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To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

From: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on October 5, 1987, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the June 1, 1987, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators

   Please see over

   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 -- none
H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of the June 1, 1987, Meeting

The PSU Constitution requires that Senators provide the Secretary to the Faculty with the name of an alternate prior to the first Senate meeting of the year.

My Name

1987-88 Alternate: __________________________ Dept. __________________

1. Question for Vice President Edgington, submitted by Robert Jones:

"Last year it was reported that PSU was to receive $2.4 million increase to its budget, due to increased enrollments. There are reports that the money was not received. Please explain what happened."

2. Question for Provost Martino, submitted by the Senate Steering Committee:

"What is the status of the writing-across-the-curriculum recommendations submitted by the Educational Policies Committee and accepted by the Faculty Senate Fall 1986?"

3. Question for Vice Provost Forbes, submitted by Ann Weikel:

"There were allegations of racial misconduct in student government during March 1986. Was an investigation of these allegations ever made and, if so, at whose suggestion? Was the matter referred to other bodies of the University? Was an investigation of the matter, in fact, ever completed, and what was the outcome?"

4. Question for President Sicuro, submitted by Hugo Maynard:

"The annual report of the University Athletics Board at the Senate meeting on May 4, 1987, stated that the 'football budget was not supported from incidental fees or 050 accounts' and that 'much of the football budget was supported from private donations' (Minutes, May 4, 1987, p. 33).

Since that meeting, the University has acknowledged (Oregonian, July 11, 1987, p. E 1) that student incidental fees have been diverted to pay the athletics department's increasing deficit (estimated at nearly $1 million for 1988-89).

Please explain the difference in these reports."
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 5, 1987
Presiding Officer: Marjorie Burns
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Cabelly for Anderson, Zarefar for Etesami, Zonozzy for Ronacher, Newborg for Sampson.


Ex-officio Members Present: Diman, Edgington, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Harrell, Hardt, Harris, Martino, Miller, Nichols, Pfingsten, Reardon, Ross, Schendel, Sheridan, Toulan.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the June 1, 1987, meeting were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Senate observed one minute of silence in honor of the late Fred Waller, long-time faculty and Senate member and Presiding Officer for four terms.

2. Senators must provide the name of an alternate to the Secretary to the Faculty.

3. When speaking on the Senate floor, Senators were asked to identify themselves by name and department.

4. Those making motions or offering amendments were asked to write them out and pass them to the Secretary.

5. If Senators arrive after roll call, they should let the Secretary know in writing.

6. Following all meetings, Senators are invited to Campus Ministries for a reception with alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages.

7. Two new ex-officio members of the Senate were introduced by BURNS: Affirmative Action Officer Jacquelyn Harrell and Provost Frank Martino.
BURNS also announced that the Provost and other administrators had agreed to answer impromptu questions from the floor.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. Vice President EDGINGTON responded to the question regarding the $2.4 million budget increase for increased enrollments. He explained that the money from overrealized tuition revenues was received, and he distributed a "1987-88 Budget Narrative" document which showed how the allocations were spent.

Page 3 of the handout shows the specific detail of the distribution of the $2.4 million by account numbers. He pointed out, however, that money was not only received, but it was also taken away. Money was received for centers of excellence in EAS, International Trade Institute, and the Center for Urban Research in Education (CURE). PSU was zapped here and there, such as an energy adjustment of $211,000, and a PERS cost reduction of $59,000. OSSHE had a total reduction of $3.6 million, and PSU's proportionate share of that was $492,000. The bottom line is that PSU received a total increase of ca. 10% over the previous budget.

Of the $2.4 million, a large share went finally to Computing Services which had been passed over repeatedly in the last several years; it was decided that we could no longer live on borrowed money, and close to $600,000 were allocated. CURE was funded for $245,000, but this amount had to be found in savings from other accounts. It was not a net increase. EDGINGTON offered to answer any questions now or at next month's meeting which he promised to attend if there will be questions.

JONES thanked Edgington for all of the information provided and asked what percentage of the allocation had gone toward academic and administrative expenses. EDGINGTON estimated that it was about the same as the last budget, perhaps a little more on the administrative side. However, Computing Services received a big portion. HARRIS said that the holes filled were primarily non-instructional. The percent allocated to instruction would be less than in the total budget. Items like Computing are hard to classify, because they serve both instructional and non-instruction. Another example of a non-instructional item would be the bank charge for the VISA usage fee in the Business Office.

EDGINGTON admitted that he had presented a great deal of information which might take some time to digest and said that he would be happy to answer questions at the next meeting. JONES observed that we still had an operative University Budget Committee which should also consider this data and report to the Senate. EDGINGTON countered that the University Planning Council had absorbed the Budget Committee but JONES disagreed and also pointed out that the UPC did not report to the Senate at this time. EDGINGTON said he understood.
2. Provost MARTINO turned the question regarding the status of the EPC writing-across-the-curriculum recommendations over to DIMAN who reviewed the three recommendations accepted by the Senate in April 1987 as follows:

- All degree-granting programs will institute writing-across-the-curriculum requirements.
- A University-wide Writing Center, operating day and evening, would be established in the English Department.
- Workshops for faculty who teach within the writing-across-the-curriculum programs would be conducted periodically.

DIMAN said that the Writing Center has been established and is housed on the third floor of NH. It takes referrals from faculty and also drop-in students who are having problems with writing. It is open from 8:00 to 5:00 but not evenings. The EPC was asked to investigate how departments were following up on implementation of the recommendation, but DIMAN did not know what has been done. The time of the semester conversion might be a good time to take a look at that. He also said that the Senate could charge the Curriculum Committee to look at the issue during the curriculum review for the conversion. Nothing has been done regarding faculty workshops.

3. Vice Provost FORBES responded to the question regarding allegations of racism in student government in March 1987. She said that an investigation was completed but that she had to maintain confidentiality because of the Student Privacy Act. No release of information on action taken is possible without the written consent of students. She also said that the General Student Affairs Committee will be asked to look at mechanisms for dealing with allegations of racism; nothing specifically relating to that is now in the student conduct code. Both the Student and Faculty Senate will be asked to vote on the recommendations of the GSA. FORBES also pointed out that workshops dealing with racism and sexism had been conducted for all students participating in student organizations, including student government last spring and more are to follow.

4. EDGINGTON answered the question, posed for President Sicuro, about the diversion of student incidental fees to cover deficits in the athletics department. He said that the Vieira statement made at the May 4, 1987, Senate meeting during the annual report of the University Athletics Board was correct at that time; i.e., no funds had been transferred. However, in July, when closing the books, there was a $254,553 transfer made for athletics from incidental fee accounts. After that transfer, there was still a remaining deficit of $591,603.

EDGINGTON explained the system and procedure relative to this situation. When the decision was made to eliminate men's basketball, gymnastics and downgrade football from Division I to Division II, the Incidental Fee Committee and others were advised that football budgets would be planned to be self-supporting. There was, however, no
guarantee that unencumbered balances in various accounts, including incidental fees, would not be used to balance shortfalls in football revenues. For the football seasons of 81-82 to 84-85 an average of $78,000 was used in each of those years from unencumbered incidental fees to support athletics. Football was the chief beneficiary of those funds, although the deficit at the end of the year is in the Higher Education Athletics account.

Since 1984 there has been a significant amount of incidental fees used to balance the athletics program. These were fund balances which were remaining after all incidental fee programs had been funded. EDGINGTON maintained that it was not an uncommon practice to use balances in fund groups to respond to deficits within the same fund groups. In fact, nine or ten years ago the Budget Office had to cover approximately a $200,000 deficit in the incidental fee accounts from other sources which had a positive balance. Unfortunately, in the recent transfers the Incidental Fee Committee was not consulted when the action was taken. When President Sicuro became aware of this last transfer he summoned all parties concerned, including the members of the Incidental Fee Committee and the University Athletics Board, to inform them of this action and that it would not happen again without coordination with the Incidental Fee Committee.

Under the current policy of using incidental fees to balance program operations, approval will be obtained from the Incidental Fee Committee before any fund transfers will be made.

EDGINGTON said that the football program in Division II has not been self-supporting. Gate receipts, private donations (less than ($100,000) and incidental fees cannot cover the cost of the operation ($411,000 last year; $400,000 this year). Incidental fees only cover the salary of the Athletics Director and are not being budgeted to pay football.

WALKER wanted to know why surplus budgets at the end of the year were never transferred into academic programs, to hire a first-class scholar or to buy badly needed equipment. EDGINGTON replied that the legislature would have to allocate funds for academic programs. HARRIS added that the law on incidental fees specifies that it can only go to support educational activities, student unions, and athletic activities.

BRENNER wanted to know why there were unencumbered funds in student fees when student groups usually have to scramble for money and are asked to cut their requests. Some requests are denied altogether. EDGINGTON replied that surpluses occur when enrolments go above projections. The Incidental Fee Committee always uses low projected enrolments. That being the case, BRENNER wanted to know why IFC money could not be transferred to student groups. EDGINGTON thought that should be looked at. FORBES explained that the IFC always starts with the balance and reserve funds; whatever is left goes to off-set fees for the next year.
MAYNARD asked if the IFC had been consulted on the diversion of fund. EDGINGTON said no. No policy existed then, but now it is policy. MAYNARD pointed out the OAR mandated consultation. EDGINGTON responded that the IFC had approved all that was spent and needn't be consulted regarding the unencumbered fees. L. NUSSBAUM observed that violations had taken place for years, since year after year money was left over. JACKSON wanted to know if the IFC was ever told later that money had been transferred. EDGINGTON said no acknowledgement had been made, but that the Athletics Director always asked for more money the following year. MAYNARD announced that he would offer a resolution under New Business.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

TUFTS reported that advance registration figures showed head count to be down 5.5% and student credit hours down 1.5% from a year ago. He warned, however, that advance registration was not indicative of enrollment since it came a week earlier than last year. For example, these figures don't show that 800 students had registered in canceled classes. Add/drop day brought 1741 new registrations. First week registration was down 1.2% from last year, and fees paid was down 3.1%. These figures do not tell where we will end up eventually.

NEW BUSINESS

1. WEIKEL said she was troubled, in the absence of a report, with rumors still floating around, and offered the following resolution:

"Be it resolved... that the University Affirmative Action Officer investigate charges of racial misconduct in student government during 1986-87 and ascertain the manner in which university administrators responded to these allegations. This report is to be delivered to the Senate at its November 2 meeting."

JONES seconded the resolution and asked Harrell if she could not report on the investigation, given the confidentiality issue.

HARRELL explained that the report could probably be provided to the body if the investigation had been conducted at the request of the body. She pointed out, however, that the report would simply be made; no further investigation at the state or federal agency level could be made since it has passed the 180-day limit for investigational complaints.

WEIKEL said that it was important to assess the processes by which the administration responds to allegations of racial misconduct. The original allegations had been made in October 1986, she thought, but no action was taken until spring. HARRELL said that the item was on the agenda of the Minority Affairs Council for its October 12 meeting. But WEIKEL reported having heard from the Chairperson of the Council that the item could not be discussed, because the Council had members from the community on it. HARRELL said that the Council would have to make that decision.
2. MAYNARD introduced the following resolution:

"Be it resolved... that the Senate condemns the unauthorized diversion of student incidental fees for athletics or any other unauthorized purpose and requests that such practices be discontinued."

MARTINO had a problem with the implication of the resolution; it carried the implication that the practice has not yet been condemned, whereas the President has clearly and publicly stated that the practice was not acceptable. GOEKJIAN argued that the resolution therefore should be viewed as the Senate's agreement with the President. MARTINO countered that the resolution might be phrased positively such as "The Senate heartily agrees...." JONES offered the following amendment:

"Be it resolved... that the Senate strongly agrees with President Sicuro's decision to stop diversion of student incidental fees for athletics or any other unauthorized purpose and supports his decision to discontinue such practices."

CABELLY seconded the amendment, arguing that the faculty had an opinion and agreed with the President but desired to see that opinion on record. WALKER spoke against the amendment saying that two groups can make two separate statements.

The amendment was defeated 19 to 24.

MAYNARD then amended his own resolution by substituting "believes" for "requests" to read:

"Be it resolved... that the Senate condemns the unauthorized diversion of student incidental fees for athletics or any other unauthorized purpose and believes that such practices should be discontinued."

JONES seconded the amendment. CABELLY was not excited about "condemns" and suggested "opposes." MAYNARD thought "condemns" to be better, since the President had also already condemned the practice.

The amendment was passed.

The main resolution, as amended, was passed unanimously.

3. MAYNARD then offered the following resolution, seconded by L. NUSSBAUM:

"Be it resolved... that the Senate views the development of a Division I intercollegiate football program at Portland State as a misapplication of University priorities."

JONES spoke against the motion saying that it behooves PSU to offer a variety of academic and entertainment options to students and the community. It is viable and reasonable to offer an athletics program
which matches PSU's development. Moving to Division I would mean a favorable influence for the University. HAMMOND wanted to know what it would mean to the football program if the resolution were implemented; football would not be abolished.

LOCKWOOD, speaking as the NCAA faculty representative and as a member of the Delkin Committee studying the future of athletics at PSU, argued that the timing of this resolution was unfortunate and urged the Senate to wait until the Delkin Committee had collected all the data. He urged faculty to respond to questionnaires which had been sent to them, let the committee make its recommendations to the President, and then consider their position. No decision had been made yet but would come soon, because athletics wants clear directions for its recruitment program. Being in Division I would mean that private funds could be generated to raise scholarship money, not through IFC funds but through outside support.

J. DAILY argued that the resolution should be passed, so that it could be used by the Delkin Committee in the decision process; he feared that faculty would have no say in the matter if the vote came after the Delkin decision. CABELLY disagreed and argued that the timing of this resolution would have a bad psychological effect; he moved to table the resolution.

The motion to table lost 14 to 31.

HAMMOND was pleased with the vote and again asked for an explanation of the difference between Division I and II. LOCKWOOD said that it relates to the number of grants in aid the University is allowed to provide. Division II allowed 45 full scholarships. A move to Division I would mean no change for two years, but then being in Division I AA would allow approximately 70 grants in aid in football. PSU may also add basketball. Being in Division II is losing money; no schools in that division are making money.

GOEKJIAN therefore asked if the Delkin Committee would be soliciting private donations for football, and he also wanted to know if the Committee had asked what effects asking for earmarked funds for football would have on other requests for money, such as funds for a chair in Asian History. R. NUSSBAUM reported that his questionnaire did not include any questions regarding the effects on fundraising. LOCKWOOD retorted that there were different questionnaires. MOOR was reluctant to pass final judgment now and offered the following amendment be added to the resolution; it was seconded by R. NUSSBAUM:

"...priorities, and that such development should not occur unless it is demonstrated that the University cannot flourish if this development does not occur and that it probably will flourish if the development does occur."

J. DAILY questioned by whom and to whom it should be demonstrated.

The amendment was defeated.
WALKER felt that there was a problem with the current study being done. The study should be done by an independent group, not one hand-picked by the President. He offered the following amendment, seconded by L. NUSSBAUM, to be added to the resolution:

"...priorities, unless a new academic scholarship of equivalent value is funded from the same source for every new athletic scholarship."

The amendment was defeated.

The main motion was then passed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 16:40.