

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Faculty Senate Monthly Packets

University Archives: Faculty Senate

10-3-1983

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet October 1983

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 October 1983" (1983). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 256.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/256>

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 of the Senate

September 19, 1983

FR: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty



The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on October 3, 1983, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- *B. Approval of the Minutes of the June 6, 1983, Meeting
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
- D. Question Period
 - 1. Questions for Administrators

Questions for President Blumel, submitted by David Wrench and Fred Waller
"Since many groups have relevant input to give in the retrenchment process, including the academic deans, the planning committees, the AAUP, and faculty committees such as the Budget Copmmittee, can you tell us the sequence in which input will be obtained from these groups and the approximate dates on which each will need to report?"

"Would you briefly explain the State System's new Budget Allocation System, its implications for PSU's budget now and in the future, and the importance of enrollment loss or decline to the relation between BAS and our Budget?"

- 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
- E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
 - 1. Registration Report -- President Blumel
 - 2. Retrenchment Report -- President Blumel
- F. Unfinished Business
 - *1. Policy Statement on Student Level Restrictions -- Dunbar
 - *2. Faculty Constitution Amendments, Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2, and V, 2, 1 -- Final Reading -- Blankenship
- G. New Business
- H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

- *B Minutes of June 6, 1983, Senate Meeting
- *F.1 Policy Statement on Student Level Restrictions
- *F.2 Faculty Constitution Amendments, V, 1, 2; V, 2, 1

The Constitution requires that elected members of the Faculty Senate must provide the Secretary of the Faculty with the name of an alternate before the first meeting of the year.

My Name _____

My Alternate for 1983-84 is _____ Dept. _____

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 3, 1983

Presiding Officer: Fred Waller
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

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

Alternates Present: Parshall for L. Nussbaum, Holloway for Pinamonti, Buell for Reece, Lockwood for Tracy.

Members Absent: Featheringill, Spolek, Wilson.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Bogue, Corn, Dobson, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Howard, Leu, Morris, Nicholas, Paudler, Pfingsten, Rauch, Ross, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Williams.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the June 6 Senate meeting were approved with the following correction of the second sentence of p. 54: "Erzurumlu reported that the committee invited him to discuss a recent grant in electrical engineering and computer science by the Oregon High Tech Consortium."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

WALLER announced that, as before, K House is inviting Senators for a glass of sherry following each Senate meeting this year. He reminded Senators to turn in names of their alternates to the Secretary of the Faculty, to state name and department when speaking on the floor, and to write out any motions they might make and hand those to the Secretary. WALLER also conveyed his plan to start Senate meetings promptly at 3:00 p.m.

QUESTION PERIOD

WALLER reminded Senators that any Senator or member of the faculty may address questions to any officer of the administration. Questions must be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty no later than one week prior to the Senate meeting to allow the respondent time to collect information necessary for a responsible response. He also explained that additional questions relative to the primary question may be raised from the floor following the response, with the initial questioner having the first opportunity for follow-up questions.

1. Questions for Administrators

a. In response to Wrench's question, President BLUMEL explained that there was no set schedule or sequence by which reports were submitted regarding retrenchment. However, time tables by which reports should be received are set in the bargaining agreement. What WRENCH was interested in knowing was what process the President used in trying to reconcile the different opinions received from different groups. BLUMEL explained that what he tries to do is to discuss the opinions of one group with other groups who are offering opinions and by that process to try to see whether there is some consensus possible.

b. Waller's question was about the short- and long-term implications for PSU of the state system's Budget Allocation System formula. President BLUMEL observed that he had dealt at some length with that question at the faculty convocation on September 21. WALLER wanted to know whether the formula -- given PSU's current and future development, particularly at the doctoral level, and taking into account the heavy weight given to enrollment in doctoral programs -- would lock the University into a disadvantageous status quo. BLUMEL said he had raised that concern repeatedly with officers of the State Board. They replied that this should not necessarily be the case and pointed out that PSU should be seeking funding based upon anticipated enrollment in programs that are being developed. He felt, nevertheless, that PSU needs to keep pressing on that issue and needs to focus on seeking refinements of the model in areas that are negative for PSU. The model does not adequately take into account developmental programs.

Equipment funding is one of those crucial areas. The model speaks about equipment replacement, but PSU's predicament is that it has no equipment to replace in the first instance. Some concession has been made in that area, allowing for some development of inventories of equipment. Various refinements in the library funding portion also need to be made, and PSU is arguing for major modifications which will make a significant difference in its allocations.

CEASE asked if the budget allocations this time were arrived at using the pure model or a transition model. BLUMEL answered that a transition model was used; he emphasized that enrollment played a very important part in the model, and enrollment changes will influence where one is relative to other institutions in the state system.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President BLUMEL reported that registration measured by fees paid as of September 30 was almost identical to last year and presented an encouraging picture. PSU had been projected to go down by about 4%. OLSON asked how we deal with the fact that cutting budgets is a self-fulfilling prophesy; students cannot be admitted into classes because there is no room, and PSU cannot expand because it does not have increases in enrollment. BLUMEL replied that there is no real solution to that problem; that is the real problem with the BAS. Under these circumstances it is a rather serious error to place such heavy emphasis on enrollment in the allocation system.
2. BLUMEL reviewed the steps he has taken in the retrenchment process: a letter to the faculty was sent on September 16, advising them of the possibility of the necessity to make a declaration of financial exigency or for the need for program reduction; at the convocation on September 21 a detailed review was given of the budget development and the cuts PSU faces in the 1983-85 biennium as well as the reasons for those cuts. He said his purpose at today's Senate meeting was to review that information, to give the Senate the opportunity to raise further questions about the information provided, and to formally seek the counsel of the Senate and individual faculty members relative to the issue of program reduction or financial exigency.

BLUMEL reviewed that for 1983-84 PSU will have to absorb about \$750,000 of temporary reductions in order to avoid lay-offs during the 1983-84 fiscal year. The difference between this amount and the \$828,000 total reduction for this year reflects recurring reductions made during the 1983-84 beginning budget. Plans for these temporary savings have been made and include the following: estimated savings in other payroll expense, normal classified wage savings, the non-filling of some temporary vacancies resulting from sabbatical and LWOP, some reductions imposed on units which overspent in 1982-83, and reductions in equipment budget.

The problem for 1984-85 is to identify permanent savings of \$748,000 remaining from 1983-84, and an estimated additional \$1,015,000 on a permanent basis. Additionally, it may be necessary to provide for further reductions in indirect cost recoveries which have been declining in recent years. Provisions must also be made for promotion increments for promotions becoming effective in 1984-85. Given all of these requirements, BLUMEL estimated the magnitude of PSU's problem for 1984-85 to be between \$1.9 and \$2 million.

In accomplishing these reductions, PSU is more severely constrained than was the case in the last retrenchment, not only because of the lessening of flexibility caused by earlier cuts, but also by two types of legislatively imposed limitations. The state system cannot increase its expenditure budget by increasing tuition, since the legislature approved the appropriation of \$21 million of general fund monies to permit the state system to freeze tuition

levels during the 1983-85 biennium. The second limitation has to do with the fact that there was appropriated program improvement money in several areas such as plant maintenance, library, and for certain academic programs related to economic development. Cuts are precluded or severely limited in the areas for which program improvement funds were provided, thus limiting the areas in which expenditure cuts can be made.

Given these requirements, BLUMEL first sought comments and advice on whether a declaration of financial exigency or the need for program reduction is required, and, if so, which mode is the preferred one. The deadline for comments on that issue is October 14. After receipt of those comments, BLUMEL promised to conclude promptly on that issue. Should the conclusion be that a declaration is required, he will promptly announce a provisional plan and set a deadline for comments on that plan. Because such a conclusion is clearly a possibility, he has undertaken consultation with the Budget Committee and CADS on the formulation of a provisional plan. The target date for the completion of the retrenchment process, should it be required, including Board action, if required, and the issuance of lay-off notices, is December 31, 1983. That would provide approximately six months' notice under exigency, or it would provide for an effective date of lay-off of December 31, 1984, under program reduction.

CEASE asked if there was a legal problem in declaring financial exigency in the absence of a budget. BLUMEL replied that he expected the State Board to adopt institution budgets at its December meeting. Karant-Nunn asked if any other institution in the state were engaged in preparing for exigency. BLUMEL and HARRIS did not know absolutely but mentioned that WOSC had already taken certain actions tantamount to program reductions when they sent one-year's lay-off notices to faculty members in at least one division, effective September 16, 1984. BLUMEL added that the percentage magnitudes of cuts for UO are approximately the same as for PSU; they are less for SOSC; there is no reduction for OSU or EOSC; there is a smaller percentage reduction for HSC; there is an increase for OIT. Based upon the percentage reductions, BLUMEL assumed that institutions which face the magnitude of PSU's cuts would face the prospect of that kind of action.

WALLER called for the Senate's advice and consent to hold a special Faculty Senate Forum on October 10, already approved by the Steering Committee. He announced his intention to invite the chairpersons of the Advisory Council, Budget Committee, and EPC to comment at that meeting. Also invited will be the President, the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Finance and Administration, and the Director of the Budget.

It was moved "that the Faculty Senate sponsor a Senate Forum at 3:00 p.m. on October 10th in 71 CH for a general faculty discussion of PSU's financial condition in 1984-85 and the measures that may be necessary to meet it." The motion was seconded and passed un-animously.

WALLER commented that if this Forum proved useful, the Senate may want to schedule others on an ad hoc basis later in the year.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. The Graduate Council returned to the Senate a revised statement, and DUNBAR moved "adoption of the policy statement on student level restrictions."

GATZ asked how the computer knows whether a non-admitted student was a graduate student or not. TUFTS indicated that the computer does have that information during pre-registration; on add/drop days the registrar is counting on faculty members to police that part of the requirement. DUNBAR added that this may not be a fool-proof system but that it will improve current conditions. CONSTANS wondered if seniors could still reserve certain graduate credits in their program, and it was pointed out that the policy allows for that.

The motion to adopt the policy statement was passed.

2. BLANKENSHIP moved "acceptance of the proposed constitutional amendments of Article V Section 1, paragraph 2 and Article V, Section 2, paragraph 1."

WALLER pointed out that these amendments were introduced at the June meeting and were not modified at that time. He gave the Senate the option of a roll call vote. Since there was no request for it, a voice vote was taken and resulted in a unanimous vote to accept the amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Graduate Council

F₁

September 20, 1983

To: Faculty Senate

Zola Dunbar

From: Zola Dunbar, Chairperson
Graduate Council

Subject: Student level restrictions

1. Enrollment in all courses offered at the 500 level is restricted to student-levels of senior, post-baccalaureate, non-admitted graduate, graduate master and graduate doctoral. Only students in these classifications may enroll for graduate credit in 400 level courses.
2. In exceptional cases, students not meeting the student-level restrictions in 1) may be allowed to enroll in a 500 level course or for graduate credit in a 400 level course upon signature approval of the instructor and department head.
3. Departments can impose further restrictions for registration in their courses for graduate credit and must include such restrictions on the course maintenance schedule for the courses.
4. These restrictions shall become effective no later than Spring Term 1984.

ZD/b

F₂

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT:

Article V. Senate
Section 1. Membership
Paragraph 2. Elected Members

Current Wording:

...For the purpose of representation, the word "division" shall mean any instructional school or college, or instructional unit which reports directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Library; and all other faculty jointly as a single entity.... Regular faculty who are involved in academic programs that are not in a division shall be attached as groups to an appropriate school, college or instructional unit....

Proposed Wording:

...For the purpose of representation, the word "division" shall mean any school or college, the Library, and all other faculty jointly as a single entity; the term "instructional division" shall mean any school or college....Regular faculty who are involved in programs that are not within an instructional division shall be attached as groups to an appropriate school or college....

Article V. Senate
Section 2. Election of the Senate
Paragraph 1. Determination of Divisional Representation

Current Wording:

...At the same time names of regular faculty and the number of full-time equivalent faculty in academic programs not in any "division" shall be reported by the chief academic administrative officer to the Secretary of the Faculty....

Proposed Wording:

...At the same time names of regular faculty and the number of full-time equivalent faculty in academic programs not in any instructional division shall be reported by the chief academic administrative officer to the Secretary of the Faculty....