGTON tried to explain that at times money from restricted accounts may spill over into the unrestricted account. This is not wrong, and the auditors have been made aware of it. He said, however, that he was not aware of this until it became a news item. The assistant attorney generals have said it was not uncommon. The problem comes when too much restricted money has been spent that one cannot respond to the uses required of the restricted money.

CONSTANS asked about the Oregonian report which revealed that the interest from designated funds had been used as undesignated funds. NICHOLS insisted that parts of the report were wrong; only interest from endowed accounts was used. She said that donors did not have to be asked. Diverted funds are noted and accounts will be credited when money becomes available. Only about \$100,000 has been borrowed, a small amount compared to the total of approximately \$2,250,000. Not all designated funds need to be available at all times. BURNS reported that Lindblad had said it would take three to four years to pay back.

NICHOLS said that three years ago a sum of \$100,000 of unrestricted funds were spent on a computer system for the alumni office. She added that every year \$25,000 for scholarships comes out of the unrestricted funds, \$17,000 faculty travel grants, approximately \$10,000 for funding receptions, and this year \$10,000 to the Honors Program.

BURNS asked about the legality of the practice. EDGINGTON reported that auditors knew of no prohibitions, and there is no problem with the practice, unless there were a "run on the bank."

KOSOKOFF asked if the Foundation was involved in negotiations with Sicuro when he negotiated items such as his wife's travel prior to his coming here and why that was so. BOGUE said that the Chancellor told the President that the Foundation would hope to support the same kind of support package that had been in place at Southern Oregon. BOGUE took the request to the Foundation Board, and they supported it without any problem.

KOSOKOFF asked about the propriety of paying \$1,500 initiation fees plus monthly dues to the University Club which still discriminates against women. EDGINGTON suggested that question be taken to the Foundation; they had approved the entire package.

NUSSBAUM asked if anybody really expected faculty members to give a penny to the Foundation so that it can buy symphony tickets for the President when faculty have to buy their own on about one-third of his salary. EDGINGTON explained that tickets were bought for potential donors and supporters of the University who were being cultivated. PSU is not the only school using that system, and we are probably very low in expenditures of this sort.

JONES asked if Dr. Sicuro was on campus today and was told that he had been this morning.

J. DAILY asked who else was receiving club membership. EDGINGTON replied that there possibly was someone else, but he said he did not know how many other memberships the Foundation was supporting.

ANDERSON understood that when banks were given money for trust funds they do not use that money for anything else; it is quite different with money put into savings and checking accounts which can be used elsewhere. He wanted to know if designated funds given to the Foundation were put into trust funds. EDGINGTON thought it was put more into trust funds, but he said he did not know. NICHOLS said that the FOUNDATION had more than 800

different accounts; some of those accounts are designated for departments or specific purposes; some are restricted and go just towards a particular purpose such as scholarship; the others are unrestricted. The portfolio is managed as a whole, and each of those accounts is assigned shares in it.

But WALKER explained that if the beginning general fund is zero, and if anything is spent out of the general fund when everything is in restricted funds, and if no gifts are received, then there has been a "bank run"; a bank run is a decline in the rate of gifts. That is how a bank run occurs, and to say it cannot occur is simply bad bookkeeping, he said. EDGINGTON believed a service charge was instituted January 1 to take care of some of the costs for overhead. WALKER countered that if the service charge wasn't big enough to cover the expenses from the unrestricted account, you still had your bank run. EDGINGTON agreed. But NICHOLS said it was too early to tell. When she came on May 1 she analyzed the situation and put into place this levee. That the intent to do that was first announced to all parties involved before the service charge was put into place January. We will not know until June 30 what the result will be. The assumption is it will cover the needs. The charge is 5% on newly raised money, regardless of the size of the donation. NICHOLS said that the cost of fundraising ranges between 9-25%; a PSU a figure beneath that was deliberately chosen.

GOEKJIAN asked if the new, higher expenditure had in fact raised more money than previously. NICHOLS said the income is approximately the same, but the Foundation has gone from 3000 to 4000 donors, thus increasing the base for support. There is also \$1,400,000 in bequests and planned gifts on record, and some of the expenditure has gone to produce brochures for those kind of pledges.

HAMMOND wanted to know if previous administrators had expense accounts or if this was something new. BOGUE answered that President Blumel had a leased car and certain events at his home covered, although the number of events now have been expanded significantly. BOGUE also explained that the Foundation purchased the computer equipment needed for the alumni office during a time when there was a moratorium on such purchases. The expenditure represents the biggest item of intra-borrowing from Foundation accounts and was approved by President Blumel and cleared ahead of time by the auditors.

MOOR asked if travel money, including Mrs. Sicuro's, came out of the development account. EDGINGTON answered in the affirmative. MOOR then asked how Mrs. Sicuro's travel to Italy could be calculated to increase donations to the Foundation. NICHOLS said that it would have been better to subdivide that one account. That expense was like a grant to the University, because Mrs. Sicuro traveled with the President to Italy, looking at the sister program in Italy; it was not personal travel but travel on University business. NICHOLS said that she was more than willing to acknowledge the fact that this account should have had a different label.

WALKER questioned a \$100,000 expense for the alumni office when classrooms are inadequate--students have fallen out of collapsing desks, chairs are so squeaky one cannot hear discussion, half of the light fixtures are disconnected, hallways are filthy (except on third floor CH). He said he had no problem with expenditures for fund raising, but the Alumni office was not the number one need in the present circumstances.

J. DAILY made the motion for "the Secretary to the Faculty to cause the following question to be put to the faculty in the form of a mail ballot: Do you have confidence in President Sicuro's continued ability to lead Portland State University? Yes or no?" The motion was seconded.

J. DAILY explained that he has been asked by the media how the faculty feels about this President. People in the community want to know and he has not been able to answer the question. It's time that the faculty told the community. We either support the President and get behind him or we don't. He said there are many more issues besides those that have been discussed today.

CONSTANS said she had also wanted to make a motion and read the following statement:

In view of the seriousness of the allegations made by KOIN and The Oregonian, and in view of the importance of the Foundation to the faculty, students, and to the image of the University, and in view of the Administration's limited address in response to Senate questions, we request Governor Goldschmidt and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to require President Sicuro or his administration to respond to Senate questions about Foundation money at the earliest possible time.

CONSTANS felt that the faculty needed to dig a little deeper. JONES, however, said that many questions had been answered today and thought there would be benefit in knowing how the faculty felt about President Sicuro. He was disappointed that the President Sicuro. He was disappointed that the President felt that he could not come to the Senate himself.

MARTINO said he wanted to make a short-term and a long-term comment. He was sorry that the short-term comment was a bit of an accusation. He found something terribly disingenuous in some of the comments made by a very small number of faculty during this whole stretch of time. He said when faced one-on-one these persons will admit that there is a hidden agenda. He said the administration could not possibly have been more thorough and open in its response to the every single question with respect to very specific dollar figures; he failed to see what other questions could be asked.

The Foundation has been audited thoroughly by a very reputable firm, and nothing even remotely illegal had been found. The Foundation will be audited again. MARTINO didn't think that request for further information with respect to uses of funds will show anything substantively new.

In commenting on the motion, MARTINO said he felt over the last several months like he had watched a Greek tragedy play itself out. He sees a University poised almost by accident of history and demographics on the verge of becoming something new and different, something the vast majority of the faculty want. But he said he saw what he believed was a minor group of that faculty hell-bent to prevent that from in fact happening. He regards that as very sad. Nobody could conceivably believe that there is something neutral and innocent and fact-finding in a scientific way about calling for a mail ballot for a vote of confidence. That is not a neutral act; it is

not simply a way of finding out if the faculty backs the President. Regardless of the results, it is a very destructive act. MARTINO therefore made a plea for reasonable prudence to those who really cared about the future of PSU. He said the faculty was really teetering on the brink of doing something irresponsible, a little mindless. Ironically, it would not do what some of the faculty think they want done. He asked the Senate to think very carefully about the consequences of this motion, because, if passed, it would do irreparable damage to PSU and will set the institution back a number of years.

BUNCH said it was arrogant to say that the future of PSU resides on what happens to Mr. Sicuro. MARTINO protested that he had said exactly the opposite. MOOR objected to the two claims of the Provost against those who support the motion, i.e., that there was only a small minority and that they are intent on holding up the progress of the University. MOOR said that if the Senate chose not to ask for this ballot it would give the impression that there were only a few faculty.

TOULAN also spoke about the seriousness of a no-confidence vote. If that were to be held, everyone should be aware of the accusations, and he said that none has been made. The shifting of money from one account to another is common practice, and all university presidents have expense accounts, from OSU, UO to Harvard and MIT. Only after a thorough investigation has been held should the faculty think about such a vote, and only if it were found that President Sicuro has violated all the norms of what other presidents do.

BATES said he had never seen morale lower at PSU in the last 25 years than it now is. Anyone thinking that this is due to a small band of inside agitators is profoundly uniformed. He was uneasy about a man who received a very solid raise when coming from Southern Oregon to PSU had to have more. When entertaining donors, BATES said, proper sources should be used from separate and restricted funds for that purpose, and he volunteered to donate \$100 toward that cause. He found it very disconcerting that this President had not engaged the faculty in any serious way, and he hoped that this very energetic man would come to the faculty and face the tough issues and the awkwardness.

MANDAVILLE said that he saw two agendas in the questions; there was the question of how money was used, but there was also an effort made in trying to bring the President to court. He suggested that the Budget Committee be given the assignment to examine the financial records.

A roll call vote on the motion resulted in the following:

38	No
16	Yes
8	Abstentions

NEW BUSINESS

MATSCHEK introduced the PSU Plan for the 90s and asked for Senate response and approval. Several Senators had a difficult time approving the plan,

not knowing what the final version would look like after several more revisions. Others were pleased that such an ambitious plan had been drafted which is catching the imaginations of the community and has received the enthusiastic approval of the University Advisory Council. While it is true that many details need to be worked out yet, it is a good starting document for now and will be refined over the next several years.

ALBERTY/LENDARIS moved "that the Faculty Senate goes on record as supporting the vision and goals stated in the PSU Plan for the 90s."

The Motion was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was recessed until March 14.

MARCH 14 Continuation

ANNOUNCEMENTS

BURNS announced that K-House would host the usual reception following today's meeting.

TANG gave the following report from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate:

The IFS met at Western Oregon State College on February 26-27, 1988. Attending the Friday afternoon meeting were Larry Pierce, Joe Sicotte and Ron Anderson from the Chancellor's Office and on Saturday morning, Ray Hoops.

A report of the last two OSBHE meetings included the following:

Endowed chairs--state matching funds will not be available and such matching is on "hold."

Foreign language requirement is on hold until a later date. Funding estimates have been made and the Board will not require until funding is available from the State.

Faculty personnel principles for quarter/semester conversion were approved.

The Presidential Search guidelines have been approved. IFS worked hard to encourage revisions on this procedure. The revised guidelines increases the number of faculty on the search committee to four and also provides a three-day period during which the finalists will be asked to come to the campus to meet with faculty and other interested groups. At the campus level, the Advisory Council/Senate Officers or some other designated group will have to coordinate efforts to get faculty comments regarding the finalists to the Board.

At the recent AAUP forum at OSU, it was suggested that a member of the faculty be appointed as an ex-officio member to the State Board

to improve communications and relations between faculty and Board. Mr. Hensley of the OSBHE has made this suggestion to the Board and will bring it to the agenda sometime in the future. It was recommended that the IFS be the group to designate such an individual.

At the IFS meeting in February, the senate members reaffirmed their commitment to take information and questions back to their respective senates/assemblies to encourage communication. TANG asked that all PSU Senators remember that they should serve as communications link to others in their own department and to faculty whose department is not represented in the Senate. Information should not stop here at this meeting but flow on to those who elected all of us.

Regarding semester conversion--the Chancellor's Office is planning on holding a hearing on each campus before the calendar is adopted. These will be held in Fall 1988. Work to prepare for alternatives for the semester calendar needs to be done during Spring. If the guidelines need to be changed, we must support any such recommendation and state how the guidelines would need to be altered.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. GOEKJIAN said he had some follow-up questions to last week's meeting, many of them in response to comments made then. He felt that there may be a misunderstanding or a misinterpretation of what the Senate is about; for example, Provost Martino's characterization of Senate business as "mindless and disingenuous." GOEKJIAN said this is not a witch hunt or character assassination. Faculty needed to know answers to be able to give answers to those asking them. He read the following questions and requested a written, direct response to them:

1. Is there money spent from Foundation funds for the use or benefit of Provost Frank Martino, Vice President Judith Nichols, Vice President Roger Edgington, or Dean Vergil Miller of the School of Business Administration and, if so, in what amounts and for what purposes?

2. Which Portland State University employees receive money from the Foundation and in what amounts and for what purposes?

3. Who submits recommendations to the Foundation for money to be spent for the use and benefit of Portland State University employees, who decides upon the money to be spent and what reporting is received by the Executive Committee and the Board of the Foundation?

4. Has money been spent for the use or benefit of President Sicuro or his family or members of the Portland State University Administration at a time when there were no unrestricted funds available without borrowing from the restricted funds?

5. Is there a special account for Mrs. Linda Sicuro, and, if so, what money has been spent for her use and benefit and for what specific purposes?

6. You have told us that money was loaned from restricted funds for unrestricted purposes and that you hope to have this money repaid within one to four years. At the time you loaned these restricted funds, did you tell the donors of these restricted funds that you were using this money for unrestricted purposes and obtain their permission?

7. We understand from the Channel 6 report that a "workable agreement" has been made to repay money loaned from restricted funds for unrestricted purposes. This being the case, what form does this agreement take, and may we see a copy of this agreement?

MARTINO said he could not respond to those questions, but he said he had to respond to Goekjian's characterization of the Provost's comments of the previous week. He protested he said nothing remotely resembling that and would have had to have been out of his mind to have said that. He defied him to find somewhere in anything he said the general characterization of Senate business as mindless and disingenuous. He felt he has been one of the strongest advocates of faculty and Senate power and took this accusation as a personal affront. He was heartily sorry if what he said could have been interpreted in that way.

CABELLY reviewed that the Senate had the power to appoint fact-finding committee to get answers to their questions. If people wanted to investigate matters, let them appoint a sub-committee. Meanwhile he urged, however, that we stop calling each other names. KOSOKOFF agreed with Cabelly and promised to stop calling people names if the Provost stopped branding those about to vote on a motion as a band of agitators.

2. WEIKEL wanted to know about the new calculation of sabbatical pay. REARDON explained the new OAR but pointed out that following the rule would be a violation of the PSU contract. Conversations will take place with the Chancellor's Office.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The constitutional amendment of Article IV, Section 4, 4c was passed.

NEW BUSINESS

1. BLANKENSHIP presented the motion "that the University Planning Council become a Faculty Senate Committee with all the rights and duties attached thereto." She said that would mean the Council will make an annual report to the Senate, and the Committee on Committees could appoint the members to the UPC.

MATSCHEK explained that the original charge of the UPC has been revised to include only some budgetary matters; the others (such as short-range budgets and financial exigency) would be handled by the Budget Committee. However, she recommended that the Educational Policies Committee

be dropped. BOB WISE also warned against direct duplication and even competition between two committees.

BRENNER argued against that idea, saying that in the past the EPC has dealt with such matters as CHIRON and ROTC, and she could not imagine the UPC dealing with those items. WEIKEL agreed.

MARTINO observed that there appeared to be a lot of overlap, but since the Senate wanted all three committees a way to solve the problem would be to make EPC and Budget sub-committees of the UPC.

TANG suggested that members from the UPC, Budget and Steering Committees and EPC meet together and work out the relationships among the three committees and present a proposal to the Senate. BLANKENSHIP agreed and withdrew her motion.

2. HARRELL asked for approval of the co-sponsorship of a video conference on racism on campus. The cost will come out of the Affirmative Action Office budget.

The Senate voted approval.

3. REECE read the following resolution:

WHEREAS, in the words of the Carnegie Commission Report, "Teachers need a command of the subjects they teach," and

WHEREAS the training and evaluation of competence in academic subjects can be performed only by the appropriate academic department, and

WHEREAS the rules proposed by the TSPC require only the passing of the NTE in a subject matter and no course work to demonstrate competency in a subject matter, and

WHEREAS the reliance on a single examination of any sort, including the NTE, is an inadequate measure of competence in an academic discipline, and

WHEREAS by violating these principles, the changes in teacher certification proposed by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission of Oregon would seriously lower the quality of preparation of middle- and high-school teachers in the subject matters that they teach with a consequent lowering of the quality of teaching in the schools, and

WHEREAS a further effect will be to reduce the number of persons in Oregon who possess skills critically needed for the state to compete economically and technologically,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of this University calls on the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission to withdraw its proposed changes, and

FURTHER that the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission be required to consult with representatives from all academic fields whose disciplines are represented in middle- and high-school curricula in developing further proposals for the improvement of teacher training, and

FURTHER that any such proposals strengthen the subject matter component of the preparation of teachers.

COOPER spoke to the resolution and stated that what TSPC had proposed was not workable. He said that the School of Education equally deplored the new certification rules, and this was not a turf battle.

EVERHART explained that TSPC had only specified minimum requirements and universities had the prerogative to add other competencies than the NTE score and to determine fully students' qualifications. He said that at PSU we would continue to ask the academic departments to make recommendations regarding students' subject-matter qualifications. He said he could provide a written statement making explicit the future process to be used.

The resolution was passed.

4. KOSOKOFF/J. DAILY moved "that questions raised by Professor Goekjian at this meeting, questions addressed to President Sicuro at the March 7 meeting, and the matter of President Sicuro's membership in the University Club, be referred to the Budget Committee and a report be made to the Faculty Senate at its May meeting."

A substitute motion by CABELLY referring the matter to the Steering Committee for an appointment of a task force failed.

The motion was then passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:30.

RESPONSE TO THE PSU PLAN FOR THE '90s

The Senate Steering Committee has determined the mechanism for obtaining Senate response to the draft of the first two years of the PSU Plan for the 90s is to solicit individual recommendations.

To help facilitate our discussion at the March 7 Senate meeting, please write out your concerns. These can then also be turned in for more careful consideration as revisions are made. Focus your attention on the following areas:

Editorial corrections/concerns

Organizational suggestion (e.g., priorities)

Substantive matters (e.g., themes/directions, budgeting, curriculum, pace, governance)

P.S. As can be imagined, a number of concerns have already come to the attention of the University Planning Council and are being addressed (e.g., the Library collections), but we are seeking response on all sections of the Plan.