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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 May 2, 1988, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the April 4, 1988, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   *1. Budget Committee, Annual Report -- White
   *2. University Athletics Board, Annual Report -- Gordon
   *3. University Honors Board, Annual Report -- Cain
   *4. Teacher Education Committee, Annual Report -- Swenson
   5. Spring Term Registration Up-date -- Tufts
F. Unfinished Business
   *1. Report by Minorities Affairs Council re Investigation on Misconduct -- Laguardia
   2. Report by Budget Committee re Investigation of Foundation Spending -- Anderson
G. New Business
   *1. Proposed Constitutional Amendments, Article IV, Section 4, Paragraph 4, 1 and 0 -- Hammond
   *2. ARC Recommendations for General University Requirements under Semesters -- Terdal
H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

E1 Budget Committee, Annual Report
E2 University Athletics Board, Annual Report
E3 University Honors Board, Annual Report
E4 Teacher Education Committee, Annual Report
F1 Report by Minorities Affairs Council re Investigation on Misconduct
G1 Proposed Constitutional Amendments, Article IV, Section 4, Paragraph 4, 1 and 0
G2 ARC Recommendations for General University Requirements under Semesters

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 5/2/88
Presiding Officer: Marjorie Burns
Secretary pro tem: Alan Cabelly


Members Absent: Etesami, Kimmel, Walker.

Ex-officio Members: Diman, Edgington, Erzurumlu, Harrell, Martino, Present: Nichols, Reardon, Ross, Stephens, Toulan.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the April 4 meeting were approved. On p. 46, Burns said that these "would perhaps be illegal." She later said, 2. "not spending restricted funds."

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. B. ANDERSON made the enclosed report for the Budget Committee's Task Force on the PSU Foundation. In response to KOSOKOFF's question, ANDERSON stated that the committee will make its final report in June.

TO: Faculty Senate
FR: Barry F. Anderson, for
The Budget Committee's Task Force on the PSU Foundation
Chair: Dick Halley
Members: Barry Anderson, E. Dean Anderson, Mike Henton, Janice Jackson, Sam White (ex officio)

ON: May 2, 1988

CONCERNING: Interim Report

1. Question of legality. We are waiting for the Attorney General's report.
2. Questions of propriety. We are seeking information on the allocation of funds to students, faculty, administration, and other categories. We are seeking information on policies for allocation, processes of allocation, and amounts allocated. We are seeking this information on the PSU Foundation for the past few years and also on other foundations.

3. Questions of efficiency. We are seeking information on monies invested in fund raising and monies realized from fund raising. We are seeking this information on the PSU Foundation for the past few years and also on other foundations.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

BURNS reported that she has received a directive from Provost Martino asking her to examine Foundation records and report what she has seen. She indicated that she has not been permitted to see all the records. She reported on the letter sent out to all faculty from the new faculty trust fund, which is trying to work as a healing unit with the Foundation. Trust fund trustees have 4 concerns.

1. the commingling of Foundation restricted and unrestricted funds, without any promissory notes.
2. the lack of openness.
3. Foundation decisions not being made according to its own regulations.
4. Inconsistencies from minutes of various Foundation meetings. In particular the decision to defer $60,000 in grants until the September meeting was reported simply as a decision to defer methods of funding the grants. Also, we were told that monies were not borrowed, but that Senators were told in the March meeting that $100,000 had been borrowed.

These are the concerns. She stated that she wants to see the new trust fund work with the Foundation, but that something is not straight.

BURNS also noted that the new trust fund is not openly soliciting funds, but has already received $750, and rejected one five-figure (later corrected to six-figure) donation. Additionally, it was not the Attorney General who requested that the name PSU not be used by the trust fund, but an attorney for the University.

BURNS then stated that members of the Foundation were present, and that they were people who we must listen to. Time is short, but they may speak for five minutes, and then we can ask questions.

Bill LINDBLAD, President of the Foundation, appreciated the opportunity to speak before the faculty. He is President of the Foundation, in for a one-year term, and will probably be replaced by Lee Koehn, who is an executive businessman and has been associated with the Foundation for four years. LINDBLAD also introduced Leigh STEPHENSON, an attorney who has been associated with the Foundation for 10 years, ever since a City Club report which recognized the potential of PSU. LINDBLAD is an executive in the electric company in town, and first got interested in PSU through Earl
Wantland. He found a large community group which wants PSU to become great. The Foundation is looked upon to generate gifts beyond what the legislature can do. We have had successes but must do better. The faculty community and administration support this. A year ago, to improve its operations, it hired an Executive Director/VP for Development, Judith Nichols. Significant improvements of business practices have occurred, but more improvements are necessary. These improved record keeping practices have been used as fodder for allegations. Marjorie was at our meeting last Tuesday. She told you some of the things that happened that day that she has trouble with. Many positive things also occurred at that time; perhaps with more time Marjorie would tell you about those also. Foundation Board members are committed to the success of this University, and to developing a public trust and confidence, and they want to fix any problems in the Foundation. We need a mutual trust and confidence to do this. BURNS agreed that we need the Foundation, along with its trust and confidence.

MOOR asked if Burns has the right to inspect Foundation records. LINDBLAD was uncertain of this, but said that he invited her to do that. BURNS indicated that LINDBLAD had not stopped her from seeing the records.

REECE asked about the April 29 letter to the faculty which indicated availability of funds to the campus. NICHOLS stated that $245,000 were small unrestricted gifts, generally under $100 each. Others included the Retzlaff Chair, the Tek Professorship, the Chiles Ethics Professorship, and $251,000 in equipment "gifts in kind," generally to engineering. This is not cash.

BURNS also indicated that both the Foundation and the trust fund need more unrestricted funds. LINDBLAD said that all funds are spent for restricted purposes, for the development of Portland State University. Any proposed expenditure which does not do this is not spent.

NUSSBAUM asked if Burns, Nichols, Sicuro, and Edgington are all ex officio. BURNS responded by saying that all these people are ex officio, but that some are more influential ex officio than others.

JONES concluded by expressing his extreme gratitude to Foundation members for their willingness to serve on the Foundation, and for their willingness to attend the Senate today.

TANG stated that the Search Committee for the new Chancellor was continuing to work. She asked that any comments be forwarded to her immediately.

BURNS shared additional inconsistencies with the Foundation. These included places where she was given different answers and was not allowed to see things. MOOR asked if B. Anderson could share documents with her. BURNS responded that she and Anderson are sharing documents. She is also receiving information from the television networks.

GREENFIELD expressed the concern that the Foundation Board members have high intentions, but that they are being made fools of. He feels some responsibility to give them some advice about what they are getting themselves into. Harmonious relations must be maintained between the Foundation and the Senate. The Board is apparently getting bad advice, acting
naively, and better shape up before they do more damage to themselves and PSU. BURNS stated that in the Board meetings she felt like the snake in the garden, and that jokes are made at the expense of faculty, as if they are dusty eggheads who need to be led into the twenty-first century and that we don't know what's going on and are afraid of change. In fact, it is the Board members who don't know what is going on. They do not understand the inconsistencies. HAMMOND asked if the Budget Committee should also advise Board members. ALBERTY suggested that the two current committees, the Budget Committee and the Attorney General, are investigating these issues. TANG stated that the final written report should be forwarded to the Board.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. WHITE presented the Annual Report of the Budget Committee.
2. GORDON presented the Annual Report of the University Athletics Board.
3. BUÉLL presented the Annual Report of the University Honors Board.

COGAN asked if the Honors Board has used money for its speakers. REARDON responded that $4000-$5000 is distributed yearly from the Foundation and $5000-$7000 from the Tucker Foundation. This is likely to continue.

4. SWENSON presented the Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee. NUSSBAUM asked about the recommendation regarding reorganization of educational training. SWENSON reported the following changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Area</th>
<th>Academic Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the academic area has been cut off. Teachers might become more effective practitioners, but know nothing of the content area. TANG asked who would determine degree requirements. SWENSON said this was still up in the air.

5. TUFTS reported that spring term, 4th week registration was up 1.7% in head count and 3.1% in student credit hours.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

LAGUARDIA presented the Report by Minorities Affairs Council regarding investigation on Misconduct. HOROWITZ stated that he was involved in bringing the initial allegations to the public. He repeated a full list of allegations of racial and other misconduct against members of student government. He also reported that the PSU administration might have quashed the investigation. JONES asked if the HOROWITZ version was essentially accurate. LAGUARDIA assumed that many different versions of the facts occurred, and that they are not as clear cut as HOROWITZ says. Further, at the time of the incident, the University
had no Affirmative Action Officer. The concern is of course about racism and the treatment of students on campus. PSU needs to do a better job of recruiting more minority faculty. This also hurts white students. We need to attract qualified, inquisitive, hard-thinking minority folks into individual departments. We also need a multi-ethnic perspective in the curriculum. MATSCHERK asked if the multi-ethnic awareness program is available for faculty. LAGUARDIA said some of this may be available. BENNETT then noted that money for this kind of support services has been withdrawn from the University since 1969. EOP funds is one lost source. MARTINO stated that, although it is difficult to attach a dollar value to this, about $125,000 had been lost. We are trying to recover these funds. BENNETT was then concerned that we might have lost $100,000, but we acted as if it was worth only $10,000. Martino suggested that this was worth a good deal more than $125,000, but that the funds simply are unavailable. LAGUARDIA concluded by stating that UO and OSU traditionally have received significantly more monies for the minority community than PSU has. At OSU, this is $600,000. We must commit more funds for this. MARTINO indicated that the PSU Foundation is attempting to raise funds in this area.

NEW BUSINESS

1. TERDAL distributed the Academic Requirements Committee's recommendations concerning P/NP credits, correspondence credits, and catalog guidelines.

ALBERTY/KOSOKOFF moved acceptance of reducing number of credits graded PASS to 45, and reducing the number of correspondence credits to 60.

MOOR was concerned about the effect this would have on students from outlying areas. WURM thought that more students were taking correspondence credits, and BOWLDEN saw the drop in PASS credits as a slap at the students. TUFTS indicated that virtually no one uses the maximum number of correspondence or pass courses, but that petitions are available if a problem exists. TANG then agreed that 90 credits of Pass/No Pass credits has been too generous. MOOR requested that the motion be split into two separate motions.

ALBERTY withdrew her motion, and introduced a new motion, "to reduce the number of credits graded PASS/NO PASS to 45." The motion passed by voice vote.

ALBERTY then moved that "the number of correspondence credits be dropped to 30." The motion failed 20-15.

COGAN then moved that "the number of correspondence credits be dropped to 45."

BENNETT felt that correspondence credits are not a cheap substitute, and that we need to be flexible. TERDAL indicated that petitions would still be available. MOOR wondered if a problem existed, and TERDAL suggested that this improved the image of the school.

The motion failed by voice vote.
ALBERTY, TERDAL, and TANG discussed ways that students choose a catalog under which they graduate. Also discussed was the difficulty of satisfying General Education Requirements and whether we should address the catalog or the GER question.

BRENNER then moved the proposed catalog description:

Proposed catalog description: Insert after the first statement quoted above: (1987-88 Catalog, p. 15, "Requirements for Bachelor's Degree") Previously admitted and enrolled Portland State University students may graduate under the guidelines of any catalog issued after their first admission and enrollment for up to five years prior to graduation, whether or not the student was enrolled during the year in which said catalog was in effect.

The motion passed.

HAMMOND described and read the proposed constitutional amendment:

Motion:

1. "That the University Planning Council become a constitutional committee established under the provisions of the Faculty Constitution, and that the Council's membership and charge be approved as proposed (see attachment).

2. That the Budget Committee's charge be revised as indicated in the attachment.

3. That the Budget Committee and the Educational Policies Committee be continued as autonomous constitutional committees."

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 17:00.
Membership

Chair, Ann Weikel (CLAS)
James Breedlove (SSW)
Alice Lehman (HPE)
Sam E. White (BA), Interim Chair
Barry Anderson (CLAS)
Dennis Barnum (CLAS)
Harold Gray (SPA)
George Tsongas (EAS)
Mike Carl (ED)
Mary Cumpston (PLS)
Walter Ellis (UPA)
Faye Powell (LIB)

Budget Committee activities were suspended between September 1986 and March 1988 at the request of President Sicuro as an attempt to consolidate all budgetary activities in the University Planning Committee. During Winter term 1988, the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees determined that an independent committee which focused on shorter term budgetary actions could be highly beneficial to University operations. Thus, the Budget Committee was reconvened to establish its membership and develop its agenda for the future.

The Budget Committee held two meetings during Winter term 1988 and has planned a series of meetings through the end of the academic year. The early meetings have focused on exploring the committee's traditional role and its relationship to the University Planning Committee. Members have agreed that the Budget Committee may provide a valuable service to the University by focusing its actions on biennial budgetary considerations and by taking a leading role in recommending policies and procedures for implementing any declaration of financial exigency.

The Budget Committee's agenda for the remainder of this academic year includes overseeing the preparation of a task force report on the operations and recordkeeping at the PSU Foundation and exploring the level of funding of PSU's library in comparison to libraries at similar institutions.
During 1987-88, the University Athletics Board (UAB):

1. Reviewed and recommended budgets to the Incidental Fee Committee (IFC) for Intercollegiate Athletics, Intramurals, Club Sports and Recreational Activities.

2. Reviewed a request for emergency IFC funds in order to hire an additional student to work in the HPE Building, women's locker room in the evenings and weekends. The request was made for reasons of student employee safety and liability coverage. The UAB unanimously endorsed the request.

3. Reviewed and discussed the Future of Athletics Committee (chaired by F. Delkin) recommendation to apply for Division I status in the NCAA. The UAB developed and approved unanimously a recommendation for PSU intercollegiate sports to return to the NCAA Division I level (football: NCAA Division I-AA). The recommendation was presented to the Faculty Senate, President Sicuro, and the State Board of Higher Education (see p. 2).

4. UAB members served on associated committees, including the Future of Athletics committee and the Athletic Director Search committee.

During Spring term, activities will include a review of policies for participation of student athletes in post-season play, future UAB committee needs, and the future of recreational activities at PSU.

Committee Members: Mary Gordon (Chair), Alan Cabelly, Len Campbell, William Olsen, Robert Walker, Laura Mosier (student representative).

Ad Hoc Members: Robert Lockwood (NCAA faculty representative), Jack Schendel, Charles Becker, Sylvia Moseley, Bernadette Rilatt, David Coffey (replaced by Ernest "Pokey" Allen), Betty Rankin, Roger Edgington, Craig Nichols (community representative).
The University Athletic Board reaffirms its earlier position and unanimously accepts the recommendation of the Future of Athletics Committee (Delkin Committee) that PSU Intercollegiate Sports be returned to the NCAA Division I level (Football: NCAA Division I-AA). We recommend that this move occur if the following criteria can be met:

1. The Incidental Fee Committee remain solely responsible for the allocation of student activity fees to athletics.
2. The move shall have no negative impact on existing programs at PSU. These programs include, but are not limited to, academics, facilities utilization, faculty staffing, student needs, fund raising efforts, and the like. (Note: Current regulations prohibit the use of university education general funds for intercollegiate athletics.)
3. Affiliation with an existing or new athletic conference for all PSU sports shall be a major priority.
4. The process of movement to Division I/I-AA shall continue to be public, and shall be overseen by the University Athletic Board. The UAB shall make timely reports to the Faculty Senate and the President, detailing prior checkpoints which have been met and outlining in detail coming activities.
5. The services of an Academic Advisor, reporting to the Vice Provost for Student Affairs, shall continue to be available to all PSU intercollegiate athletes. The Vice Provost, UAB, and Athletic Director shall work cooperatively to determine the best methods in which to utilize this individual's skills.
During this year the Board met to establish the program of visiting lecturers for academic year 1988-89. The focus of the lectures will be on the development of the humanities, with a special concentration on two historical periods, classical Greece and seventeenth-century France. The Visiting Scholars Project will also include the development of a faculty seminar, in which various PSU faculty will participate.

The visiting scholars for 1988-89 will be:

Charles Rowan Beye  
Professor of Classics  
Lehmann College

Hugh Davidson  
Professor of French Literature  
University of Virginia

Hugh Lamberton  
Professor of Classics  
Princeton University

Charles Natoli  
Professor of Philosophy  
St. John Fisher College

Sara Melzer  
Professor of English  
University of California, Los Angeles

Richard Regosin  
Professor of French Literature  
University of California, Irvine

Timothy Reiss  
Professor of Comparative Literature  
New York University

Six students from the Program attended either the national meeting, (October 30-November 2, 1987), or the regional meeting, (April 14-17), of the National Collegiate Honors Council, all presenting papers or joining
in seminars.

No student appeals were submitted. Forty-five students were admitted to the Program; three students received degrees during the fall and winter quarters; eight have applied to be graduated spring quarter. One hundred and eighty-three students are currently active in the Program.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard Cain
Chairman

University Honors Board Members:

Leonard Cain, Chairman
Earl Molander
Leonard Swanson
Thomas Buell
Franz Rad

Sociology
Management
Mathematics
English
Civil Engineering
REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

TEACHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE

May 2, 1988

MEMBERS: Chairperson, Eric Swenson, Foreign Languages; William Becker Chemistry; Mildred Bennett, Math; Mary Constans, Art; Deborah Freedman, Music; David Krug, Special Ed.; Hugh Lovell, Economics; Ray Mariels, English; Virginia McElroy, Education; Joan McMahon, Speech & Hearing; Linda Neklason, HPE; Carl Pollock, Business Administration; William Tate, Theater Arts; Arthur Terry, Counseling. Ex-officio members: Robert Everhart, Dean of School of Education; Ulrich Hardt, Assistant Dean of the School of Education and secretary to the committee; Kathleen Greey, Education Librarian.

The following report summarizes the activities of the Teacher Education Committee during 1987-88.

The committee reviewed at length the new fifth-year program for Teacher Certification at both the elementary and secondary level to be fully implemented at Portland State beginning in the Fall of 1990. The complex and dramatic nature of these changes, which also coincide with a change to the semester system, have necessitated review of the new fifth-year program by a series of committee, department, Consortium, and general faculty meetings. The new program, radically modified in accordance with limiting constraints imposed upon us by the legislature and by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, will be coming before the Faculty Senate for review and action.

The committee moved unanimously to recommend:

---Acceptance of the Kimmel Committee revised proposal dealing with pre-professional programs under the new fifth-year Plan.

---Acceptance in principle of the initial course outlines as well as the proposals regarding the new fifth-year program at both the elementary and secondary level.

During their accreditation visit in March '87 the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission did continue approval of our 59 basic and standard certificate programs through August 31, 1991.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the committee by

Eric Swenson, Chairperson
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 14, 1988

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate ad hoc Committee
John Hammond, Chairperson

Committee members: Whitney Bates, Marjorie Burns, Sheldon Edner, Ulrich Hardt, Nancy Matschek, Ann Weikel, Sam White, Norm Wyers

RE: Proposed Constitutional Amendments regarding University Planning Council and Budget Committee.

Motion:

1. "That the University Planning Council become a constitutional committee established under the provisions of the Faculty Constitution, and that the Council's membership and charge be approved as proposed (see attachment).

2. That the Budget Committee's charge be revised as indicated in the attachment.

3. That the Budget Committee and the Educational Policies Committee be continued as autonomous constitutional committees."

Rationale:

The ad hoc Committee, made up in part of six past and current chairpersons of the Budget and Educational Policies Committees and the University Planning Council, discussed the relation among the Budget and Educational Policies Committees and the University Planning Council. The motion above is the committee's recommendation.

- All three bodies have an important role to play in University governance, and the University Planning Council cannot do its work without the other two committees.

- The main function of UPC will be to facilitate and coordinate the discussion and review of plans and policies important to the work of the University. Budget and Educational Policies Committees will review the budgetary and educational policy implications of proposals initiated by the UPC.
o Membership of the chairpersons of the Budget and Educational Policies Committees on the University Planning Council will assure communication and coordination among the three committees.

o Continuing the Budget and the Educational Policies Committees as autonomous committees will assure accessibility of these committees to faculty and other committees without going through the University Planning Council (as would be required if the former were sub-committees of UPC).

o Examples of actual topics of discussion of the three committees show the need for three distinct groups:

**Budget**

Fine tuning the budget, such as reviewing actual budget allocations, responding to short-term financial emergencies, conducting comparative studies to assist the planning process.

**Educational Policies**

Reviewing departmental reorganization plans and reorganization of the colleges; ROTC; CHIRON; making recommendations on the writing across the curriculum question.

**University Planning**

Plan for the 90s; planning physical facilities for the next three and five years; designing priorities for years 3 and 4 of the Plan for the 90s; organizing and working with an advisory group in the area of high tech; working with an advisory group identifying resources for children and family issues. (This is a major part of present, on-going UPC agenda.)

o For additional rationale, see the attached Committee on Committees January 21, 1988, report to the Faculty Senate.
PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Article IV. Organization of the Faculty

Section 4. Faculty Committees

4) Standing Committees

Current Wording

1) Budget Committee. This committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, two students, and, as consultants, each of the following or his or her representative: the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the University Budget Director. The Committee shall:

1) Consult with the President and make recommendations for the preparation of the annual and biennial budgets.
2) Recommend short- and long-range priorities for succeeding biennia.
3) Recommend to the President and to the Senate policies to be followed in implementing any declaration of financial exigency.
4) Report to the Senate at least once each year.

Proposed Amendment

1) Budget Committee. This committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, two students, and, as consultants, each of the following or his or her representative: the Provost, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, and the University Budget Director. The Committee shall:

1) Consult with the President and make recommendations for the preparation of the annual and biennial budgets.
2) Recommend budgetary priorities.
3) Analyze budgetary implications of new academic programs or program changes.
4) Consult regarding changes from budgets as prepared.
5) Review expenditures of all public and grant funds.
6) Recommend to the President and to the Senate policies to be followed in implementing any declaration of financial exigency.
7) Report to the Senate at least once each year.
7) University Planning Council. The University Planning Council shall advise the Faculty Senate and the President on planning for the University. Membership of the Council shall be composed of the Provost, the Vice-President for Finance and Administration, two deans, 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 representing all other faculty, one classified person, two students (one undergraduate and one graduate), and the chairpersons of the Budget and Educational Policies Committees. The two Deans serving on the Council shall represent their academic units; therefore the Council will consist of twenty members. A representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and the Director of Planning shall serve as consultants to the Council.

The Council shall:

1. Initiate and facilitate the discussion of plans and policies that have broad significance for the University and coordinate the orderly review of proposals that emerge from this discussion.

2. In consultation with the appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-range plans, policies, and priorities.

3. Determine the appropriate implementation of such recommendations.

4. Review and advise on capital facilities requests, including those for new facilities and for major remodeling projects.

5. Review and advise on facilities planning, including development and maintenance of the campus plan.

6. In consultation with the Educational Policies Committee and the Budget Committee, review the implications of plans on budgetary allocations and on the structure and educational function of programs, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities.

7. Refer issues to appropriate University committees and communicate on-going Council activities to the Faculty Senate at least once a term.

8. Coordinate and consult with the President's external advisory board.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 21, 1988
TO: Faculty Senate
FR: Committee on Committees
RE: Status of Budget and Educational Policies Committees

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

The Committee on Committees recommends that Budget and Educational Policies Committees be continued with charges as specified in the Faculty Constitution; i.e., they should not be allowed to die by having their functions absorbed by the University Planning Council.

Following are some of the chief considerations that influenced the Committee's deliberations on this matter:

1. The constitutional charge of each of these two committees (Budget and EPC) is broad and important enough to occupy a single university committee. It is not realistic to suppose that one committee could adequately discharge the duties presently assigned to the three committees affected by the proposed reorganization (i.e., Budget, EPC, and Campus Planning Committee).

2. Budget Committee work alone is technical and demanding on the time and energy of committee members. A former Budget Committee chair observed, "It takes up to two years just to develop the skills to be effective...."

3. Educational Policy Committee's role of advising the University on educational innovations (e.g., Writing across the Curriculum) requires a greater commitment of time and effort than is reasonable to ask of a body which has other significant responsibilities.

4. Some Committee on Committees members believe that there may well be important functions for a planning group constituted as is the UPC, and that these functions are different from, or not covered by, the charges of present university committees. Generally, the feeling was that there is a need for a group to engage in a continuing preoccupation with broad integrative planning and the establishment of priorities ("the future shape of the University"). Some specific issues mentioned were:

   • PSU's relation to other colleges and universities in the state
   • Ways to improve the general campus physical and learning environment
   • PSU's relations to the Portland community
Educational Policies Committee. This committee shall consist of five Faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, two students, and, as consultant, the Vice President for Academic Affairs or his or her representative. The Committee shall:

1) Serve as the faculty advisory body to the President and to the Faculty Senate on matters of educational policy, broadly considered, which are not already assigned to other committees by this Constitution, but which shall include such matters as long-range educational policies and priorities, the impact of these on physical planning, educational policy guidelines for the University, and the like. The Committee's consideration of these and such related matters as may come within its purview, subject to the limitations expressed above, may be undertaken on its own initiative, may be referred to it by the President or his or her designated administrative officers, or may be brought by faculty committees or the Faculty Senate. In any event, the Educational Policies Committee shall not subscribe to nor promulgate any substantive declarations or decisions on policy without due and timely consultation with or recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

2) Receive and consider proposals from appropriate administrative officers or faculty committees for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities, so far as such changes primarily involve educational policy rather than current or budgetary considerations only; and make appropriate and timely reports or recommendations thereupon to the Faculty Senate. The Educational Policies Committee may also take notice of developments leading to such changes on its own initiative, again with timely report or recommendation to the Faculty Senate. Finally, the Educational Policies Committee shall ensure that proposals for the sorts of changes outlined above are presented in timely and well-ordered fashion for the Faculty Senate's due consideration, with appropriate consultation, where necessary, with other interested faculty committees.

3) Determine which matters of consideration and proposals fall within its purview as defined in sections one and two, subject to review by the Senate.

4) Coordinator or consult with the chairpersons of the Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, Budget Committee, or other appropriate faculty committees, on matters of mutual concern, especially when educational policy broadly considered relates to curriculum, budget, and the like.

5) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.
Recommendations from Academic Requirements Committee
For Calendar Conversion of General University Requirements

Current requirements are listed on pages 19-20 of the 1987-88 PSU Bulletin. In most instances, ARC is recommending a straight 3-2 conversion. Exceptions are noted below with an asterisk. Rationale for each exception is briefly noted.

1. General Requirements for All Degrees
(a) that minimum number of credits be changed from 186 term credits to 124 semester credits.
(b) that minimum number of upper division (300- and 400-level) credits be changed from 72 to 48.
(c) that minimum number of credits earned at four-year institutions be changed from 78 to 52.
(d) that maximum number of credits transferred from regionally accredited two-year institutions be changed from 108 to 72.
(e) that maximum number of correspondence credits (transferred from schools recognized as institutions of higher learning) be changed from 60 to 21. Note: this represents a reduction from the current maximum of 60 term hours. With the spread of community colleges, fewer students are taking correspondence credits.
(f) that maximum number of credits graded P (Pass) that may be counted for graduation be changed from 90 term credits to 30 semester credits. Note: this represents a reduction in the total number of non-differentiated grades counted for graduation. This information also appears on page 25 of the 1987-88 catalog.
(g) that residence credit after admission to PSU be changed from 45 to 30 (excluding credit by examination) of the final 45 or 110 of the total credits presented. Restriction: A maximum of 15 of the last 30 credits may be graded P (Pass). Note: this information also appears under "Grade Requirement for Graduation," page 26, 1987-88 catalog, and represents a slight increase in acceptable Pass credits from the current 20 term hours. This relatively large number was chosen so that the new guidelines would not have an adverse impact on students whose programs require an internship, practicum, etc. in the fourth year.
(h) HPE 298—that the 3 term hour course be converted to 2 semester hours, with one lecture and two laboratory sessions per week. This recommendation is consistent with actions being taken by other state universities and the community colleges which send students to PSU. This is the proposal presented by the HPE department. The following changes in the 1987-88 catalog description should be made: delete from p. 16 "Students admitted on catalogues prior to 1982..." and from p. 19 "Students admitted prior to fall 1982..."

2. Requirements for the B.S. Degree
that the statement on page 19 be revised to state: Students must complete a minimum of 24 credits from the science academic distribution area or a minimum of 24 credits from the social science academic distribution.
3. The Writing Requirement
(a) that PSU continue to require one writing course in the freshman year and a second in the junior year. This is the vertical model, which places the two required courses in different years. The arguments for it are that students profit more from exposure to writing instruction throughout their careers; that juniors are more mature scholars with different writing needs to be addressed than those of the lower division; that it prevents the overcrowding of the freshman schedule with first-year requirements.
(b) that both courses carry 3 semester hours of credit. The English department expects that there will be a statewide requirement for six semester hours of writing for the Bachelor's degree; most other courses in English will be three semester hours and parity with those other courses is desirable.

4. General Studies
(a) Option I—that the statement on page 19 be revised to state: A major in one of the three academic distribution areas: 36 credits in addition to the general education requirement. Of the 48 credits in the distribution area, a minimum of 21 must be upper division with at least 6 upper division credits in each of two departments.
(b) Option II—that the statement on page 19 be revised to state: ...a minimum of 54 credits of work in the three academic distribution areas must be upper division.

5. General Education Requirements
(a) that the statement on page 20 of the 1987-88 catalog be revised to state: Every student must earn a minimum of 12 credits in each of the three academic distribution areas. These credits must be earned in at least two departments within each academic distribution area, with a minimum of six credits earned in one department. (Thus the possible combinations could be 6 + 6, 6 + 3 + 3, 9 + 3, 8 + 4). Note: This would allow the possibility of three departments. The two-department limitation can be a major hardship for transfer students.
(b) that the statement on page 20 relating to Upper Division Requirement be revised to state: A minimum of 12 of the 48 upper division credits required for the degree must be earned in the three academic distribution areas with no more than 6 credits in any one department.
The remainder of these sections shall stand unamended.

6. Transfer Credits
Transfer students who lack less than one credit for meeting a given distribution requirement (and which lack is produced by conversion to the semester system) shall be considered to have met the requirement. Such students need not petition; this policy will be the university standard. Note: the Residency requirement and the Minimum Credits for Graduation requirement must be met in full.

The Academic Requirements Committee intends to recommend replacing the specific listing of courses approved to meet general education requirements with a statement which would exclude certain courses, for example, omnibus numbered courses.