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Minutes:
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Wolk for Bowlden, Rhyne for Finley, Petrie for McElroy, Midson for Olmsted.

Members Absent: Casperson, Cooper, Dawson, Ellis, Lowry, Manning, Tuttle.

Ex-officio Members Present: Erzurumlu, Everhart, Hardt, Holland, Mackey, Martino, Oh, Paudler, Pfingsten, Powell, Ramaley, Reardon, Savery, Schendel, Sheridan, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the June 4, 1990, meeting were accepted after the name of David Johnson was changed to Ansel Johnson as a member of the Steering Committee on page 48. DAILY observed that Powell's report of a 29% increase in IFC monies for the support of athletics over the past six years was actually a 61% increase (p. 48).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

EDNER made the following announcements:

1. When you speak on the Senate floor, please identify yourself by name and department.

2. Please give to the Secretary to the Faculty the name of your alternate. When you cannot attend, please pass your senate mailing on to the alternate and ask the person to attend in your place.

3. If you arrive at the Senate meeting after role has been taken, inform the Secretary to the Faculty in writing that you were present.
4. If you make motions or amendments during Senate meetings, please write them out and hand them to the Secretary when you make them.

5. The Senate is looking for a volunteer to assist Dean Jack Schendel in chairing the PSU United Way campaign. If no one volunteers, the Steering Committee will designate possible candidates.

6. The K-House reception following Senate meetings was discussed briefly. Attendance has been low, and the Steering Committee will make a decision about how to proceed.

TERRY JONES from the Employee Assistance Program explained the services available to faculty and all PSU employees; seven days a week, 24 hours a day. It is a confidential service provided by mental health professionals at sites outside of the University. They are on a retainer contract, paid by the University. He emphasized that EAP phone numbers should be posted in visible places in department offices, and employees should be reminded of this free service available to all for assistance with work-related problems such as stress or productivity, or personal problems such as marital or chemical dependencies.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President RAMALEY was welcomed to the Senate. She said she hoped to know everyone by name soon and would come to most Senate meetings to make formal reports. She presented a new planning exercise and explained its two-year stages. A subcommittee of the UPC, augmented by chairpersons of University committees, faculty and student leadership, will be asked to carry out the exercise, which will result in an academic plan and campus management priorities. The process will be organized and chaired by the Provost (see the attachments to these minutes for further details).

RAMALEY also commented on the governor's budget. There appears to be strong support in the budget for higher education and faculty salaries and for supporting the development and delivery of higher education in the metropolitan area. $1M is designated to support the work of the Council of College Presidents in the Portland area. $5M is identified for the collaboratively developed graduate schools for engineering. $2.5M is listed to fund whatever the Governor's Commission identifies, with PSU serving as the hub of Portland-wide collaborations. $1M is to go to initiative expansion, and other monies are identified for student loans and engineering research facilities; considerable debate is occurring about where to place the latter. PSU engineering is in drastic need of new and central facilities; programs are now housed in seven different buildings. RAMALEY
said that comments have already been made about the budget focusing too much on Portland.

RAMALEY discussed the new promotion and tenure guidelines which she reviewed and added to in order to make them reflective of PSU's urban mission. She said that faculty portfolios must reflect our concept of scholarship and service, which she described as the creative bringing together of people and ideas. Thus scholarship can occur in the classroom in teaching; it can occur in rendering community service or doing applied research; and it can happen in pure or new research or creative work. The guidelines have been revised to reflect this thinking. She announced that the Provost will deal with how we support faculty who are coming up for tenure and promotion considerations. What is also missing still is how we work with new faculty when they first get here and what help we can give them at the mid-term review.

The President explained that the internal management directive on scientific and scholarly misconduct, sent out in the Senate mailing, was issued because PSU was out of compliance for not having such a statement. Faculty who want to respond to or give input regarding the statement should contact Bill Savery, she said.

RAMALEY talked about the E-Board's release of monies for faculty salary increases, described in the hand-out she distributed (see attachment to these minutes). PSU's share of the funds is $599,299. Of that amount, 20% is to go to engineering, mathematics, and related physical sciences faculties, and 20% to faculty teaching in international and related areas. The remaining money is to recognize faculty who have made especially meritorious contributions to teaching, research or community service. Market factors, salary compression and equity can be considerations.

LENDARIS asked for an elaboration of "urban," a concept he said he was hearing a lot about. RAMALEY said we would continue to explore our mission and the opportunities and limitations we have in this urban environment. She said many of our agendas tie in with national agendas and funding sources by federal agencies. PSU should become a real laboratory for the urban experience and should take advantage of the many opportunities for basic and applied research. She said the distinction between those two types of research doesn't seem to mean too much. In response to MCKENZIE's question she said that the metropolitan area did include Clark County in Washington. She reported meeting with President Smith of WSU last month; they agreed to explore cooperation and avoid unnecessary duplication. She also reported that the Provost sits on Washington State's planning board, and a Washington representative is included in our planning process.
2. **TUFTS** reported that registration was up 3% over last year's fall quarter at this time.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

FISHER/ASHBAUGH moved "acceptance of the constitutional amendment of Article IV, Section 4, Paragraph j." HARDT reported that the Advisory Council had reviewed the proposed amendment and had made slight stylistic changes, to preserve the style of the rest of the Faculty Constitution. As revised, the amendment would read:

This council 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, and two graduate students appointed upon recommendations by the Vice President for Student Affairs.

The amendment was **passed**.

**NEW BUSINESS**

1. **A. JOHNSON** proposed a vote of thanks to last year's Senate officers and Steering Committee: John Cooper, Nancy Chapman, Rick Hardt, Marvin Beeson, Mary Constans, Janice Jackson, and Janet Wright.

   The motion was **approved** by a round of applause.

2. Dean Schendel presented the request for a name change for the School of Health and Physical Education to "School of Health and Human Performance." He explained that historically physical education was associated with preparation for teaching, coaching and intercollegiate athletics. But the profession has evolved over the years, and the proposed title is also used at UO, OSU, and the University of Florida, among other places.

   BECKER moved "to approve the change as presented."

   The motion was **passed**.

3. Dean Erzurumlu introduced the proposal for the initiation of the Center for Software Quality Research saying that we need a central point which serves the local industry. Questions regarding the proposal dealt largely with funding issues. HARRISON explained that the computer science department budget will fund one graduate student for the first year and portions of one professor. He speculated that industry contributions will take over more and more of the funding; if contributions don't come in, the Center will be reduced.
KOCOAGLU/A. JOHNSON moved "the approval of the proposed center."

The motion was approved.

4. MILLNER introduced what he called an issue of national significance, the exposure of students to a diverse range of ethnic, cultural and gender-based perspectives as part of their general education requirements. He said that this discussion has taken place at PSU before, but no action has ever been taken. His motion charges the ARC to bring the Senate a report with related recommendations by May 1991. ARC is also charged to invite active participation of appropriate individuals in its deliberations.

A. JOHNSON/CUMPSTON moved the entire motion presented by Millner. (See G3).

The motion was passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:33.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 5, 1990
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Julnes for Ellis, Gurtov for Goucher, Bulman for Latz, Westover for Wright.

Members Absent: Arick, Brenner, Casperson, Cooper, Cumpston, Dawson, Duffield, Koch, Manning, McElroy, Petersen.

Ex-officio Members Present: Davidson, Erzurumlu, Hardt, Mackey, Martino, Miller, Nunn, Powell, Ramaley, Reardon, Schendel, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the October 1, 1990, meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. EDNER reminded Senators that they needed to identify alternates who could attend in their place. [Sixteen (16) Senators have no alternates at this point.]

2. The monthly reception at the K-House following Senate meetings has been changed to a quarterly occurrence, due to low attendance.

3. EDNER reminded everyone to vote on November 6.

QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

ASHBAUGH asked if revised procedural guidelines of departments are being reviewed by OAA. He reported that the biology department guidelines had been submitted May 3, 1990, and there has been no response. He wondered if the delay was due to the upcoming review of the department. REARDON responded that departments had been
asked not to submit revised guidelines until the promotion and tenure review was done.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. RAMALEY distributed a status report on the Campus Security Task Force recommendations (April 16, 1990). The report is attached to these minutes. She pointed out that each one of the 14 recommendations was assigned to some office, program, committee, or department and that most of the recommendations are being worked on; some have already been achieved. But not all recommendations are workable or cost-effective.

2. RAMALEY distributed a copy of the polices and procedures by the central administration according to which the E-Board funds for salary increases are being distributed. (See attached) She said that all criteria were in the document now. PSU was one of 83 institutions used in a comparator list, which also included UO and OSU. The guidelines were reviewed by the administrative council and are in the academic units now to see if the merit processes in each unit can accommodate the guidelines.

ASHBAUGH asked if eligible faculty included department chairs and associate deans. RAMALEY said everyone who had scholarly responsibilities up to the dean's level was included. Recommendations are due in deans' offices by November 22 and to OAA by November 30. Raises are to be effective by January. BURNS asked to have the international education and research category defined, noting that "predominant" responsibility of "internationally active faculty" was nowhere defined. What is important? Would the English department faculty not be widely appropriate? MARTINO said each departmental committee should make the determination. BUNCH observed that "predominant" was never used in the written criteria only verbally.

3. Regarding an update on the planning process described last month, RAMALEY said that members of the sub-committee had been announced in Currently and were at work on step one of the process. Step two would begin in the spring, and Senate involvement will be crucial as budgets, academic plans, campus management priorities, program reviews, etc. are being developed. The existing EPC, UPC and Budget Committee will also be included to ensure faculty involvement and the effective functioning of faculty governance. She asked that governance structure not be changed until we see how it works with this planning process and can determine which structure works best.

4. Finally, RAMALEY said that the Governor's Commission Final Report would be issued by November 15. Information available suggests that the final version will not be substantially changed from the last one. PSU's central role in the delivery
of higher education in the metropolitan area certainly was emphasized in that report, and we can be pleased with that affirmation.

Following the president's report, the Faculty Senate congratulated the president on the excellent inauguration program and the wonderful celebration. She said she had had great fun orchestrating the program and deeply appreciated the outpouring of support.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Speaking for Tufts, RICKS reported that 14,758 students were enrolled this term, which represents a drop of .05 percent from last year. SCH were down 3.7 percent. BRENnan asked why there was a drop when we had tried so hard to attract more students after the enrollment limitation had been lifted for this year. RAMALEY said we had heard very late about the lifting of the enrollment cap, and she speculated that people were also wondering about the role of PSU in the future and were waiting for the recommendations of the Governor's Commission report. She also thought that enrollment caps will be reinstated, unless other resources became available.

BEEson recalled that the original purpose of increased enrollment was to support athletics. Do the registration figures mean that we cannot support athletics? MARTINO said that PSU did not increase athletic scholarships at all.

2. MANDAVILLE presented the quarterly UPC report and said that the planning process was going very well.

3. HARDT gave a report of the October IFS meeting (see attached).

NEW BUSINESS

1. LALL presented the proposal for a name change for the Division of Continuing Education and Summer Session to "The School of Extended Studies." The EPC was recommending the change.

NATTINGER asked what the implications of moving from "division" to "school" were. Does a school, for instance, have a permanent faculty? MARTINO replied that school was not a well defined object. ENNEKING wanted to know if summer session could ever really be "extended studies," offering even more of the wonderful array of courses we now feature and perhaps fewer of the regular courses which now make up the bulk of the offerings. DAVIDSON said she saw summer session as an extension of the other three quarters.
CEASE/FISHER moved "that the new name of The School of Extended Studies be accepted as proposed."

The motion was passed.

2. ASHBAUGH presented a motion, growing out of the AAUP Oregon Conference, objecting to the use of the academic budget for non-academic purposes, i.e., athletics (see attached text).

ASHBAUGH/FINLEY "moved the adoption of this resolution."

CEASE asked about the meaning of the resolution. ASHBAUGH replied it was difficult to speculate at this time, given the tax limitation measure on tomorrow's ballot. TOULAN warned about the negative side of the resolution. Would below-limit enrollment monies go to non-academic programs under this proposal? MARTINO pointed out the resolution inaccuracies regarding fall enrollments.

Given these unresolved questions, BRENNAN/LENDARIS moved to table the resolution until further information became available.

The motion to table was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:13.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 3, 1990
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Schaumann for Casperson, Julnes for Ellis, Gurtov for Goucher, Petrie for McElroy.

Members Absent: Finley, Manning, Weikel.

Ex-officio Members Present: Erzurumlu, Hardt, Holland, Mackey, Martino, Miller, Paudler, Pfingsten, Ramaley, Reardon, Savery, Schendel, Sheridan, Tang, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Provost MARTINO announced his resignation effective January 1, 1991; he will retain the title until June 31. He will be on executive loan to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

MARTINO talked about his three-and-a-half years at PSU, during a deteriorating climate, and his efforts on behalf of academic programs. With President Ramaley the University has a fresh start, he said, and he deserves a fresh start too.

The Senate gave the Provost a round of applause.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. RAMALEY expressed her personal thanks to Martino for his service to PSU and for his counsel, help and wit during the transition period. She emphasized that the University will continue to profit from his work at NASULGC over the next six months.

RAMALEY announced the appointment of Robert Frank as acting provost. Frank is chairperson of the OSU English Department and for nine months was OSSHE Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic
Affairs. He has also been acting dean of the OSU College of Liberal Arts. RAMALEY reviewed some of Bob Frank's vita and academic accomplishments and talked about the good match he was for PSU.

A national search for provost will begin in January. The Advisory Council will propose faculty names for the search and campus screening committees. The Senate Steering Committee and the Advisory Council will constitute a faculty transition team, to be chaired by Jim Heath.

2. The President reported on a number of projects of the fall term (see attached list):
   a. Formation of a Commission on the Status of Women, chaired by B. Oshika. This is a recommendation of the American Council on the Education of Women, which was chaired by Judith Ramaley.
   b. Formation of the Strategic Planning Committee and its nine sub-committees.
   c. Action Committee to Implement PSU's Plan for Diversity and its five sub-committees that are setting up a series of specific actions.
   d. Committee on Institutional Climate and Tone which is due to report in the middle of Winter term 1991.
   e. NCAA Self-study of Intercollegiate Sports.
   f. Ad hoc Committee to Review Parking Issues.
   g. Implementation of the new promotion and tenure guidelines.
   h. Review of all administrative committees before April. RAMALEY said she does not like the committee world and prefers working groups on specific and real projects.

3. RAMALEY reported having received requests for reconsideration of E-Board money distribution. She explained that the order of appeals is outlined in the guidelines: dean, provost, president, non-contractual grievance. She expressed hope that all salary adjustments would be completed by Christmas.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. HOLLOWAY presented the annual report of the Curriculum Committee and highlighted the item on cross-listing and slash-listing of courses. The committee also discussed the uses of '+'s and '-'s in the grading system but did not reach consensus on the matter;
it recommends a faculty-wide survey and turned the matter over to EPC.

2. EDNER presented the annual report of the Graduate Council and circulated an addendum to the report (see attached). BRENNAN reported that the council favored the use of +'s and -'s in grading and had passed that information to EPC. LALL said that EPC had considered the issue but had put it on hold, awaiting further research and a directive from the Senate.

BRENNER moved "that EPC continue to discuss the grading options of + and - for undergraduate and graduate courses and bring recommendations to the Faculty Senate."

The motion was passed.

3. WEST presented the Library Committee annual report. He recalled comments by President Ramaley that a high priority of hers was the building of a good, major research library without which not much can be accomplished. He said that Pfingsten had brought that to the attention of the Governor's Commission. WEST emphasized the importance of honesty in requesting library support for new programs. The library addition should be finished in February, and plans for a dedication are being made. COOPER and A. JOHNSON asked if the new library will solve our problems of shelf space. Will we be able to get all of our books out of boxes? PFINGSTEN said that the situation will be improved considerably. The shelf capacity will be for 1 million volumes. The floor space is increased by 45 percent, but the shelf space increase is somewhat less than that, since there are now wider aisles for handicapped access. Stored items with low usage will stay stored, since we do not want to fill up all shelves. Finally, WEST reported user satisfaction.

4. WRENCH presented the annual report of the Scholastic Standards Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Speaking for the Curriculum Committee, HOLLOWAY recommended approval of the two proposed program changes: B. S. program in Computer Science, and the B.A./B.S. degrees in Music.

A. JOHNSON moved "approval of the proposed program changes."

The motion was passed.

HOLLOWAY recommended approval of course proposals and changes in CLAS and the professional schools.

A. JOHNSON moved "approval of all CLAS course proposals."
The motion was passed.

A. JOHNSON moved "approval of all course proposals from the professional schools."

The motion was passed.

2. Speaking for the Graduate Council, BRENNAN recommended approval of all proposed graduate course and program changes.

SETTLE presented the following changes for two business courses, and the changes were accepted:

a. FinL 535 CORPORATE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (3)
   Change "Prerequisites: Actg 511, Ec 513 or concurrently" to "Prerequisites: Ec 513 or taken concurrently; Actg 511"

b. Actg 553 FINANCIAL STATEMENT ANALYSIS (3)
   Change "Prerequisite: FinL 543" to "Prerequisite: FinL 535"

LENDARIS said that the following two courses should be added to Systems Science (p. 14), and the additions were accepted:

a. SySc 575 (same description as EE 455/555 -- see p. 12).

b. SySc 576 (same description as EE 456/556 -- see p. 12).

COOPER asked why some chemistry course numbers had been changed to 6XX. BRENNAN said that these were courses taken by doctoral students.

A. JOHNSON moved "to accept all graduate course changes as proposed and amended."

The motion was passed.

A. JOHNSON moved "to accept the proposed program changes in the M.A. in Applied Linguistics, and the M.A. in Foreign Languages."

(The M.A. in TESOL was changed to an M.A. in Applied Linguistics. The changes in Foreign Languages involved dropping the MAT and dropping the M.A. in German and replacing them with an M.A. in Foreign Languages).

The motion was passed.

3. Speaking for the ARC, MAYNARD recommended that PSU recognize the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma in the admissions
process. COOPER asked if other universities accept the diploma. MAYNARD said that most of the best universities of the world do.

A. JOHNSON moved "that the Senate approve the ARC recommendation regarding the IB Diploma, as stated in attachment G2."

The motion was passed.

4. LALL reported that the EPC had met and discussed the problems faced by students who were suddenly called to military duty. The committee made the following recommendation by way of clarifying academic policy on grades:

"If the student has completed substantial work for the course at the time of call to active duty, then a grade should be provided based on current standing in the course.

If substantial work is not completed, an incomplete (I) may be assigned. Specific information about requirements for the completion of course work should be left in the departmental office by the instructor.

In either case, students should be given the option of requesting a withdrawal or change of grade through petition if they so desire."

The guidelines were accepted as circulated.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:10.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes:
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Tamblyn for Ogle, Pollock for Settle.

Members Absent: Arick, Becker, Dunnette, Lendaris, Lutes, Manning.

Ex-officio Members Present: Hardt, Holland, Mackey, Paudler, Powell, Ramaley, Reardon, Savery, Schendel, Sheridan, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the December 3, 1990, meeting were approved as distributed.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President RAMALEY welcomed Senators to Winter term '91 and to the new era of Ballot Measure 5. She said that new Governor Roberts' specific budget recommendations would be announced next week. What is clear already is that two percent need to be cut out of the current year's budget. The next biennium will probably require $90 million or 12 percent cuts for OSSHE. Approximately half of the loss can be made up by tuition and fee increases; the other half will have to be achieved through reductions. PSU needs to decide how many students it will be able to serve, given the revenues.

RAMALEY also said that Chancellor Bartlett did not want to use across-the-board cuts in these reductions.

RAMALEY explained the Budget Review Process (see attached) and promised to tap the ideas of faculty. The University Budget Committee will develop criteria for budget review and will present them to the Senate before the end of January. Once criteria have been drawn up, contingency plans will have to be developed, because we will not have final instructions and real numbers from the Chancellor yet. The
danger of working in a vacuum is that several options will have to be identified, some of which will never come to pass. The alternative is to work totally in private and not openly identify possible program adjustments. The president said she preferred the open discussion, because collectively we can do a better job. Senators agreed.

RAMALEY then explained the Strategic Planning Process (see attached); it is not to be confused or merged with the budget review; they are not related functionally. She said she made the following assumptions about budgets:

1. It is a restructuring not budget-cutting exercise.
2. We must protect and enhance our institutional development; therefore, we must protect the foundations we will need for the programs we will be called on to provide in our urban environment.
3. We must provide community service and when possible connect with OSU and OHSU in fulfilling our statewide mission.
4. We must generate and manage more of our own financial support and be a state-assisted school, not state-supported.
5. Since students will be asked to pay a higher percentage of their education through increased tuition and fees, we must hold down instructional costs.
6. Students will be increasingly part time; therefore, we must design programs and services for them and their time, family and financial constraints.

Even though we will serve fewer students than today, RAMALEY said we must protect access and quality--why bother to protect access to mediocrity?

KARANT-NUNN asked about the origin of the "state-assisted" concept. RAMALEY replied that a state planning document she had just received used that concept for all of the OSSHE schools. WEIKEL asked if the OSU model for reduction would be used. RAMALEY said that an amended version of that document would be used. But we also must consider our values, our criteria for adding money to programs, reducing allocation to programs, eliminating or merging programs. BUNCH appreciated the consultation with AAUP, and RAMALEY was grateful for the support, encouragement and leadership of the AAUP. She vowed not to relive the trauma of 1982 and 1986 and will do her best not to lay off faculty. However, deep cuts are required and this crisis is serious and not merely temporary.

A second meeting of the Senate will be called in January, EDNER announced, and there will be a welcoming reception for Bob Frank at the K-House following the February 4 meeting.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. TUFTS reported that advance registration headcount for Winter term was up 7 percent and up 4.9 percent on Friday, January 4.
HOLLAND spoke of the special efforts that have been made to encourage students to continue their studies. Many letters have been sent and 800 phone calls have been made to students who had not pre-registered for Winter, or who had received academic warning, or to first-year students with low grades. All of this communication and offers of assistance have earned much good will and have been well received. Many contacts with community college students have been made to heighten transfers; these efforts will continue during Winter and Spring, particularly in areas like engineering where a conditional admit has been worked out for ease of transfer. PSU is looking for good quality students in all areas, and HOLLAND thanked everyone who has worked hard in this effort.

2. HARDT reported on the December 7-8, 1990, IFS meeting held at UO. The group met Vice Chancellor Weldon Ihrig who talked of his concerns of the effects of B.M. 5. While discussing possible cuts, IHRIG also talked about the higher enrolments in Oregon colleges being forecast and the bigger-than-usual numbers of faculty retirements coming up. The vision is to enhance the overall quality of the OSSHE and to be responsive to the needs of the state. That includes the special needs in the Portland metropolitan area and the lack of educational opportunities there.

Vice Chancellor CLARK referred to B.M. 5 as the elephant in the room around whom we have to maneuver but who takes up most of the space. She talked of the need to publicize the excellent research and scholarly activities of the state's faculty--things not as well known or as visible as they might be. The Governor's Commission recommendations regarding faculty cooperation and collaboration in the Portland area were discussed, as was the increased pressure for public accountability--i.e., state assessment--and the new focus on undergraduate teaching which is sweeping the country (and the reward structures in our promotion, tenure and merit guidelines for undergraduate teaching).

Roger BASSSETT, Director of Governmental Relations, discussed B.M. 5 and the legislative leadership. He speculated that 10 percent cuts would be possible for 1991-93 and pointed out that M.5 allows escalation to 40 percent by 1995-97. Higher education is extremely fragile, he said. He encouraged IFS and all faculty to be strong and vocal about making higher education a central issue, especially to people we meet in the coffee shop, the shopping mall, the service station.

IFS talked about the E-Board salary monies distribution on the various campuses and, not surprisingly, found considerable variations. Also under discussion are promotion and tenure guidelines at the eight schools and the different interpretations of the state guidelines and how they are effected by
contractual agreements. In February the IFS will hear Mark Nelson, lobbyist for AOF, and Bassett talk about how IFS can coordinate with the new state government. Campuses will also report on what they are planning regarding the cut-backs caused by B.M. 5.

3. Kocoaglu announced that a series of workshops/open meetings would be held on January 23 and 24 to assist with the strategic planning process. A memo with details will be distributed soon, and input is earnestly sought. One of the results will be an updated PSU mission statement.

NEW BUSINESS

1. BRENnan presented the Graduate Council proposed policy regarding residence credit:

   **Residence Credit.** In a 45-credit program, a master's candidate must earn a minimum of 30 graduate credits in courses on the PSU campus during the student's graduate degree status (regular or conditional) and graduate certificate status.

   A minimum of 12 credits (25% of the required credits in a degree program greater than 45 credit hours) must be taken in residence in 500, 500/600 or 600 course level categories. The remainder of the required credits may be 400/500 courses taken for the 500-level number.*

   *Underlined section is the revised addition to the policy.

   A. JOHNSON/FISHER moved approval of the policy.

   A long discussion followed about who could take what level courses, and about what the transcript would show. Some were astonished that only one-fourth of the graduate program would be strictly graduate, but they were told that has been the case all along. Others argued that many schools across the country did not have absolutely discrete courses for graduate students. BRENnan said that departments which were in compliance with the old policy will be in compliance under the new one. BRENNER commented that some accreditation bodies may not allow graduate students to be in a mixed class with undergraduates. R. JOHNSON asked if departments could override the last sentence. BRENnan answered in the affirmative and pointed to the use of "may" in that sentence; departments may choose to be more restrictive.

   The motion was passed unanimously.
2. MAYNARD presented the ARC recommendation that "effective Summer Term 1991, the two courses, AJ 220 Crime Literacy (3 credits) and AJ 330 Crime Control Strategies (3 credits) be accepted as six credits in one department, satisfying part of the social science distribution requirement of the GER. We also recommend that selected elements of these courses be prepared by the appropriate instructors in the Administration of Justice Department, in cooperation with Campus Security, as part of the freshman and transfer student orientation programs at Portland State University."

WURM/RUFOLO "moved acceptance of this policy."

MAYNARD pointed out that all parties who had been consulted agreed that this proposal would work.

The motion was passed, but not unanimously.

3. George CABELLO presented a resolution "urging President Bush and his administration to explore all non-violent and diplomatic means relevant to the settlement of the crisis in the Persian Gulf and give the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations a reasonable chance to succeed." The resolution further states that "if President Bush intends to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to a war in the Middle East, he must obtain the approval of Congress to do so."

WEIKEL/D. JOHNSON "moved the acceptance of this resolution."

COOPER asked if this is to be a letter to the addresses (Bush, Hatfield, Packwood and AuCoin) or a sense of the Senate motion. CABELLO replied both.

The resolution was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:28.
The special Senate meeting was called to order by EDNER in the SMC Ballroom. He explained that President Ramaley would outline the budget building/cutting process and that the Senate will be asked to approved proposed "Criteria for the Allocation of New Resources, Reallocation of Existing Resources and Reduction and Elimination of Programs."

RAMALEY reviewed the stages of the Strategic Planning Process, the Budget Review Process, and Consultation with AAUP. She explained that PSU had been asked to cut $8.2 million (6.5%) from its 1991-93 biennial budget. A provisional budget has to be submitted to the Chancellor by noon, February 9. She emphasized that this provisional budget will continue to be discussed and changed; nonetheless, it is to included specifics regarding PSU cuts. She explained her frustrations about going public with preliminary plans which may very likely not hold up. Things could change significantly as we get more information and know more of the implications of B.M.5.
The members of the Transition Team were announced:

Robert Frank  
Nancy Tang  
Michael Reardon  
William Savery  
Morris Holland  
Earl Mackey  
Steve Sivage  
Ken Harris  
Sheldon Edner  
Walt Ellis  
Barry Anderson  
Beatrice Oshika

RAMALEY said that the T.T. would be asked to discuss a number of scenarios which would differ enough in contrast to allow campus-wide discussion. Open University forums would be announced in Currently. CADS and the Budget Committee will be consulted (February 3 and 6-8), and student government, the Faculty Senate, Advisory Council, and the President's Advisory Board will be kept informed of what the provisional budget cuts will be.

RAMALEY identified the following principles for budget building:

- collegiality
- timely and meaningful information sharing
- substantive involvement of all elements of the University community
- personal and professional respect
- collective responsibility for outcomes
- building for the future.

She added the importance of putting students first, restructuring rather than cutting, maintaining diversity, streamlining the structure, protecting faculty scholarship and teaching, and maintaining access, quality and program building. It has not taken her long to discover that PSU is the University with a heart, she said.

ELLIS presented the "Criteria for the Allocation..." document and explained that it was a compilation of an OSU and 1989 PSU Planning Document (from a Toulan task force). This was draft four; the Budget Committee has been involved in two of them; the final revision and editing was done by Ramaley.

A. JOHNSON/LENDARIS moved "to adopt the document."

ELLIS explained that the Budget Committee had looked for ambiguity in language and had discussed the problems in gathering some of the information called for in the guidelines. There was also a discussion of what would constitute appropriate sources of information. The criteria are set within the context of PSU's mission as an urban grant university. He reviewed the general outline of the guidelines and acknowledged that many bits of information refer to items which departments may not have been collecting, therefore building the scenarios for or against cuts will not be easy. However, he pledged that the T.T. will do the very best it can, and be emphasized that the
scenarios will only be provisional statements. After February 9 there will be more time to develop the final budget for the spring.

ARICK observed that the definition of program is very wide and wondered who would—in this very compact timeline—make the decision of what constituted a program. ELLIS said that all the definitions listed would be used; they account for the rich diversity on our campus. GOSLIN wondered what criteria will be used to assign priorities; they are not given anywhere. Who will decide what weight and priority to give to programs? ELLIS said there was no time to include that in these guidelines. There will be a lot of informal weighing in this short run. Later there will be time for changes.

LENDARIS noted that the title of the document referred to eliminating programs and asked if that were a possibility at PSU. EDNER answered in the affirmative, given the substantial cuts which have to be made. BUNCH concluded that the criteria are so all-encompassing that any program could be cut. ELLIS concurred. EDNER added that the programs which were more central to the University mission were safer. ENNEKING asked if there will be cooperation among the OSSHE institutions about which programs to cut. RAMALEY replied that the presidents and provosts are discussing that; we need to coordinate and not all cut the same thing. We are also talking with community college presidents and need to work together to ensure that we don’t unnecessarily disadvantage students. It is a deep concern to all.

THOMS proposed cutting "option" and "minor" from the guideline; TANG explained that "options" are a valid part in certain programs.

The motion to approve the criteria was passed, but not unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 15:54. A general University meeting was scheduled for 16:00.
Minutes:

Faculty Senate Meeting, February 11, 1991

Presiding Officer:
Sheldon Edner

Secretary:
Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present:

Alternates Present:
Falco for Arick, Brabenac for Gray, Becker for D. Johnson.

Members Absent:
Duffield, Dunnette, Ellis, Goucher, Lutes, Manning, Millner, Tuttle.

Ex-officio Members Present:
Davidson, Erzurumlu, Frank, Hardt, Holland, Mackey, Ramaley, Savery, Schendel, Sheridan, Sivage, Tang, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the January 7, 1991, meeting were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENT

EDNER reminded Senators of the reception being planned for Interim Provost Bob Frank at the K-House following this meeting.

REPORTS

1. A. JOHNSON gave a report of the joint Steering Committee and Advisory Council meeting with the Chancellor (see attached).

ASHBAUGH asked about the meaning of "suspension" of programs. JOHNSON explained that a suspended program can be activated again with action on campus, whereas an eliminated program would require full re-application. EDNER, however, said that a good rationale would be needed to re-activate a suspended program. RAMALEY further explained that suspension only meant there would be no admission of students next year; the program could open admission the following year with no explanation to the chancellor. To the question of whether we are more optimistic than the chancellor, RAMALEY said yes.
2. RAMALEY further explained "suspension" in her report. Those programs which were suspended needed more time to be re-evaluat-ed. They either had low enrolments, faculty vacancies, or they lacked necessary faculty expertise, due to vacancies. Suspended programs could be opened up tomorrow without permission from the chancellor. RAMALEY said there was no intention to reduce the size of the liberal arts and sciences or eliminate programs (in an obvious reference to a memo distributed by Senator Susan Karant-Nunn at the beginning of the meeting--see attached).

RAMALEY indicated that our legislative representatives know how bad these cuts are and that the tuition increase and surcharge is badly needed. We are serious about moving ahead and are getting the community behind us. She tried to explain again the number of faculty involved in making budget decisions and the fact that the Budget Committee's input will affect the longer-term way of changing the budget, admitting that short-term decisions made by the Transition Team were not changed in many instances, despite the Budget Committee hearings and input.

RAMALEY gave formal notice that she was activating Article 21 in the AAUP agreement, indicating that PSU was in a program reduc­tion mode. A formal letter will be sent to Craig Wollner.

She was frustrated that the numbers we are dealing with are still only tentative. We are assuming a 6.5 percent cut is all that is needed. On March 11 she expects AAUP comment regarding reductions. Another checkpoint will be 30 days later on April 11. In the interim, Ways and Means will meet on March 25 and the OSSHE Board on March 26. She pledged that the Budget Committee, AAUP, and the Senate Steering Committee will be fully informed in the future. The preliminary budget plan had to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office before we could go through the review process with AAUP.

RAMALEY reported that the draft of a new mission statement is in the works. The Strategic Planning Process is moving ahead on schedule. The reorganization of the administrative structure is proceeding and the questions of access are being investigated. She is grateful for long hours spent by the Transition Team and the Budget Committee. The EPC will soon become involved in the discussions of the proposed restructuring. She pledged faculty consultation at all points.

SETTLE observed that the campus was not really aware of the details of the plan submitted to the chancellor; they only saw one overhead transparency in one meeting here on campus. Then the Oregonian carried details which people were not aware of. He asked when the University community will know. RAMALEY said that some committees will get detailed information tomorrow. On February 18, deans, directors and department chairpersons will know. Individual units which were slated for elimination and
suspension were contracted; she was only aware of one case where faculty were not apprised of a slow phase-out being planned.

BUNCH asked how a randomly selected committee could decide that a masters in political science or sociology should be sent aside because the faculty was not adequate or competent. RAMALEY rejected that notion and said no one had said that. Those know of decisions were not made. She said the “random group” was the Budget Committee, and it was anything but random. We will develop a mechanism for these kinds of decisions through the strategic planning process.

BUNCH also asked about the impact of losing graduate students vs reducing undergraduate students. RAMALEY said that no analysis of that had been done yet. However, she stressed that since programs that have been suspended had vary few students, there will not be major impacts. We don't know the long-term consequences of suspensions, but we're waiting to hear what faculty want to do to bolster admissions: e.g., recruit more students, come up with new program and degree combinations.

DAILY asked why physics had been cut. FRANK replied that it was a combination of low numbers of undergraduate and graduate students, number of recent graduates, and faculty vacancies. A stronger department was needed to offer programs. DAILY wanted to know how we can justify cutting this program when the chancellor had talked about the need to increase science offerings in Portland. RAMALEY said students simply were not taking the program. We need to recruit harder. But we also need to fill faculty positions. She feared that moving to early retirement options in the next few months will further increase the randomness of the distribution of vacancies across programs. BOWLDEN said that Karant-Nunn's memo captured what many faculty feared. Programs can be cut under Article 21 after it has been invoked. He worried about putting programs on suspension when no dollars are being saved. The chancellor had warned against doing that (see his response to question 3). RAMALEY said the suspensions could be changed any time there was good reason to change them. We have done the best we can, given the time. She hopes that she will be able to honor the 30-day AAUP contract requirement, but that may be a judgment call, and the contract allows for that. We have to keep in mind that the budget can be imposed upon us. We simply do not know at this time. The legislature may want to see what a 10 percent cut would look like, and then we'd have to cut to that level. The AAUP contract allows for pressing circumstances and adjustments of contractual agreements. DAILY asked if there will be time to discuss Article 21 in the future. EDNER thought there could be but urged people to refer to the contract meanwhile. BEESON asked about the frozen faculty positions. Will any of them be unfrozen? RAMALEY said that target of opportunity hiring was a high priority and will be continued. The provost has also
approved hiring in two critical areas. FRANK added that much depends on upcoming retirements; we will not know for several months what flexibilities those will create.

3. ASHBAUGH asked about the status of biology department's guidelines which were submitted for OAA approval in May 1990. Is there a deadline for responding to such matters? Many requests have been made. FRANK said he had not seen any materials nor had he heard of this case. He promised to find out.

4. TUFTS said that winter term registration was almost the same as last year. Headcount was down 1 and SCH down a fraction of a percent.

5. MANDAVILLE presented the UPC quarterly report. WEIKEL wanted to know how UPC, EPC, and the Budget Committee could possibly consolidate as is being proposed, given the recent experience of very taxing assignments to the Budget Committee, for instance. MANDAVILLE saw no reason why the Budget Committee could not work in tandem with the planning process. The two should go together. The proposal for the merger will be brought to the Senate later this year.

6. E. ENNEKING made a report of the recent IFS meeting (see attached).

NEW BUSINESS

1. KOSOKOFF presented the proposed constitutional amendment of Article III. 1.4 regarding the election of department chairpersons. He said the Advisory Council was trying to straighten out confusions and controversies over earlier versions. He highlighted the changes, noting that choices must be forwarded immediately. He recommended this amendment as a workable solution.

ASHBAUGH noted that the proposal does not deal with the recall of a chairperson. KOSOKOFF said that needed to be covered in departmental guidelines. LENDARIS wanted to know if these guidelines would have to be followed if a department brought chairperson in from outside. KOSOKOFF said yes. Other discussion centered around the length of terms, the definition of "promptly" and the consultative role assigned to the Advisory Council in cases of stalemate. KOSOKOFF said that it was not the Advisory Council's intent to make rulings in disputes, but to give advice. The ultimate choice is up to the president.

The proposed amendment will be up for a vote at the next Senate meeting.

2. Speaking for the Graduate Council, BRENNAN presented the School of Education request to add the following omnibus numbers to its
departmental listings in CI, COUN, EPFA, LIB and SPED: 801, 802, and 804 to 810.

A. JOHNSON/FISHER moved "approval of the Graduate Council recommendation."

The motion was passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:34.
Minutes:
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Young for Brennan, Anderson for Cumpston, Bluestone for Gray, Roseberry for McKenzie, Midson for Olmsted.

Members Absent: R. Johnson, Lendaris, Lutes, Manning, Millner, Rees, Tuttle, Zwick.

Ex-officio Members Present: Davidson, Frank, Hardt, Holland, Mackey, Pfingsten, Ramaley, Reardon, Savery, Sheridan, Sivage, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the January 25 and February 11, 1991, meetings were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

EDNER announced that the Provost Search Committee has been formed and is organizing itself. Deans Erzurumlu and Ward are co-chairs. The position description is being written at this time.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

The President reported where the budget process was. The Board on March 1 approved FY 1991-93 budget; therefore we have a budget. But because of the uncertainties in Education, the budget remains tentative. Deliberations are happening at this time to investigate if curriculum and instruction from UO and the Training and Development program from OSU could be moved to PSU.

RAMALEY announced that other schools besides PSU used the "suspension" designation in their cut-backs. She also explained that suspensions and consolidations could be lifted at any time at PSU's discretion; no Board action is needed.
RAMALEY emphasized that this budget is not open to major revisions. Further work on campus is not meaningless, but no major change will be allowed; except in Education. She admitted that it is very legitimate for the constitutional committees at PSU to review the recommendations of the Transition Team and offer a legitimate second opinion. Review of management of the campus is important. On the hand-out (see attached) she showed that $2.4 M had already been identified but that $1.7M more needed to be found.

RAMALEY said no tenured or tenure-track faculty will be laid off. Frozen positions account for $.5 M; they will not be unfrozen except in unusual circumstances, such as in Spanish. Early retirement incentives will be issued, but they tend to cost money, especially in the beginning. She admitted that programs could be victims of circumstances if they had a vacancy when the University needed the savings. That should not be viewed as a signal for future cuts.

The President also announced that vice presidents were going through reorganization plans to see what positions can be eliminated among classifieds, in non-academic areas, and administrative positions. Answers should be available in the next three weeks. She said that "preliminary advisory" notices for potential lay-offs will be given by March 25; these are not lay-off notices. If those have to be issued, it will not be until after the April or May board meeting.

RAMALEY said that affected people will be given counseling and any assistance the University is capable of giving. Most will have a one-year notice (classified shorter).

She encouraged faculty to work closely with students who are in programs which have been identified for elimination—in an effort to reduce as much anxiety as possible. Provost Frank is working with the OSSHE system, and Vice President Mackey is working closely with the legislature. She plans to hold two more open meetings to answer any questions people might still have. There will be a wonderful University left after all these cuts, she said, and we must plan for that tomorrow.

KOSOKOFF raised the distinct possibility of increased revenues returning to higher education (perhaps as much as $27 M) and wondered how it would be spent. RAMALEY said that Ways and Means has set aside some money, but it would probably go to some specially targeted projects, rather than across the board. Word also has it that the chancellor wants most to enhance faculty salaries. MACKEY thought that any new money would go for targeted programs. RAMALEY said questions had been raised above saving some elements of HHP, but she said it was hard to undo what you've already said you'd do. It is also dangerous to go to the legislature to fund specific programs, because if the legislature funds programs they can also unfund them at will.
REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. EDNER told the Senate that the Steering Committee and Advisory Council felt that the following four constitutional committees have a charge to review elimination and changes in programs: Curriculum, Graduate Council, EPC, and the Budget Committee. Accordingly, the Steering Committee and some Advisory Council members met with the chairs and another representative from the four committees to lay out the task of review. A preliminary report will be given at the April 1 Senate meeting, with the final report on May 6. The four committees are to carry out their review in somewhat coordinated fashion, and their recommendations will have to be acted on by the Senate.

BOWLDEN added that the charge to the committees was not simply to look at only the irreparable harm done to the University by the proposed changes. Rather, the committees need to look carefully at all programs to see if they would have made the same decisions as the Transition Team.

2. Regarding the status of the biology department guidelines, FRANK reported that a request for updating all departmental guidelines had gone out from Vice Provost Reardon's office. No new guidelines have been received so far. He said the biology department had a discussion with Dean Paudler about its proposed guidelines, and they were back in the department for revisions. OAA will not respond to the guidelines until they are submitted with the dean's recommendations. So far that hasn't happened.

ASHBAUGH asked if the department knew that. REARDON replied that almost invariably guidelines come to OAA with the dean's recommendation. ASHBAUGH doubted if the department knew that. A. JOHNSON wondered what the department should do if its guidelines were chopped to ribbons by the dean. Shouldn't the dean just write them? FRANK said it was important that the dean and provost agree with guidelines the department could live with, otherwise there will be endless quarrels. DUFFIELD said the department sent the guidelines where it thought they should be submitted, but when it tried to implement them, people were told that the guidelines had not been adopted. FRANK found it regrettable that there had been no action for four months.

FRANK also expressed hope that there would be more consistency among departments regarding merit, promotion and salaries, otherwise we are inviting discrepancies and inequities. For that reason OAA needs to be sent the guidelines. If the provost needs to intervene in negotiation between a department and a dean, he will do that.
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. JOHNSON/WEIKEL moved "to adopt the proposed constitutional amendment of Article III. 1.4, dealing with faculty authority in the selection of department chairpersons."

KARANT-NUNN said it was important not to consider personalities in this matter. ENNEKING urged approval because of the recent history of this issue. She said having the selection of the chairperson totally in the department's hands is ideal but not realistic, since the department has to work with the administration.

The amendment was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:00.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes:
Presiding Officer: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 1, 1991
Sheldon Edner
Secretary:
Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present:

Alternates Present:
Bulman for Ashbaugh, Schaumann for Casper son, Anderson for Cumpston, Dawson for R. Johnson, Rhyne for Finley, Etessami for Koch.

Members Absent:
Brennan, Brenner, Daily, Dunnette, Ellis, Lowry, Lutes, Manning, Olmsted, Tuttle.

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the March 4, 1991, meeting were accepted as written.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President RAMALEY announced that Rod Diman had been appointed interim assistant to the president until July 1, giving her enough time to figure out what to do. He is spending about two hours a day in that office.

RAMALEY said that the governor called her and the chancellor to her office about a month ago and asked them to translate the Governor's Commission report into an action plan. That has been done, and she distributed the executive summary and three appendices. She indicated that this action plan was still in draft form; nonetheless, significant components of the plan include a cooperative regional library system, the Portland Educational Network (PEN), the Council of Presidents, the joint OSSHE engineering program. She said that PSU has emerged as the hub of the educational network, and that is important for the University's future. Oregon now needs to go public (Mackey's term) with its request for support. RAMALEY said the governor accepted the plan with enthusiasm. The plan will be presented to the Board in April.
COOPER asked where the engineering center might be located. RAMALEY said she and Erzurumlu want it on the PSU campus, and very preliminary plans for that already exist. However, the chancellor has said the new council will review all options when the time for that comes. OGI, PSU, OSU and UO will participate, as well as OHSU's bio-tech program. For the latter to be possible, the location has to be downtown and not in Washington county. We are making compelling arguments for this.

BURNS asked about the make-up of the Trust, observing that the right people had to be on it. RAMALEY agreed and said the governor was helping to recruit people; a list of potentials is being created now. The Council of Presidents will create the agenda while the Trust will be involved in carrying out the action plan. She said the Council of Presidents was meeting tonight and will be presented the action plan; she predicted they will focus on the proposed regional library system in their discussion.

The President reported that the transition process was being monitored. Twenty-five persons have been notified that their jobs have been eliminated; they include 8 tenure track faculty, 8 classifieds, 3 management service personnel, and 6 unranked faculty. A. JOHNSON asked about retirement packages. RAMALEY said that packages were being developed designed to be attractive to younger faculty. FRANK added that medical benefits were the specific focus of one proposal; because it is new in its concept, it is receiving close scrutiny by the chancellor's office. He would not predict its final outcome.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. TUFTS reported that Spring term registration figures were almost identical to a year ago.

2. MAYNARD presented the annual report of the ARC.

3. PATTON presented the annual report of the Committee on Effective Teaching. COOPER asked what the committee had done about last year's Senate request that the committee address the issue of evaluation of teaching for promotion and tenure purposes. PATTON responded that that was outside of the committee's responsibility. FRANK said that the Evaluation of Teaching, Advising and Service Committee was beginning to deal with that and will be sending a memo to all departments soon. KOSOKOFF asked why the names of unfunded requests were published. BUNCH thought it was inappropriate and embarrassing. PATTON said the Steering Committee had requested that information, but BEESON thought the committee had only wanted more information about how many more requests there were than funds to accommodate them. However, DAILY and REARDON argued that all grant requests not funded were a matter of public record anyway. DIMAN added that being turned down is not necessarily a reflection on the writers
of the grant. Bowlden said we needed to know what was requested in order to make a case for getting more money for the committee.

BUNCH/KOSOKOFF moved "that only the successful requests be mentioned in the annual report of the Committee on Effective Teaching."

The motion was defeated.

4. L. ROBERTSON presented the annual report of the General Student Affairs Committee.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Preliminary reports were presented by the four committees reviewing the work of the Transition Team, to "see if they would have made the same decisions as the Transition Team made," EDNER said. HOLLOWAY said the Curriculum Committee was reviewing the impact of the decisions on the curriculum. The committee is asking the affected department chairs and directors and is getting information together. The committee is specifically looking at the consistent delivery of liberal arts programs to the University and community. The committee has a long way to go yet.

BRENNAN reported that the Graduate Council was examining the impact of proposed actions. The Council is looking at data being sent by departments; it is also waiting for information from the Budget Committee. The Council is particularly concerned about the uneven impact of frozen positions and retirements.

KOROLOFF, speaking for LALL, said that EPC was looking at policy decisions which were made by the Transition Team. They were also interested in the issue of student access and program diversity. Are transfer students specifically being hurt? Are we affecting the cultural mix of students at PSU? Is there a sufficient base left to offer quality degree programs, and can mergers help with creating broader, stronger areas?

A. JOHNSON, speaking for Ellis, said the Budget Committee had met and wrangled over issues. Since the committee had already served as hearing panels for affected programs, it had in a sense already dealt with this assignments, although its findings and recommendations from those hearings have not been made public. The committee is sending that information to the other three committees on request.

EDNER said that the strategic planning information was confidential, proprietary and not generally disseminated. He said the Provost had it, and it was not generally used by the Transition
ARICK was concerned about incorrect information which the Transition Team had used from Institutional Research. He asked how the corrected information which departments gave at the Budget Committee hearings could now be used in this review. EDNER said the Institutional Report data were used. A. JOHNSON thought departments should send their information to each committee. RAMALEY was concerned with the accuracy issue and thought we should start with Institutional Research and correct the central files or else we continue to use wrong information.

FRANK announced that suspended programs are to have external reviews next year; memos to that effect are going out this week. KARANT-NUNN said this was a constitutional issue, and the Senate needed to be involved in the elimination or suspension of programs; the constitution demanded it. DUFFIELD agreed that the Senate had to review the decisions; she said that they were not based on what the Transition Team said they were based on. Is there no recourse at all? EDNER said that there wasn't time to go through the regular process in making the earlier program cuts; three weeks was not our choice. He pointed out that the Senate did vote on the criteria used by the Transition Team, and that the Budget Committee was involved in preparing those criteria.

BOWLDEN said the Steering Committee gave broad charges to the committees, yet he senses that committee members see themselves as being rubber stamps. Since he is a member of the Steering Committee he said he knows what committees were asked to do; committees need to take their charges very seriously and do in-depth analysis of program suspensions and eliminations. EDNER said that the board has acted on the proposed plan, therefore there was no point in discussing eliminations. The suspension issue, however, was open for discussion. Referring to the minutes of the March 4 meeting, BEESON said that the four committees were "to look carefully at all programs to see if they would have made the same decisions as the Transition Team." He agreed with Bowlden that committees were to do an in-depth investigation even if decisions could not be overturned.

ENNEKING urged that the committees go far enough to say that it was regrettable to eliminate programs and that programs should be rebuilt at the first opportunity, even if the board has already acted. The Senate should be honest and say if we made a mistake. REAR DON said that the section of the constitution giving those responsibilities to the Senate predates the first contract. There is a certain vagueness about coherence, yet we need to look at preserving the Senate's role. WEIKEL countered that AAUP never intended for the Senate to abdicate its role.
She urged that we not let the precedence of the last few months stand.

NEW BUSINESS

SESTAK introduced the memo from the Women Faculty of PSU to the Senate, pointing out that budget limitations disproportionately impact women students, faculty and staff. Since we purport to be concerned with preserving diversity on campus, we must examine the cuts and how they affect women.

BOWLDEN/WEIKEL moved "that all decisions involving personnel and program cuts be carefully reviewed to ensure that campus diversity is maintained and that proposed staff and program reductions are free of personal or political motivations. We further move that changes in enrollment and number of non­returns be tracked by gender and ethnicity to determine the effect of increased tuition and surcharges on students and programs."

SETTLE wanted to hear arguments in favor of the motion. SESTAK and OSHIKA explained that women students are often the first effected by tuition increases, because many of them are single parents. Also women faculty often are last hired therefore first fired. We need to track this information. SETTLE wondered if this would be an administrative burden. TANG didn't think so, since Institutional Research already tracks male and female admissions.

COOPER was troubled by the political overtones and wondered how that could be handled without adjudication. He wondered if Bowlden might be willing to remove that from the motion. BOWLDEN refused.

COOPER/DIMAN therefore "moved to amend the motion by removing the language 'and that proposed staff and program reductions are free of personal or political motivation'."

FRANK supported the amendment, saying that the original motion seemed to imply maliciousness or mean-spiritedness. KASAL said the original motion was not clear enough and needed to be more specific to be helpful.

The motion to amend was defeated.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:27.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 6, 1991
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present:

Alternates Present:
Bulman for Ashbaugh, Etesami for Koch, Dusky for McKenzie, Pollock for Settle.

Members Absent:
Finley, Duffield, R. Johnson, Lutes, Manning, Tuttle.

Ex-officio Members Present:
Davidson, Erzurumlu, Frank, Hardt, Holland, Laguardia, Mackey, Pfingsten, Ramaley, Reardon, Schendel, Sheridan, Sivage, Toulan, Ward.

Faculty Senate Meeting, May 13, 1991

Members Present:

Alternates Present:
Amato for Burns, Dusky for McKenzie.

Members Absent:

Ex-officio Members Present:
Erzurumlu, Frank, Hardt, Reardon, Sheridan, Sheridan, Sivage, Toulan.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the April 1, 1991, meeting were approved with the following corrections: Brennan and Brenner had both been present. The Bowlden/Weikel motion (p. 36) regarding the careful review of program and staff reductions and their effect on gender and ethnicity was passed.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President RAMALEY reported that the Ways and Means Committee was hard at work shaping the budget. Favorable new economic forecasts are expected, but we will not know anything definite until after the middle of May. Prospects look good for some restoration of funds; the chancellor is working on a $56-57M package. Faculty salaries and the Portland agenda will have high priority. PSU has met with Vera Katz to discuss her education reform bill. There are still many concerns that need to be dealt with, but PSU is at the table and effectively involved. The University is in general well situated to deal with many of the pressing challenges of the state, since PSU is the University with the "people agenda" in such schools as Education, Social Work, Business, and Urban Affairs.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. EDNER announced that there would be a reception at the K-House following today's Senate meeting.

2. COOPER made the following motion, congratulating the Vanguard on garnering so many commendations and awards in the 1991 Oregon Collegiate Press Contest:

"The Faculty Senate of Portland State University congratulates the editor and staff of the Portland State University Vanguard and Lois Breedlove, their adviser, for their having won seven first-place commendations and three awards of merit at the 1991 Oregon Collegiate Press Newspaper Contest in Salem. To have achieved these honors in the first year in which the paper has produced a daily edition is particularly impressive and reflects well on the intelligence of the students, their capacity for hard work, and professionalism of the advice that they have received."

The motion was passed unanimously.

3. Liz KONSELLA announced the May 14 "Forum on Homophobia/Hate Crimes" in SMC Ballroom, 12:00-3:00 p.m., and she urged faculty to attend and to promote the meeting.
4. A. JOHNSON reported that the Committee on Committees was working on administrative committee nominations for next year. The Committee is also recommending the elimination of six committees and the merger of three. Details will be available later.

**QUESTION PERIOD**

HOLLAND responded to the spirit of the questions posed and invited interested persons to go to him for further information. He also distributed the Student Affairs Budget summary (see attached) which shows how Student Affairs has responded to the reorganization. B.M. 5 has effected all, he said. HOLLAND pointed out that PSU has the FTE of 9,000 students, but in actuality deals with 37,000 different students every year, because of the high percentage of part-time students. That fact puts a strain on many offices, like registrar, student financial aid, etc. There is growing demand for child care, parenting help; the needs are great, the resources slim. PSU is doing heroic things given our graduation rate of 20 percent. Yet we must focus on doing a better job.

HOLLAND said there have been three different reviews and intense discussions of OSA: spring 1989, spring 1990, and winter/spring 1991. Three goals have been identified

- enrollment management (recruitment/admissions, financial aid, registrar's office)
- doing a better job with information and support services in one place--created one large department from five smaller ones
- strengthening the on-campus community and create a student center or union.

Each of these changes will have a benefit on the services provided to students, HOLLAND said. He also talked about the reduction of administrative overhead from eleven to seven. The total permanent cut in OSA has been 6.5 percent or $129,000, which translates to six positions.

Students will pay $47.50 in health fees next year, $2 more than this year. $18 is a mandatory fee, considered low, because it is 40 percent less than at OSU or UO. HOLLAND acknowledged the $189,000 rebates during 1989-91 but said that the insurance carrier does consult with the General Student Affairs Committee and ASPSU each year. Because there were no catastrophic illnesses, the insurance company has given the refund. A new X-Ray machine has been bought with this money, and other medical equipment will be replaced. The rebate will also supplement student health fees so they don't have to be raised.
REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. ELLIS submitted the annual report of the Budget Committee. KARANT-NUNN asked if the committee had met recently to review the budget cuts. ELLIS said no, since the committee had had hearings earlier. He did distribute, for the first time, the committee's written report to the Transition Team (dated February 6) which contained the recommendations made following the hearings.

2. JONES presented the annual report of the University Athletics Board. He said that PSU women's basketball and volleyball had recently been invited to join the Continental Divide Conference. The UAB will recommend that basketball join the conference. DAILY asked how the budget compared to previous budgets. JONES said that there were slight increases of 3 to 5 percent for personnel costs. OGLE asked if NCAA allows different levels of participation for men and women. JONES didn't know but said there was a lack of evenness. He thought football and basketball had to be played under the same division.

3. D. JOHNSON submitted the annual report of the University Honors Program Board. He said that a proposed constitutional amendment regarding the make-up of the board will be submitted.

4. POLLOCK presented the Teacher Education Committee annual report.

5. TUFTS reported that spring term registration was down very slightly in headcount but was even with a year ago in SCH. He also said that 1870 students had already registered for Summer Session, 90 percent of them via the new touchtone telephone system.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. HOLLOWAY reported on the Curriculum Committee's investigation of the Transition Team decision regarding program cuts and reductions. He acknowledged that the situation is still in flux and therefore was difficult to deal with; however, the written report distributed outlined a number of points where the committee disagreed with the team, particularly in decisions to suspend the bachelor degrees in philosophy, physics, and health.

   A. JOHNSON/WEIKEL moved "that the Senate adopt the recommendations by the Curriculum Committee (on pages 3 and 4 of their report) regarding the reinstatement of philosophy, physics and health."

   COOPER said he agreed with these recommendations but wanted to know which other programs should be cut if not these. HOLLOWAY said that the suspension of these three programs resulted in no savings, therefore the committee was puzzled by why the deci-
sions were made to begin with. A. JOHNSON added that no budget was being given back; the programs would carry on effectively, albeit with a smaller faculty. WEIKEL said she had heard from philosophy that they would be able to operate within the budgetary constraints. LENDARIS wanted to know what the effect of voting yes on this motion was. EDNER explained that the constitution charged the Senate with voting on curricular matters and changes; therefore the Senate would go on record with its opinion. BRENNAN wanted to know the process of lifting suspensions. RAMALEY said the provost would make a recommendation to her after he was satisfied with program strength; admissions to the program would then resume. BRENNER asked if the Curriculum Committee recommendations were consistent with those of the other three committees doing reviews and was told yes, but HOLLOWAY said he had never received the Budget Committee report of February 6.

The motion to accept the Curriculum Committee recommendations was passed.

2. BRENNAN made the report for the Graduate Council investigation of the Transition Team decisions. Among other points, the Council felt that a grievous mistake was made in the elimination of the graduate degrees in exercise science and sports studies. The Council supported the Transition Team decisions regarding the elimination of the Ph.D. options in criminal justice and in electrical engineering, and the elimination of the MAT/MST in physics.

A. JOHNSON/BRANNAN moved "that the reinstatement of the MA/MS and MAT/MST in health education, the MA/MS in political science and in sociology, and the MFA in art be recommended."

The motion was passed.

LATZ asked if the Graduate Council had taken into consideration frozen positions and early retirements. BRENNAN replied that the council dealt only with the information they had and of course would not know about early retirements. All programs recommended for reinstatement could be covered by current faculty. LENDARIS wondered if early retirements could result in frozen positions. Provost FRANK said not necessarily. RAMALEY added that the provost would know during spring where these positions are and would develop a strategy of filling them. It will not be a random process.

3. LALL presented the EPC report of its investigation. While they felt that the Transition Team did a reasonably good job given the tight schedule, the committee made several recommendations.

A. JOHNSON/ENNEKING moved "that an accelerated review of all suspended programs in general and BA/BS in Philosophy in
particular be carried out. It is also recommended that until the status of departments with suspension of degrees is resolved, these departments be eligible for consideration for additional positions if and when funding becomes available for those now frozen."

Because Senators had many specific questions about the EPC report and recommendations, a motion to table until the June 3 meeting was passed.

4. ELLIS distributed the February 6 Budget Committee report to the Transition Team and pointed out that the committee disagreed with the team's report on a large number of programs. He said the Budget Committee would now meet again to consider the recommendations from these three committees and coordinate them. There is no movement on frozen positions, he said, and we don't know about early retirements yet. However, the Budget Committee could now talk to the provost and could consolidate information for the Senate. He promised that the committee will have recommendations for the June 3 Senate meeting. KARANT-NUNN observed that the committee did take very constructive action in February and urged the committee to now bear in mind what needs to be done now, in May.

FRANK pointed out that several things are still up in the air; e.g., the move of some education programs from UO and OSU to PSU. He said that Representative Katz wants PSU to take leadership with regard to her programs and initiatives, the workforce and at-risk agendas. It is very difficult to figure out what will happen. ARICK asked if UO faculty moving to PSU would be considered new faculty or replacing positions. He said the SOE is losing five positions. FRANK said they should be considered new faculty. This led to a discussion of the reduction of 6,000 students in the system and the need for legislative fiscal support if numbers of students are not to be reduced.

BOWLDEN asked why the Budget Committee had not made a recommendation regarding physics. ELLIS said physics had not asked for a hearing initially. However, there have been subsequent meetings with the dean and departmental faculty. FRANK said that we are moving as quickly as we can to have external reviews of programs. It is possible that we may lose a round of student admissions while programs are suspended.

NEW BUSINESS

1. A. JOHNSON explained that the Committee on Committees was asked to discuss the possibility of merging the EPC, Budget Committee, and the UPC into one constitutional committee which conforms to
the form and organization of all the other constitutional committees. He proposed a constitutional amendment of Article IV, 4, 1, n, o.

WEIKEL had questions about the workload of this new super committee and wanted to know which "the appropriate Faculty committees" were with whom the council would consult. JOHNSON thought they might be administrative committees. WEIKEL wondered who would choose faculty members to serve on subcommittees. Would the Committee on Committees? JOHNSON didn't think so. WEIKEL asked how the chairpersons of the effected committees felt. ELLIS was ambivalent but thought the Budget Committee still had an important function. MANDAVILLE felt uncomfortable personally, though the UPC as a whole seemed to favor the proposal, but not unanimously. LALL felt that there needed to be a permanent subcommittee to deal with program reviews. KARANT-NUNN generally favored fewer committees, but recent program suspensions and reductions made her think differently. KOSOKOFF had two reasons for sharing Ellis' ambivalence: a) it is the identical proposal made by Nat Sicuro, and b) it takes some time to become an expert in reading budgets, and now we're talking of giving that task to another committee which already has heavy assignments. He suggested that standing subcommittees be used.

Attempts were made at amending the proposal, but these were not successful.

EDNER adjourned the meeting until the following Monday.

MINUTES OF THE CONTINUED MEETING--MAY 13, 1991

1. GOSLIN/KOSOKOFF presented a motion folding together the EPC and UPC but leaving the Budget Committee as a separate committee. (See the complete proposal attached).

There were arguments for and against the motion. In the end, the vote to approve the motion was 19 to 15.

ENNEKING offered a friendly amendment "that the chair (or a designated member) of the UPC serve on the Budget Committee." The amendment was accepted.

2. In Kacaoglu's absence, GRUBB and MANDAVILLE reported on the Strategic Planning Process and its progress. They distributed the attached papers containing the timeline and said that the draft document would be available and sent to all Senators around May 20. Senators are urged to give input at that time. KARANT-NUNN wanted to know if the mission statement, distributed earlier, was discussable now? She had a statement to distribute, and EDNER urged her to pass it out so people could reflect on it. She did. (See attached). ENNEKING wanted to know if
the Senate would have time to discuss the plan. Would there by
a July Senate meeting? EDNER said the Senate Steering Committee
would discuss a summer meeting for June or July.

3. LALL proposed the establishment of the Institute of Portland
Metropolitan Studies for which the city has already provided
$100,000.

A. JOHNSON/STERN "moved the acceptance of the proposal as
presented."

COOPER inquired about funding, observing that the proposal
specifies that $5M will eventually be needed. He asked what
kind of assurances there were that this will not drain PSU
resources. LALL said the Institute will only work with outside
funds. TOULAN reviewed the history of the planning which began
in 1974 under President Blumel. B.M. 5 has created new prob­
lems; however, the community is committing finances to the
project, and we can't stop them. A number of influential people
from the private sector are promising financial support. He
said the proposal has many benefits for many different depart­
ments. The Institute is housed in UPA because Toulan developed
the plan for it. WRIGHT asked if accepting private support will
allow us to be neutral. TOULAN answered that we will not accept
money for pre-determined results. PSU will act as a neutral
agent, just as we now do for grants and other research.

The motion was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 15:50.
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The minutes of the May 6 and 13, 1991, meetings were approved as written.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. EDNER announced the following campus election results:

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

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

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

ELECTION RESULTS

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

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

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

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

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

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

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

5. MANDAVILLE presented the annual report of the UPC.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

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

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

The motion was defeated.

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

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

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

The motion was passed.

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

BUNCH/ASHBAUGH moved "to table the motion."

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

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

ENNEKING/WEIKEL moved "to table the motion."
The motion was passed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ELLIS pointed out that the Budget Committee had also encouraged departments to be creative in class scheduling and to review their offerings. KARANT-NUNN saw no problem with rising to a temporary problem, but she warned against canonizing something for all time. BRENNAN reminded Senators that the recommendations by the Budget Committee were prefaced by "for the academic year 1991-92 only."
The proposed constitutional amendment, Article IV, 4, l,n,o was passed. It combines the functions of EPC and a newly designed UPC. The Budget Committee will continue.

NEW BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

The motion was passed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The motion was passed.

KOSOKOFF/MAYNARD moved "to adopt the sexual harassment policy."

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

The sexual harassment motion was passed.

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

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

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

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

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

Motion to amend passed.

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

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

The motion to table was defeated.

Motion to approve the motion as amended was approved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was approved.

The motion as amended was passed.

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

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

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

The original motion passed.

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

EDNER thanked the Senate Faculty for their support and cooperation. The meeting was adjourned at 14:48.