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Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 7, 1991
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Dodson for R. Johnson.


APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the June 3 and 10, 1991, meetings were approved with one correction. The top of p. 49 should read "MILLNER/BOWLDEN moved 'to eliminate item b (not c) from the motion'."

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President RAMALEY's report began with her introduction of Vice President Lindsay Resrochers who is in her first week at PSU. Since the provost search did not result in finding a satisfactory candidate, it has been reopened. Linda Parshall is chair of a screening committee which is to do the initial work of bringing a small group of candidates to campus. The Provost Search Committee will then do the rest of the work. Names should be fed to Parshall.

RAMALEY distributed the newly board-approved PSU mission statement and the summary of the Introspect Team findings and recommendations. She pointed to the guiding principle that reorganization is necessary in order to support the new mission and the increasing scope of the University. RAMALEY pointed out that the recommendations of the co-consultant team were general in nature; e.g., consolidate Academic and Student Affairs, create a shared enterprise with all other activities supporting that. The report does not deal with specifics like international education. It does,
however, make four recommendations which have already been rejected by the President, such as the creation of an Executive Vice President Office, and taking affirmative action and athletics out of the President's office; the latter two recommendations go counter to national trends and to Ramaley's interests and commitments.

BJORK asked why we had to go outside of the University to get the Introspect Team and how much the consultants had cost us. RAMALEY said that Introspect has a successful 15-year history with business and other agencies, and they were using a proven approach and software program that it would have taken us years to develop; they did the study in five months. The cost to us was approximately $130,000; it will eventually result in savings of $2 million, hence was very cost effective. The $2 million will be directed toward implementing recommendations, teaching, and research. LENDARIS asked if there were any recommendations for the computing center. Yes, to merge it with telecommunications to form an information center, putting all technology together, including ED NET.

WEIKEL wanted to know if there would be a reduction of vice provosts. RAMALEY said the number of layers would be reduced to affect better communications and more effective service. The important point is how much work we get done, not how many vice provosts we had. There may be more "lead players" at the next lower level. BRENAN asked about the financial aid office. It will be clustered with admissions and the registrar, but no details or prescriptions were given. We need to do better in this area than we are doing. MIDSON wanted to know how we will measure the success of these changes. Will Introspect stay with us and evaluate what we do? The co-consultants will help us with the first two steps and will leave their software programs. They will also give intermittent help, but it is important to realize that organizations change over time, and no organization is for all time. We need to change as the needs of the community change. We now have the structure from Introspect for making future changes.

RAMALEY announced the availability of $220,000 over two years for the Portland agenda, i.e., involvement in the community. In the next two weeks the Provost will develop an RFP for one-time projects, and competition will be opened up. She urged faculty to think about how their projects could be extended out into the community.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Presiding Office Ansel JOHNSON made the following announcements:

1. Please submit the name/department of your alternate to the Senate ASAP. Send to the Secretary to the Faculty.
2. If you arrive after roll has been taken, please give the Secretary your name in writing, so that our attendance will be noted.

3. If you make motions during the meeting, please write them out and submit them to the Secretary during the meeting so that we may have accurate text for the deliberations.

4. Please state your name and department when speaking on the Senate floor, so that we can get to know each other.

5. K-House is preparing for liquid refreshments after each Senate meeting. Both non-alcoholic and alcoholic drinks will be available, and you are encouraged to attend.

6. The ARC will present an update at next month's meeting regarding courses on diversity. Further discussions will take place.

7. The Conflict of Interest document has been submitted to AAUP for review and as a possible bargaining item.

8. JOHNSON reported having received a memo from the Advisory Council which pointed out that the proposed reorganization of the School of Business Administration needed to be reviewed by the UPC. The constitution requires it, and a memo by the Provost to John Oh urges consultation with all necessary University committees. Accordingly, there will be a UPC report next month on this item.

**QUESTION PERIOD**

1. Provost FRANK reported that the decisions to unfreeze faculty positions are made by deans, provost and president. Deans submit requests, and then a number of matters are considered, such as the recommendations of the Transition Team; the total number of positions eliminated, frozen, lost through retirements; the recent strategic plan and its implications; the add-backs and their implications; the needs of strategic new programs, such as the Ph.D. in Social Work and Curriculum and Instruction; the salary savings of retirements. FRANK said that most decisions on thawing positions will be reached in the next two weeks, although other requests will be reviewed after that. Deans can also forward recommendations for filling positions in the target of opportunity program. At this point, specific positions which have been unfrozen are in Spanish, Russian, UPA, and Computer Science.

KARANT-NUNN was alarmed that recommendations of the Transition Team still carried weight, since the faculty felt that the Team's findings had been discredited. She said the faculty will not accept this criterion for unfreezing positions.
FRANK responded that the chancellor and state board approved those recommendations; we may not like it, but that's a fact. BEESON asked if faculty can be involved in final decisions. The Provost said he will work through the deans and envisions them working with faculty. BEESON responded that that was difficult because faculty had not known which priorities had been identified. FRANK said that deans will know in the next two weeks. Several searches already are under way because of recruiting requirements within certain disciplines. He vowed to open as many positions as possible as soon possible.

S. BRENNER asked about the $4.1 million cut PSU had to accommodate. FRANK said we needed to identify $.5 million more and were looking at retirements.

2. HOLLAND distributed a new OSA organizational chart (dated 10/4/91) and brief position descriptions of the executive staff. Without further comment he turned to the creation of the Information and Academic Support Center (IASC) and invited CUMPSTON to describe it. She called IASC a first-stop center for students and elaborated on the stages of the move to this center which will eliminate the many inappropriate referrals which now are made. There were some questions about the proposed redistribution of FTE.

TANG talked about the plans for academic advising. The Advising Center in NH will be phased out; the aim is for some central advising in each school and college. Each unit is now responsible for doing its own advising, including giving information about distribution requirements. Faculty will do all of the main advising. However, TANG said that something needs to be figured out for advising during summers and other breaks and holiday periods.

BEESON asked Holland when the latest organizational chart was drawn up. HOLLAND said several months ago, but minor changes were made recently. He predicted that other changes will follow, in light of the B.M. 5 and the Introspect recommendations. WEIKEL wanted to know about Collier's position. As of October 1, .5 FTE is planning and development, and .5 FTE is a no-line assignment in OSA. KOSOKOFF asked about the difference between judicial affairs and legal services. HOLLAND said judicial affairs administers the student conduct code while legal services concerns itself with matters such as dealing with landlords in student housing.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. TANG reported that the fourth week headcount was 14,758 students. Fees paid was down 6% from last year, perhaps partly due to the 30% tuition increase this year. PSU's FTE corridor this year is 9,128 (compared to 9,458 last year).
2. TANG said the enrollment management committee was working to develop benchmarks for the new system. PSU retention and graduation rates are terrible. Last spring, meetings with student focus groups found that students were apathetic about the institution. We need to find out why student come to PSU and what their long-range plans are.

TANG reported that there were virtually no complaints with BANNER and touchstone registration. DAILY introduced the need for a discussion of ethical questions with the availability of BANNER and accessing student records. TANG agreed. MOOR talked about the incongruity in timing of what the enrollment management committee and the retention task force were doing and the far reaching changes OSA is already putting into place. He argued for the importance of doing the study first and not putting the cart before the horse.

FRANK added that PSU could potentially get a second and third payment from OSSHE if all 4000 students which the system is permitting to be added show up. That would give us money for lecture sessions for winter and spring. TANG added that we will also soon see students who fled to the community colleges when cutbacks were put in place; they will have earned their 108 credits and will come to four-year institutions.

3. KOÇOAGLU said that the Strategic Planning Committee had completed its task with the publication of Phase I Strategic Plan. The project is in the hands of the President now.

4. Janice JACKSON gave a report of the weekend's IFS meeting in Klamath Falls. Among other things, she reported on the IFS opposition to the proposed state bail out of university intercollegiate athletics. For a complete text of the resolution and her entire report, see the attachment.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Grant FARR presented the Strategic Plan for International Education at PSU. He said that some changes had already been made since the plan was put together. E.g., Extended Studies will be a part of the International Council. And Dean Everhart has made the suggestion that other divisions and units on campus perhaps have rotating membership on the council. FARR emphasized that the list was meant to be suggestive, not exclusive. OGLE asked if this proposal called for a new vice provost. FARR said that had already happened, and he was it. MIDSON asked about international services and exchanges. FARR said that this program will seek to assist those who want to go abroad and those who want to come here. No details have been worked on yet, but the effort will be to coordinate the international interests across campus, exchange information, and respond to queries.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 4, 1991
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Gurtov for Goucher, Becker for D. Johnson, Rad for Kocaoglu, Kristof for Sestak, Grubb for Visse.

Members Absent: Ashbaugh, Bjork, Casperson, Dunnette, Haaken, Kasal, Sobel, Westover.


APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the November 4, 1991, meeting were approved as distributed.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President RAMALEY announced two upcoming changes in senior administrative positions. Interim Provost Robert Frank will return to OSU in the middle of December and will be replaced by Acting Provost Michael Reardon. The President is delighted with Reardon’s acceptance of the position. She also reported that the provost search committee is working hard on identifying strong candidates for the position.

RAMALEY announced that Morris Holland is stepping down as Vice President on December 1 to become senior advisor to the acting provost. The President praised Holland for his three years of service to the University, pointing out particularly the strong ties he helped develop with the community colleges and providing access to their students. She said he will develop those relations further in his new role in the provost’s office, and she is grateful that Holland will help with these important activities, including the Portland Education Network (PEN).

RAMALEY elaborated on PEN. Armando Laguardia is the coordinator; a steering committee is in place, and an agenda is being developed. An inventory of educational reform activities in the region is being put together. The concept of a regional library is developing apace, with plans for automation also proceeding. The Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies is progressing; Elizabeth Kutza is the director.

The President announced that RFPs would soon be issued from Reardon’s office, inviting faculty to make proposals that would strengthen the links between the University and the community. RAMALEY said the alumni weekend had been a big success and had been well attended. The seminars planned in conjunction with the dedication of the library addition were especially good for our kinds of alumni.

The President’s final report and recommendations growing out of the Introspect study will be made the third week of November. Input from the University community is being sought now. Changes in OSA will be addressed as well.
REARDON reported successful contract negotiations. He estimated the AAUP will soon be given a proposal to ratify. It is the hope to have salary increases begin on January 1, 1992, for 12-month employees, and on February 1, 1992, for 9-month employees.

RAMALEY said Devorah Lieberman had won the rumor contest for reporting that the President was going to be the chancellor of the University of Colorado. A dinner at Atwater’s is the prize.

QUESTION PERIOD

HOLLAND responded to questions posed by the Steering Committee. Regarding the search for an assistant dean of students he said that the new position is not identical to the one being eliminated. One was narrow, the other quite broad. He invited people to compare the two job descriptions. The change is therefore not entirely due to B.M. 5; increased effectiveness and productivity is the reason for change in this instance, not salary savings by elimination. (Attached to these minutes is an analysis of the Jack Lutes and Ken Fox positions, as provided by Holland.)

HOLLAND also provided a document showing new assignments within OSA, and he said that three persons will be eliminated. Three senior-level people are assigned to work with Minority Affairs: Gil Sanchez, Brenda Green, and Catherine Collier. J. BRENNER asked why it was unnecessary to have one person who has an oversight position for minority affairs. HOLLAND said he has tried to distribute these functions to departments throughout the University. The assistant dean who had that responsibility for seven months is losing his job. He acknowledged that the decentralization of minority affairs needs to be reviewed carefully; we don’t know the right answer yet. DECARRICO asked why Sanchez shows up as director of minority affairs when he is leaving in February. HOLLAND said that was his current position. HOLLAND did not know what will happen to OSA and to this position.

Regarding the number of student conduct complaints, HOLLAND said there have been 22 complaints in 1989-91 as follows:

17 resolved
3 open and ongoing
2 on administrative hold

He described the pending cases. BURNS asked to whom investigations were delegated. Usually to the assistant dean, but in two cases there is a conflict of interest involving Ken Fox who therefore can’t do the investigation. Holland has selected two senior staff to the cases (C. Collier and P. Waring), and they have met with Holland and Fox. They will bring reports to Holland. BURNS asked why Holland preferred to have a lawyer at PSU when we have the services of the attorney general. HOLLAND said he relied on the A.G. for some issues, but he said that student affairs needs to navigate through many issues and therefore needs someone who knows the OARs and Oregon. Fox can interact easily with the justice system. Complex tracking is needed, and an attorney’s advice is especially helpful. J. BRENNER was not convinced that legal experience should be such a high priority in the new position, since 22 cases in three years is not much. She thought that minority affairs, student leadership, and student government were more important areas on which PSU should focus. HOLLAND said a legal license was not a requirement, but experience with diverse cultures, advising, and student government was important.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. JACKSON gave an update on the Mediation Center Work-group. See attachment to these minutes.

2. TANG reported that fall term registration was down 3% from last year (at the fourth week), but that PSU was well within its enrollment corridor. There were 14,285 students. She said enrollment at all private colleges in the state was up.
3. MILLNER reported that ARC was trying to determine the criteria to be used for the selection of courses for the diversity requirement. FARR asked if 199 and 399 courses may be used. That is up for discussion. ARC is requesting input from faculty, student groups, and campus support units by December 2. The committee plans to have criteria drafted by the end of the fall term. MILLNER said he'll assume that each course did not have to include both ethnic culture and gender diversity.

NEW BUSINESS

1. HOLLOWAY presented the following course change proposals, all recommended by the Curriculum Committee, and all were approved by the Senate:
   - Accounting, Engineering (except CS), Administration of Justice, Dance, Music, Theater Arts, and HPE 298. In Art, two new prefixes were approved: Architecture (ARCH) and Art History (ArH).
   - KARANT-NUNN made a strong plea for keeping ceramics and textiles. TANG said ceramics had been eliminated with the budget cuts. GOSLIN asked about dropping the music courses, but DIMAN explained that only the third term of a course was being dropped.

   Regarding the change in the HPE 298 course, JOHNSON ruled that the ARC should be consulted, since it involved quite a drastic change in graduation requirements. MOOR and BOWLDEN asked whether the Transition Team had in mind the elimination of the requirement. FRANK thought that was likely and possible, but no final decision had been made. The HHP faculty have now decided they can offer 298 as a lecture course.

2. BRENNAN said the Graduate Council recommended approval of all proposed courses. However, two motions were passed to take the School of Education and System Science courses off the proposal for further discussion next month. Education faculty wanted to double-check prerequisites for their courses. GOSLIN wondered why SYSC would drop the courses, given PSU’s urban mission. Once dropped, courses are difficult to add, especially given the current climate. KOCH said the proposal reflected a change in faculty during the last three years.

   The Senate approved the Graduate Council’s recommendations.

3. GOSLIN gave UPC’s review of the Introspect Draft Document. A detailed written response is attached to these minutes. Also attached is the quarterly UPC report to the Senate.

4. BURNS gave a report from UPC regarding the SBA reorganization. She said that SBA did not go through the appropriated Senate committees for review and approval of the reorganization, even though Provost Frank had made that a requirement. SBA minutes indicate that some faculty thought reorganization was a "done deal." SBA departments were abolished on July 1, and new associate deans began to serve on September 16. UPC has been told that it would take a year to develop bylaws and guidelines for the new school organization. BURNS reported that a UPC telephone survey of the SBA faculty found that faculty were willing to give the new organization a chance to succeed.

   BURNS/WEIKEL moved that the School of Business Administration submit a proposal for reorganization of their school, to include promotion and tenure guidelines, and explanation of grievance procedures, and explanation of the faculty voice in electing administrative representation, and demonstration of financial savings through the loss of FTE or other means.

   REARDON and MOOR pointed out that departments were not allowed to have their own grievance procedures. WEIKEL and MOOR therefore moved to drop "an explanation of grievance procedures" from the resolution. The amendment was passed. KARANT-NUNN urged Senators to vote for the resolution. Faculty committees and the requirements of the constitution should not be bypassed in these matters, even
when a financial emergency exists.

The motion was passed.

5. BURNS/BRENNAN then moved "that the Library submit both their proposal for reorganization and information on the procedures involved in reorganizing the Library."

J. BRENNER complained that this proposal will also come to the Senate after it has been implemented. PFINGSTEN said he had sent his proposal to the Library Committee and to the chairperson of the Advisory Council, but not to UPC. The Library faculty had not been formally polled on the reorganization.

The motion was passed unanimously.

6. BURKE/WEIKEL moved "that the PSU Senate endorse the IFS resolution on the proposed bailout of university intercollegiate athletics which follows:

The IFS shares the Oregon State Board of Higher Education's frustration that it should be forced to consider bailing out university intercollegiate sports programs at a time when valuable academic programs have been cut. While IFS is cognizant of the symbolic value of athletics in higher education, we reaffirm the value of academic programs to the State of Oregon. Therefore, we heartily encourage the creative and thorough search for alternative dollars to fund university intercollegiate sports programs. However, we are unalterably opposed to the transfer of any dollars that would otherwise fund academic programs."

BURKE said he supports athletics, but this proposal was a travesty. The state legislature should put up the money or shut down athletics. BEESON observed that the chancellor's recent article in The Oregonian never identified the source of the bailout money.

The motion was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:40.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 2, 1991
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Krug for Arick, Korloff for Briggs, Skokan for Haaken, Kristoff for Sestak, Tseng for Stern, Robertson for Terry.

Members Absent: Duffield, Dunnette, Edwards, Gillpatrick, Johnson, Midson, Sobel.

Ex-officio Members Present: Desrochers, Diman, Erzurumlu, Frank, Hardt, Pfingsten, Ramaley, Reardon, Savery, Schendel, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the November 4, 1991, meeting should have listed Bjork and Bowlden as present and should not have listed Dodds, who was only appointed to the Senate after that meeting, replacing D. Johnson. The minutes were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. JOHNSON announced that Senators need to provide the name of an alternate to the Secretary.

2. A revised policy on sexual harassment will come to the Senate in January. JOHNSON also announced a workshop for Saturday, January 18, 1992, from 10:00-2:30 p.m., sponsored by the Sexual Harassment Resource Network.

JOHNSON has received a reply from Chancellor Bartlett re the PSU Senate's resolution opposing the athletics bailout. The chancellor reported that the State Board also opposed the staff recommendation on the bailout.

3. Sculptor Mike TAYLOR, on a grant from the Oregon Arts Commission, is surveying public art at PSU and distributed a questionnaire which he would like to get back in two weeks.
4. JOHNSON acknowledged that this would be Bob Frank's last Senate meeting. There was warm applause for FRANK's many contributions as interim provost to the University, and Senators were invited to attend the social hour following the meeting.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY announced that the reorganization plan has been issued and will be implemented over time. OAA and OSA will be combined quickly; other parts of the reorganization are several months away. Details will appear in PSU Currently. There are three pieces to the reorganization: structural changes; the use of management teams rather than administrators, allowing us to combine expertise available on campus among faculty and others; and the initiation of quality management in those parts of the institution where it will be most beneficial and where problems need to be solved. She also announced that two people have gone to OSU to study how their organization is working.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. JACKSON reported that the IFS Executive Committee had met on November 9 to discuss alternatives to the proposed state bailout of athletics. They were joined by representatives of AOF and AAUP and by Vice Chancellor Ihrig. The Executive Committee drafted a number of specific recommended alternatives and sent the letter to the board and chancellor.

2. BRENAN presented the annual report of the Graduate Council.

3. WEST gave the annual report of the Library Committee. Use of the library is up since the new addition. He also announced that library hours will be extended to 11:00 p.m. on weekends. KARANT-NUNN asked if the proposal for the library's reorganization had been reviewed by the committee. WEST said that the committee had been informed of it. PFINGSTEN reported that he tried to inform the EFC, but it no longer existed.

4. HOWARD presented the annual report of the Scholastic Standards Committee. The committee acted on nearly 1,000 petitions. RAMALEY asked if staff could act on some of the routine requests. The staff and chairperson do, but requests for reinstatement require a great deal of compassion and careful reading by committee members, often especially in the summer. MOOR suggested that 12-month employees might be considered for membership on the committee. HOWARD thought that two days' extra pay may also be incentive for faculty to serve.
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. BURNS reported that UPC had sent a letter to acting dean John Oh requesting a proposal for the reorganization of the SBA. The proposal is to address, among other things, what benefit the reorganization is to the students, what the savings are, and what new positions have been created because of it. UPC also is concerned what input faculty will have in choosing the associate deans. For the record, BURNS also reported that Provost Frank had sent a letter to Oh saying he should clear the reorganization with all appropriate University committees. BJORK asked if that had been done. Not until now, and it was being done retroactively. BURNS thought, however, that the Senate could ask the SBA to make changes, but an informal survey of the business faculty had shown that most were content with the changes and were willing to try out the new reorganization. BJORK thought the quality of the response of faculty to the survey could be doubted, since we learn to accommodate to things that have already happened.

2. The ARC is requesting input from all departments and programs on the criteria regarding the diversity course list. Responses are coming in now, and a draft statement will be distributed later in December, with hearings scheduled in January. The HPE 298 requirement will also be discussed by ARC.

NEW BUSINESS

1. The Curriculum Committee presented proposed new courses and course changes.

KOSOKOFF/WURM moved "to approve all recommendations except the change of major in English and PSY 491."

There was some discussion regarding the extensive changes in Psychology, including some courses which appear to overlap with offerings in SBA and UPA. BRENNAN and SKOKAN explained that the department was moving from a clinical to an applied psychology model with interests in industrial organization. While there appeared to be some overlap in the areas of leadership and group effectiveness, HOLLOWAY said the committee had been satisfied that courses were not duplicating existing ones. JOHNSON and BEESON explained that the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council both had representatives from across the University on them who would raise these questions on overlap and duplication; further, all requests for new courses have to respond to that on the proposal form. WEIKEL thought the psychology courses looked pretty basic and belonged in the department. BJORK was concerned that PSY 592 Decision Making II would not have a mathematics prerequisite.
MOOR encouraged ways to cooperate and coordinate offerings during these times.

The motion was passed.

2. The Graduate Council recommended program changes, and KOCAOGLU/ABBOTT moved "to accept all changes as proposed."

The motion was passed.

In a separate motion, BOWLDEN/ABBOTT moved "that all graduate course proposals, including those of the School of Education tabled during the November meeting, be approved."

BJORK/SCHAUMANN moved "to delete PSY 592 from that list, because of its lack of mathematics as a prerequisite."

The motion to delete was defeated.

The main motion to approve the graduate courses was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:28.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 6, 1992
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Klebba for Gillpatrick, Bulman for Latz.

Members Absent: Arick, Briggs, Burke, Burns, Dunnette, Forbes, Goucher, Dodds, Kocaoglu, Parshall, Sobel, Tuttle, Wurm.

Ex-officio Members Present: Davidson, Desrochers, Diman, Erzurumlu, Hardt, Miller-Jones, Oh, Pfingsten, Reardon, Vieira, Schendel, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the December 2, 1991, meeting were approved as distributed. Bowlden was noted as having been present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

JOHNSON announced a 2:00 p.m. January 7 meeting for all those interested in discussing a 1-year turn-around for making curricular changes.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION

1. JACKSON gave the IFS report (see attached).

2. HOLLOWAY presented the Annual Report of the Curriculum Committee.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. THOMS gave an update of the UPC's deliberation regarding the Business School reorganization (see attached). STERN wanted to know how TQM, early instruction of synthesis, and lack of faculty voice in the selection of assistant deans had to do with a discussion of the reorganization. THOMS said these topics were brought up in UPC, and the last item was particularly critical. KARANT-NUNN asked whether there was any
implied disapproval of the reorganization if nothing else were to be said. THOMS didn't think there would be.

2. MILLNER circulated a draft statement of criteria for implementation of the diversity course requirement, and he announced two public meetings (January 13 and 16) for discussions (see attached). The ARC drafted these criteria with input from 12 departments. MILLNER briefly reviewed the guidelines, pointing out the required dual focus on content and methodology. After the approval of the criteria, the ARC plans to review proposed courses, and these will then be brought to the Senate before the end of this year, but not in time for the fall 1992 catalog. Lists will be available for advisors.

FARR doubted if a requirement could be in effect without a list of officially published courses in the Bulletin. SCHAUMANN questioned the proposed requirement of two courses from two different departments; in engineering, at least, this would be very difficult for students. MILLNER thought that the diversity requirement could easily be satisfied within the 54 credits of general education.

3. VIEIRA presented a revised sexual harassment policy and a guide for assisting individuals in resolving complaints. Revisions were made to improve consistency, format, and clarity. If approved, the document will be widely circulated. KARANT-NUNN said the procedures in the abstract were good, but she doubted whether faculty would take the required appropriate action for threat of law suits. Will the policy therefore have any effect? VIEIRA replied that PSU is obliged to confront the issues; we are in violation of the law if we don't. Individuals should go to the Affirmative Action office for help.

BULMAN and DUFFIELD addressed the problem of students not willing to complain or go through what's required in these cases. Do witnesses have a responsibility to make allegations of sexual harassment? If individuals confide in us, do we have the right to violate their trust? VIEIRA acknowledged that these were tough questions that had no clear answers. OSHIKA asked if complaints could be anonymous or if they could be made by a third party. They cannot. Both parties have to be identified, have to be informed and respond. J. BRENNER said she has kept notes on complaints students have made about certain faculty members. On occasion she has reported to a colleague who has had repeated complaints what students have said and how they feel. This is an informal way of handling the situation, and it doesn't accuse people. However, she also urged that we must not be too overwhelmed to take formal action.
MOOR, praising this as clear, judicious and logical policy, moved "that the Senate endorse this sexual harassment policy draft as a replacement of the previously passed policy."

The motion was passed unanimously.

Next steps are wide distribution of the documents, orientation and training sessions for all employees and students.

4. HOLLOWAY presented five left-over items from the Curriculum Committee's course and program changes. They included (a) adding PHL 213 Life and Death Issues; (b) adding PSY 491/591 Decision Making I: Values and Choice, and with the prerequisites of MTH 243 and PSY 348, or permission of instructor; (c) adding MTH 243/244 Statistics to the BA/BS Speech Communications major; (d) reducing the number of upper division credits of the Speech Communications minor from 18 to 15; and (e) withdrawing the previously approved changes for ENG 301.

A lively discussion ensued regarding Life and Death Issues and the topic of abortion in that course. Senators wondered if the course description would suggest that only one side of the issue would be presented. Several suggestions for resolving the problem, including dropping "abortion" from the course description, were rejected.

BEESON/WEIKEL moved "that the Senate approve all five of the proposed changes."

The motion was passed, but not unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

1. KINNICK gave a brief history of the development of the PSU Statement of Unity. At the instigation of students and the request of the President, the statement was developed and has been reviewed by a number of constituent groups, including the Executive Committee, CADS, ASPSU, the Senate Steering Committee, and the Advisory Council. Major final revisions were made by the Advisory Council.

GOEKJIAN suggested that "ethnicity" be added following national origin, and TOULAN proposed adding "or group" to the phrase "...or violence against any person." Both additions were accepted.

KOSOKOFF/STERN moved "that the Senate endorse the Statement of Unity."

The motion was passed unanimously.

The revised statement reads as follows:
Portland State University supports the right of all people to learn and live safely and without fear. We will respond forthrightly to any event on campus that promotes or results in discrimination, hatred, or violence against any person or group on the basis of race, religion, national origin, ethnicity, age, gender, ability or sexual orientation. We value diversity and reaffirm the common humanity of all people and the intrinsic value of every individual.

HAAKEN asked what this statement called on us to do. Could the Oregon Citizens Alliance still hold events on campus, for instance? KOSOKOFF replied that a forthright response by the administration is important, but this policy permits free speech, and it protects students who speak out against ideas being presented on campus. KINNICK said the policy implies that we will be fair, follow protocol and take action whenever necessary.

2. HOLLOWAY proposed a constitutional amendment for Article V.1.1, providing ex-officio status to chairpersons of constitutional committees.

3. MOOR proposed a constitutional amendment for Article IV. 4. 4.n, clarifying the duties of the UPC.

4. A. JOHNSON proposed an amendment for Article IV. 4.4.g and m. This amendment would create a Faculty Development Committee by combining the Research and Publications Committee and the Committee on Effective Teaching. REARDON spoke for faculty development program integration and said the new committee could be organized immediately if the amendment is passed (i.e., this year's awards of faculty development funds could be made by this committee).

All three of the above proposed amendments will be taken to the Advisory Council for review and will be presented for a Senate vote on February 3.

5. KOSOKOFF presented a resolution congratulating the PSU coaches and students for their successful football, volleyball and soccer seasons.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:44.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 3, 1992
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Benowitz for Burke, Beatty for Edwards, Johanson for Gray, Wollner for Dodds.

Members Absent: Ashbaugh, S. Brenner, Dunnette, Jackson, Kasal, Lansdowne, Sobel, Tama, Tuttle.

Ex-officio Members Present: Davidson, Desrochers, Diman, Hardt, Oh, Miller-Jones, Oh, Pfingsten, Reardon, Vieira, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The January 6, 1992, minutes were corrected. Page 19, line 1, should read: "KARANT-NUNN asked whether there was any implied approval of the [SBA] reorganization if nothing else were to be said." The minutes were approved with that change.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

REARDON spoke for President Ramaley and commented on the governor's speech regarding reductions. OSSHE presidents have met twice with the chancellor and are still discussing the implications of the governor's remarks. No details are available at this time, but the chancellor is considering giving an agency response. When PSU hears about the percentage of its cuts, the President hopes that the institution will be able to decide how to manage them. More information should be available in two weeks.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Bev FULLER, chairperson of an ad-hoc computer committee, announced a campus-wide survey regarding computing resources, needs, and requirements for the next five years. Departments will be asked to inventory their equipment. The committee is being assisted by an IBM resource person, vendor-neutral. REARDON urged participation in the survey. Findings from it
will be used to help disburse ca. $90,000 for computer purchases.

2. Several groups are sponsoring a forum on "Diversity and Multiculturalism" on February 18, noon-2:00 p.m., SMC.

REPORTS

1. TUFTS reported a 7 percent drop in headcount from winter term 1991. The fall term drop from a year ago was 3.4 percent.

2. PARSHALL gave an update on the provost search. The committee has narrowed the original list of 90+ to a manageable group. Calls are being made to candidates this week. During the following two weeks references will be called. After that, eight to nine persons will be interviewed at centrally located airports. Persons who emerge as finalists from that group will be brought to campus (perhaps in about a month), and the Provost Search Committee will take over at that point. None of the top candidates has withdrawn so far. PARSHALL is hopeful that a new provost could be here July 1992.

3. Ray JOHNSON addressed the budget reduction process and distributed a handout (see attached). A Budget Reduction Team numbering 15 has been put together with representatives from AAUP, OPEU, ASPSU, vice presidents, Budget Committee Chairperson, among others.

MOOR raised the concern many have had with the criteria for budget reductions. Criteria do not help with identifying programs which are fundamental as opposed to those of lower priority. JOHNSON said other groups need to discuss this, such as UPC and the Budget Committee. BRENAN asked what corrections have been made to the data base of departments and programs. JOHNSON said department chairpersons can meet with the executive committee to discuss their concerns regarding the data. BRENNAN and HOLLOWAY urged that the data be corrected now, before preliminary information is given to the Budget Reduction Team. JOHNSON agreed. KARANT-NUNN did not want the debacle of the Transition Team repeated.

MIDSON asked what process would be used in making the apportionment. DESROCHERS said that the governor had program review committees, including one on education, which made recommendations to her. The chancellor participated in the process, but not the campuses. BEESON asked about the number of positions attached to the $138 million to be cut. DESROCHERS said there was not necessarily a connection between the dollar figure and the 4,000 cut positions that have been talked about.

4. DECARRICO gave the quarterly report of the UPC (see attached). OH asked if the UPC was getting into concerns that belong to
the Curriculum Committee, rather than UPC, referring to how TQM operates in teaching and learning, and the early introduction of synthesis. MOOR said that the UPC did have a concern regarding the selection of associate deans, if they are to serve rolls similar to department chairs; the constitution has things to say about department chairpersons. DECARRICO invited OH to attend the next UPC meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. MILLNER reviewed the work of the ARC on the diversity requirement, identifying steps the committee has taken and problems and issues it has dealt with (see attached). He listed the following main issues on which the ARC has acted in the affirmative:

- "western" courses can fulfill the requirement
- a third category of courses was added since an earlier draft
- gender courses should be included in the diversity requirement
- omnibus-numbered courses should be allowed
- courses must be taken from two departments
- the criteria for course selection should not be too broad or narrow

J. BRENNER moved "that the Senate adopt the ARC recommendation."

BRANNAN argued that the concept of diversity should be expanded to include disability. MILLNER pointed out that the criteria on page 3 had been adjusted. BRANNAN, however, wanted the minutes to reflect this discussion and to have the rationale of the diversity statement make reference to ability.

BRANNAN/LIVNEH therefore moved "that the Senate expand the proposed criteria on diversity to include disability."

The amendment was passed.

BURNS commented that the Advisory Council had been approached by a number of faculty who felt that the ARC recommendation was too narrow. BURNS/JOHNSON therefore moved a substitute motion (see attached).

BRENNAN was confused why the Advisory Council would take over the work of the ARC. MOOR explained that the substitute motion did not come from the Advisory Council but from a group of concerned senators who felt the new statement was preferable, more succinct, clearer and coherent. There are faults
with the ARC draft, among them that the categories of courses are hard to understand.

J. BRENNER objected to the substitute, because it was more than copy editing. Significant changes are being introduced, and these should have been brought to the ARC. The committee has been responsive to other suggestions, adding age, ability, and sexual orientation to the criteria. She and COGAN pointed out that the substitute eliminated the process of selecting courses which the ARC had proposed. One cannot simply go through the catalog and choose courses by their title. BJORK warned that a list of approved courses in the catalog is doomed to failure; lists in the catalog have been unworkable. J. BRENNER said that category "c" in the substitute was different from the ARC version. The issue is that courses should provide students with conceptual mechanisms for the study of human diversity.

DAILY asked whether the Senate was discussing a statement which would be in the catalog or in the Senate minutes. MILLNER answered that a shortened version of the statement needed to be in the catalog, but a longer document should be available to students and departments for guidance. TANG agreed that a brief summary of the Senate statement would be in the catalog, and the deadline for that copy for the 1992-93 Bulletin was coming quickly. She pointed out that the substitute motion delays implementation by one year. MOOR responded that implementation could begin as soon as the Senate had approved a list, but J. BRENNER insisted that the Senate needed to approve the criteria first. FARR said that the ARC statement needed work, and the substitute statement falls short.

DAILY/FARR moved "that the issue be tabled, returned to the ARC, and brought back to the Senate at its March 2 meeting."

The motion was passed.

2. The constitutional amendment (V.1.1.), providing ex-officio status for chairpersons of constitutional committees, was passed.

3. The constitutional amendment (IV.4.4.n), clarifying the responsibilities of the UPC, was passed.

4. The constitutional amendment (IV.4.4.g. and m.), creating a constitutional Faculty Development Committee from the Research and Publications Committee and the Committee on Effective Teaching, was approved.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 16:47.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 2, 1992
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Anderson for Cumpston, Dieterich for DeCarrico, Becker for Dunnette, Young for Kasal, Bulman for Latz, Menke for Parshall, Grubb for Visse.

Members Absent: Arick, Briggs, Dodds, Midson, Sobel, Terdal.

Ex-officio Members Present: Desrochers, Diman, Erzurumlu, Hardt, Oh, Miller-Jones, Paudler, Ramaley, Reardon, Vieira, Schendel, Ward. Senator Wurm also represented Davidson.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the February 3, 1992, meeting were corrected as follows: Jackson had been present. JOHNSON said the Budget Reduction Team had not been appointed yet. Should a significant budget reduction be warranted, an Emergency Budget Reduction Team numbering 15 has been recommended, with representatives from AAUP, OPEU, ASPSU, vice president, Budget Committee Chairperson, among others.

With those corrections, the minutes were approved.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President RAMALEY reviewed the document "Maximizing Impact and Minimizing Costs: A Higher Education Strategy for the 1990s." (See attached). She said that decisions will be tied to the PSU mission, the strategic plan, and to the Introspect recommendations. The Portland agenda of the Governor's Commission will also be considered (e.g., PEN). She reported that nine projects have been selected from over 50 applications for faculty incentive funding.

The 1993-95 budget process instructions will probably not be issued until early fall, therefore the '93-'95 budget will not be created
until then. DESROCHERS added that the Chancellor will submit his general OSSHE budget to the Governor in spring for dialogue with the executive office. RAMALEY explained the proposed budget distribution strategy. The starting point is 80 percent of the current budget services level. Agencies can then ask for 10 percent agency-specific addbacks and for a 10 percent increase tied to the lead benchmarks for people, quality of life, and economy. Higher education can potentially be involved in all of the areas, as illustrated by the President.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

MOOR intends to propose a constitutional amendment at the next meeting requiring Faculty Senate approval for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration in structure or function of any department or academic unit.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. DESROCHERS responded to questions regarding financing and operating the HPE-building following the demise of the School of Health and Human Performance. An analysis has been done of the costs of having faculty, recreation, and athletics in the building, and it has been determined that the service can be continued pretty much as is, except for recreation. The management of the building will be taken over by Smith Memorial Center, since Sylvia Moseley and Jack Schendel are both retiring.

2. REARDON said no final decision had been made where Health Studies will be housed next year. The remaining 8.5 FTE Health faculty has requested UPA. A small committee made up of Health, UPA, and CLAS representatives studied the issue, and majority and minority reports have been issued. The interests of the majority of the Health faculty should be paramount. The UPC will be given this issue for its recommendation.

A question was asked about what PE courses and faculty would remain. Most PE courses are taught by lecturers and are financed by course fees; therefore no changes are anticipated. About 165 sections will continue to be offered.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. TUFTS said winter term headcount was 13,528 which is 2.76 percent less than winter term last year.

2. COOPER presented the IFS report of the February 7 meeting. Two campuses have already supported the request for a special legislative session to deal with the catastrophic effects of Measure 5 on higher education.
A detailed report IFS is attached to those minutes.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. MILLNER presented the newly revised Criteria for Diversity Requirement and reviewed the changes the ARC had made in response to the Senate discussion last month and subsequent meetings with senators. The new statement is more compact. The rationale and implementation statements are clearer, the categories of allowable courses have been expanded, and the criteria have been reduced to six from seven.

JOHNSON/WEIKEL moved "to take the tabled items off the table and to put this new proposal on the table."

The motion was passed.

JOHNSON/WEIKEL moved "to adopt this proposal."

KARANT/NUNN found the current document much more nearly acceptable, especially because of the addition of "courses which examine a culture or broad social phenomenon different from those that are dominant in the U.S."

The motion was passed.

2. THOMS presented the UPC report regarding the reorganization of the School of Business Administration. He said the committee in its recent investigation had focused primarily on two questions: How does TQM affect teaching and learning? How much voice do SBA faculty have in the selection of associate deans?

GILLPATRICK and STERN asked if the UPC questioned all disciplines at PSU about these internal management issues. THOMS and A. JOHNSON explained that the selection of department chairpersons (or other faculty overseers who serve the function of department chairs) was clearly spelled out in the constitution. Sufficient faculty control must exist in the selection of faculty overseers. R. JOHNSON thought that since the SBA Faculty Council interviewed the associate dean candidates, the faculty had been represented. J. BRENNER pointed out that before the reorganization all faculty had voted in department chair elections and now could not. The Senate has the responsibility to protect the norm of faculty governance, and the UPC is doing its job. JACKSON also welcomed the UPC oversight and questioned whether all SBA faculty nominations had been put on the slate for the Faculty Council interviews.

KARANT-NUNN asked whether Thoms' report to the Senate was the end of the investigation. THOMS said that the UPC had
presented some questions to the SBA that still had not been answered and that the UPC would report further on those matters. KARANT-NUNN continued that she hoped that the investigation would not simply "die," with the result that the Senate would be giving tacit approval to the SBA's circumvention of the provisions of the Faculty Constitution. John OH objected to the use of the word **circumvention**. MOOR noted that Provost Robert Frank had told the SBA in writing to comply with specified procedures for making major structural and instructional change. MOOR said that whatever the motives for not doing so might have been, the effect was circumvention. KARANT-NUNN said that at an appropriate time in the future she wished to make a motion that the Senate Steering Committee in office during the 1993-1994 carry out or have carried out an appropriate study, including the individual questioning of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member of the SBA, of the effects of reorganization, and that the Senate then decide, on the basis of that study, whether finally to approve the SBA reorganization. THOMS said the OPC will examine the SBA charter when it is completed to see how this issue is dealt with.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Speaking for the Curriculum Committee, JACKSON presented the reinstatement proposal of the Health Studies program. In addition to agenda item C, distributed earlier, she supplied the following materials:

The Curriculum Committee recommends approval of the Health Studies Curricular proposals subject to the following changes, limitations, and recommendations:

**HS 340 and HS 341** Switch numbering to reflect proper flow.

- **HS 341 Development and Management of Health/Fitness Programs** [originally proposed as HS 340]
- **HS 340 Social Foundations of Exercise Behavior** [originally proposed as HS 341]

**HS 449/549** approve with revised outline.

- Approval conditioned on running it by math department for notice to them and reaction.

**Community Health Education Option**

- **HS 449/549** [see above]

The "Health Electives" provision should read: "Health
Electives (including a health related class in aging, nutrition, and other adviser approved electives) 21" [also, the committee members strongly encourage that adviser approved electives include a sequence as opposed to a single course in chemistry]

Typographical Corrections: PHS 450 Epidemiology I should read "PHS 450 Epidemiology I"

Health and Fitness Option

HS 449/549 [see above]

New course requirements from other departments (Math, Psych, and Speech) be "cleared" with those departments regarding their ability to accommodate those students

"Approved List" should be changed to "Approved Departmental Electives"

Typographical Corrections: "HS 47 Applied Kinesiology" should read "HS 478 Applied Kinesiology"

Other Committee Recommendations:

Future consideration by the Health Studies Department of prerequisites for HS 341.

Future consideration by the Health Studies Department of proposing a discrete number for Health 410 Nutrition.

SVOBODA reported that the program faculty wanted to withdraw its 449/549 from the proposal, to allow more time to coordinate prerequisites with the math department. Discussions are continuing.

DAILY asked if the 110 credits required is comparable with other majors. JACKSON said it reflected national standards. FORBES pointed out the biology had a similar requirement, if one counted all related work in math and chemistry. SVOBODA agreed; 20-30 credits are University distribution requirements.

It was moved "that the Senate approve the Health Studies curricular proposal, subject to the changes noted below."

The motion was passed.
Changes:

HS 340 and HS 341 Numbering switched to reflect proper flow.

HS 341 Development and Management of Health/Fitness Programs [originally proposed as HS 340]

HS 340 Social Foundations of Exercise Behavior [originally proposed as HS 341]

HS 449 Withdrawn

Community Health Education Option

HS 449 Withdrawn from option requirement

The "Health Electives" provision should read: "Health Electives (including a health related class in aging, a health related class in nutrition, a course in statistics, and other adviser approved electives) 24:

Typographical Corrections: PHS 450 Epidemiology I should read "PHS 450 Epidemiology I"

Health and Fitness Option

HS 449 Withdrawn from option requirement

"Approved List 12" changed to "Approved Departmental Electives, including a course in statistics 15"

Typographical Corrections: "HS 47 Applied Kinesiology" should read "HS 478 Applied Kinesiology"

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:52.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 6, 1992
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Members Absent: Bjork, Duffield, Ellis, Johnson, Danielson, Parshall.

Ex-officio Members Present: Davidson, Desrochers, Diman, Hardt, Miller-Jones, Nunn, Ramaley, Reardon, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the March 2, 1992, meeting were corrected on p. 28, three lines from the bottom to read "elections" in place of "interviews." With that change, the minutes were approved.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY gave an update regarding the budget process. We are awaiting final word about a special session. We will probably be asked to build a budget on an 80 percent base and propose a 10 percent addback for special program development and 10 percent for linking programs to the Oregon Benchmarks. RAMALEY has been appointed to lead a team that is examining the benchmarks; more new benchmarks may be nominated, and Ramaley is welcoming ideas. She briefly discussed the higher ed/benchmark fit and reported that Roger Bassett had said that the Oregon Benchmarks are mostly short-term goals while education focuses on long-term goals.

RAMALEY reported that all campuses are doing the same general things regarding budget cutting; however, each school is also thinking about its own cuts for the 1993-95 biennium, and some schools (e.g., OHSU) are further along in the process than PSU. Deans will be sent instructions in about two weeks, but the President urged faculty to be thinking about critical questions
like: What really matters to PSU? What gives us a unique role? What must we protect? What makes PSU the place it is? How should faculty be involved? When? Should we hold a general convocation? Should there be small-group meetings?

BEESON asked what plans are being made with the administration. RAMALEY said there were no plans in mind but a process. REARDON added that departments will be asked to respond to proposals such as the use of academic service centers vs. departmental offices. RAMALEY reminded Senators that we are waiting for specific instructions from the chancellor; at the last budget cuts those instructions included the cutting of HPE and the serious reductions in Education (except at PSU). BEESON, BOWLDEN, LENDARIS and WEIKEL all urged that faculty should be involved in meetings because these are serious cuts. Departments are asking what they should be doing. BOWLDEN suggested small-group meetings while WEIKEL thought an augmented Senate with proportional representation might be better.

RAMALEY predicted that OSSHE will look much more critically at professional programs this time, especially to determine where there are no unique offerings. The signals are not clear at this time. DESROCHERS said it is possible that the 80 percent budget will be due September 1, and the more detailed internal budget planning may have to be moved up.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. WARD reported that four provost finalists will be on campus during the next two weeks. He encouraged faculty to attend sessions that have been organized for each candidate and to provide Ward with feedback.

2. A. JOHNSON announced that Governor Roberts and Chancellor Bartlett will meet with AOF and AAUP on April 18 at OSU. Faculty were urged to give Johnson questions to be taken to the meeting.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. MILLNER presented the annual report of the ARC. He said that the waiver of WR. 323 for block transfer students will be proposed at the next Senate meeting. Writing across the Curriculum will also be encouraged.

2. TAMA gave the final annual report of the Committee on Effective Teaching; the committee has been merged with Research and Publications to form the new Faculty Development Committee.

3. RHÝNE presented the annual report of the General Student Affairs Committee. During spring they will be involved in the interviews of the Dean of Students. BRENNAN asked if there
had been any disciplinary issues or policy revisions this year. Disciplinary issues are handled by the Student Conduct Committee. There was some input on policy revisions regarding the dean's search.

4. ENNEKING gave the IFS report (see attached). Chancellor Bartlett is frustrated with higher education having to play only a supporting role because it is not large enough to influence events. Higher ed has to sell itself and develop models for that.

5. TUFTS reported that all registration figures were up for spring term from a year ago: Headcount + 14%; SCH + 6%.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

DECARRICO reviewed the actions of the UPC regarding the reorganizations of the School of Business Administration and the Library. SBA has given a great deal of information to UPC and has answered most questions. SBA is now writing a new charter and will submit that to UPC to help answer the two remaining questions.

The Library reorganization is in limbo. Departments have been eliminated and associate directors were appointed (not elected). The UPC has recommended that an advisory body be formed to advise the Director and associate directors.

KARANT-NUNN said she and other faculty continued to be concerned about the disregard of procedures outlined in the faculty constitution.

KARANT-NUNN/WRIGHT moved

"that the 1991-92 Faculty Senate instruct its 1993-94 successor, however this may appropriately be done, to carry out a full review and evaluation of the effects of the 1991 reorganization of the School of Business Administration and of the University Library;

that the review and evaluation include at the minimum a confidential inquiry of every tenured and tenure-track SBA and Library faculty member as to faculty roles in governing their school/library, in particular but not confined to faculty influence in selecting administrators and faculty participation in promotion and tenure decisions;

that the result of this study be reported to the 1993-94 Senate so that it may then decide whether the SBA and Library reorganizations should be modified or invalidated."

LENDARIS asked if the Senate could impose its will. KARANT-NUNN said the Senate had that right. GILLPATRICK said that 27 SBA
faculty voted on their reorganization last year, 4 to 23; could the Senate vote against that? KOSOKOFF said Gillpatrick's question implied the problem. The Senate has authority to act. KARANT-NUNN responded by asking if the rest of the faculty would allow the SBA to unilaterally relinquish their right regarding promotion and tenure.

Addressing the motion, REARDON pointed out that the administration of an evaluation could not be kept confidential. KARANT-NUNN explained that only the questionnaire was to be sent back confidentially to the Steering Committee. The results of the evaluation would not be secret.

TOULAN commented that the severe budget cuts we are facing may force many schools to reorganize. The tone of this discussion may be sending the wrong message to creative reorganizations that may become necessary. FARR, however, pointed out that the motion on the floor redresses a procedural problem, not a substantive issue. MCKENZIE agreed. In the Library reorganization, no faculty was allowed to vote. There had been no discussions of the proposal. It is not a question of whether the reorganization is working or not. No constitutional or democratic process was followed; it was a "coup." Something as drastic as this should have a full faculty vote and be recorded as a majority vote. KARANT-NUNN thought the effect of all faculty filling out a questionnaire would constitute a vote, not based only on theoretical outcomes but on what they had experienced.

J. BRENNER said governance is the appropriate role for the Senate; it is mandated by the constitution. HARMON wondered if a comprehensive review of all units on campus should be undertaken. LANS Downe asked if the Senate had that kind of authority. LENDARIS thought that the Senate's role was to be advisory to the president.

LENDARIS/SCHAUMANN proposed to amend the last sentence of the motion to read "...may then decide whether to advise the SBA and Library reorganizations be modified or invalidated."

There was no vote on that amendment.

J. BRENNER/CUMPSTON moved "to table the entire issue pending a review of the constitutionality of it by the Advisory Council."

The motion to table was passed.

NEW BUSINESS

1. MOOR introduced a constitutional amendment to Article III, Section 1. He emphasized that the main purpose of the amendment was that the Senate should consider reorganization proposals before the changes occur. OSHIKA didn't think the Senate could block executive action, even though the constitu-
tion seemed to favor shared responsibility. MOOR said that if this amendment were passed and agreed to by the president, she would indicate her willingness to share responsibility. She would be bold to concede this much authority, and MOOR thought that sharing authority would be healthy and appropriate, and those who have authority should periodically be invited to share it.

Various attempts were made to change "approval" in the amendment. Suggestions included "action," "review," "consultation," and "consideration." Finally, the following two amendments were passed:

"...of departments or of programs, including those of more than one department or academic unit, without prior...."

"...without prior action by the Faculty Senate...."

2. DECARRICO/WEIKEL moved "the approval of the proposed establishment of the PSU Center for Science Education."

The motion was passed unanimously.

3. DECARRICO/WEIKEL moved "approval of the request for a name change from Latin American Studies Program to Hispanic and Latin American Studies Program."

The motion was passed.

4. DECARRICO/CUMPSTON moved "acceptance of the recommendation of the Majority Report by the ad hoc committee on the relocation of the Department of Health Studies." DUNNETTE, director of the Center for Public Health Studies, said the minority report addressed some crucial issues, and it is important for CPHS to maintain strong ties to CLAS. He recommended that the principals get together and talk about what dual affiliation means. He recommended that the Senate approve the motion, contingent on the successful outcome of such a meeting.

DECARRICO and SVOBODA explained that it would be disastrous to delay the decision any longer. Matters like the selection of a department chairperson and the scheduling of classes cannot wait any longer. SVOBODA pointed out that centers are not technically affiliated with one school or department anyway, only budgetarily. REARDON observed that the Senate minutes ago approved the Center for Science Education which is affiliated with CLAS and ED.

The motion to house Health Studies in UPA was approved unanimously.
5. BURKE presented the resolution congratulating PSU student-athletes in basketball and wrestling and their coaches and trainers for their outstanding seasons. The resolution was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:59.
Minutes:
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Secretary Pro Tem: Alan Cabelly


Alternates Present: Falco for Arick, Cain for Farr, Harvey for Latz, Babcock for Tuttle.


Ex-officio Members Present: Davidson, Diman, Erzurumlu, Harris, Miller-Jones, Pope, Ramaley, Reardon, Vieira, Savery, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the April 6, 1992, meeting were corrected as follows:

p. 36, four lines from the bottom, should read: "REARDON observed that the Senate, minutes ago, approved..."

p. 33, four lines from the top, should read: "BEESON asked what plans are being made by the administration."

p. 35, ten lines from the bottom, in reference to the LENDARIS/SCHAUMANN motion, should read: "Due to the following motion to table, there was no vote on that amendment."

With those changes, the minutes were approved.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY noted that the PSU rally in the aftermath of the Rodney King verdict in Los Angeles went well. She announced a PSU Town Forum on Tuesday May 5 at noon on the issue.

RAMALEY announced the schedule of PSU meetings to interpret the OSSHE Budget Guidelines and help develop PSU criteria for dealing with potential cuts. The focus for 1993-1995 will be on cross-institutional programs, including Engineering, Teacher Education, Continuing Education, Nursing, and Business Administration. The President and Provost have agreed to deploy a Campus Budget team
of the university essential to the budget process. She noted that the Chancellor would hold a press conference on Tuesday to announce his plan for budget reduction. PSU's role as an urban university is affirmed deeply in this process, giving us more discretion than other campuses. We are uncertain how we will cut 20% and still accomplish our mission; many questions remain.

In response to questions from J. BRENNER and LENDARIS, RAMALEY indicated that all campuses were asked to build an 80% budget. Sets of systemwide "decision packages" will add back to this. All is speculative at this point; cuts from one institution probably will not go to other universities. Theoretically, one institution could cut a full program to get to 20%, but that probably would not occur.

KARANT-NUNN asked about the makeup of the Budget Reduction Team; RAMALEY responded by indicating that outgoing and incoming leaders of the Faculty Senate, Advisory Council, and Budget Committee will transition to the team during the summer. RAMALEY also noted that the new Chancellor would be selected by the end of the week.

KARANT-NUNN asked about OSBHE actions and Advisory Council suggestions. RAMALEY noted that specific decisions would be made Wednesday, and that the Council would need to make suggestions to save programs, but not necessarily dollars. The prime Board motives are that the general public sees all duplication as unnecessary, and that we all might benefit from intercampus cooperation; programs developed in this vein might share enhancements. The values most crucial at PSU are student access, quality, and program variety. The Board is apparently ignoring the fact that 10-20% cuts will eliminate students.

In response to HAAKEN's concern that these cuts would unduly impact women, RAMALEY noted that AAUP was also concerned about this, and that cuts would be programmatic, not across the board.

QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. Question for Nancy Tang: "What level of support was budgeted for the conversion of the SIS to the Banner System? What provisions were made for training of secretarial and administrative assistants to handle departmental services, and why were important reports (such as advising transcripts) not continued during the transition year? What can be done even now to remedy the situation?"

TANG noted that initially there was no support, although now one person is working directly with Banner. Implementation was delayed one year; the vendor suggested that we have six new people in admissions, and five in registration as support. Smaller schools using Banner are able to cut their staff because they were moving away from a keypunch system; we were
already computerized, so did not have the opportunity to make these savings. Training for the system here involved a series of workshops, based on the needs of various users. Some Banner reports (such as advising transcripts) appeared to have been discontinued because they were not available through Banner, although the paper transcript still was available. Banner's transcript piece was incorrect. Programs and departments can still receive the transcript, but must print it up to give it to the faculty member. Additionally, parking will soon go on touch-tone; however, a 200-hour programming job will be necessary for this. DAILY asked about the security of the system. TANG noted that there should be no changes from the old system. Faculty are told that all (including GPA) is private, and that those with a need to know can get the information. We must be certain to retain security.

2. Question for Dalton Miller-Jones: "What is the status of the task force reviewing graduate studies, grants and research, the role of the Graduate Council, and the position of the vice provost? Please give a report of the progress and the types of recommendations that are likely to come from the group."

MILLER-JONES noted that the charge of the 1992 TASK FORCE ON GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH is:

The Executive Committee requests the Task force on Graduate Studies and Research 1) to meet with the Council of Academic Deans to determine the process for gathering faculty ideas about such an office and to meet and discuss the nature of a graduate studies office with the Graduate Council 2) to conduct a study of similar offices at a select group of comparator universities and to ascertain from the study the nature of the function, authority, and service provided by Offices of Graduate Studies 3) to draft a description of an Office of Graduate Studies and Research that defines its functions and role in the academic administration of the University, connections to external university constituents, and outlines the organization of such an office including the type of personnel needed to support it 4) to develop a position description for the administrative director of the office and recommend appropriate administrative designation 5) to review the Task Force's findings with the Council of Academic Deans and 6) to make recommendations to the Executive Committee.

The Task Force is asked to establish a timeline that can allow for its collection of information, development of recommendations, and reporting to the Executive Committee by May 1. Upon the completion of the Task Force's work, a search within the University will be conducted for the person to direct the office and a selection will be made by July 1, 1992.
office and a selection will be made by July 1, 1992.

Task force members are: Dalton Miller-Jones, OAA; William Savery, OGS; Joe Hendricks, Administrator in Residence; Lee Casperson, EE; Paul Giles, ENG; Mary Gordon, SPHR; Chi-Cheng Hsia, SBA; Cheryl Livneh, CE; Gary Nave, CURE; Nancy Perrin, PSY; John Rueter, BIO; Charles Tracy, UPA; Joan Shireman, SSW.

MILLER-JONES noted that the group has met with various constituent groups, and discussed a number of models for the proposed office. Three distinct models are available (see attachment 1).

Model three is most sophisticated; we are currently understaffed, and are close to Model 1 (see attachment 2). As our task at this university becomes increasingly complex, we are being pressed to move closer to model #3. We still need significant integration between functions, so may end up close to #2. Additionally, the task force wants to support the faculty resource center, and will be the search committee for the office head. The preliminary report will be available within a few weeks. The office will support Ph. D. students (currently 308), and Masters level (approximately 2477). This is an increase of about 1130 masters students and 30 Ph. D. students over the past four years. On the research side, Paulette Watanabe's office processes between 200 and 260 grant applications per year, with about $8,000,000 in grants to be received this year.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. TUFTS reported that fourth week headcount is 12,669. This is down 6.1% headcount and 7.4% credit hours from winter to spring. This is within the normal experience. We are down about 3.4% headcount from last spring (the same that fall had been down from the previous fall). TANG noted that we have done better than all OSSHE institutions this year except OIT.

2. KOCH presented the annual report of the Budget Committee. He noted its work with the Status of Women Committee, as well as the fact that it is currently developing budget allocation criteria.

3. KOSOKOFF presented the annual report of the University Athletics Board. In addition to the report, he noted that the committee is reconsidering splitting into two committees, one to deal with intercollegiate athletics, and one to respond to campus wide issues.

4. GOUCHER presented the annual report of the University Honors Program Board. She reiterated her request for various types of faculty input and support, as noted in the report.
5. POLLOCK presented the annual report of the Teacher Education Committee. He noted that School of Education Accreditation had gone well.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. The Constitutional Amendment to Article III, Faculty Powers and Authority, Section I, Faculty Powers: was presented. It says:

"The University shall not establish, abolish, or effect major alteration in the structure or educational function of departments or of programs, including those of more than one department or academic unit, without prior action by the Faculty Senate upon advice of the University Planning Council."

The rationale for the amendment is:

The Constitution now assigns to the UPC and the Senate authority to act on the matters in question. The proposed amendment makes explicit the requirement that Senate approval precede changes being made effective, in order to forestall the Senate's being faced with faits accomplis.

In response to Gillpatrick's concern with speedy Senate action over the summer, A. JOHNSON noted that the Senate can meet in the summer to respond if necessary. LENDARIS noted that the rationale should state the phrase "Senate action" instead of "Senate approval" in the third line.

The amendment PASSED unanimously, with two abstentions.

2. MOOR gave the Advisory Council interpretation of Faculty Powers and Authority. He noted that the Constitution stipulates that the Senate actually acts on issues--the Senate's authority is considerable. The Constitution does not give the President veto power--this is extraconstitutional, through the State Board's internal management directives, which are not Senate issues. LENDARIS asked whether there was a distinction between the faculty and the Senate, as noted in Article III, Section 1. He asked if faculty could be the "Faculty of the School of Business Administration?" MOOR responded by noting that the faculty normally exercises power through the Senate, but could do this otherwise. He also noted that the word "Faculty" is listed in the constitution as a singular, and therefore could not refer to one academic unit. TOULON concluded by noting that a binding meeting of the faculty as a whole could be called if necessary to resolve an issue.

3. J. BRENNER/MOOR moved that the tabled motion from April 6 be untabled. This motion is:
"that the 1991-92 Faculty Senate instruct its 1993-94 successor, however this may appropriately be done, to carry out a full review and evaluation of the effects of the 1991 reorganization of the School of Business Administration and of the University Library;

that the review and evaluation include at the minimum a confidential inquiry of every tenured and tenure-track SBA and Library faculty member as to faculty roles in governing their school/library, in particular but not confined to faculty influence in selecting administrators and faculty participation in promotion and tenure decisions;

that the result of this study be reported to the 1993-94 Senate so that it may then decide whether the SBA and Library reorganizations should be modified or invalidated."

LENDARIS noted that his amendment, to add the words "to advise the SBA..." in the last paragraph, must be discussed and voted upon. KARANT-NUNN wondered if it hurts the Senate if we agree to advise when we can actually decide. LENDARIS asked if we could actually force academic units to change what they have already done. The amendment FAILED.

KARANT-NUNN then proposed an amendment to eliminate the last two words, "or invalidated." This amendment PASSED.

HAAKEN expressed concern that we separate the process from the content, that we not appear to be punitive, because that is not the intent of the motion. A. JOHNSON noted that the history is in the minutes, while KARANT-NUNN stated that this is merely a shaper of policy. She hoped that the study would produce positive findings, and was offered in the spirit of protecting the rights of faculty.

GILLPATRICK asked how changes would be evaluated in this situation without taking baseline measures which are normal in evaluation processes that we as researchers are typically involved in. STERN wondered how we would know if a finding of 83% satisfaction was good or bad. J. BRENNER noted that evaluation here takes on a different meaning. If faculty rights were routinely overridden now, but improved to 50% in a year, the Senate would still be unhappy. A pretest/posttest analysis would be unduly burdensome. STERN asked that an acceptable level be given now so that no hidden agendas would arise.

BEESON felt that this was a question of faculty rights and due process. He asked how we would do the evaluation if we were voting on this before the fact. Senators are chagrined, but does this really solve the problem. GILLPATRICK asked what criteria existed, what evidence exists to show that faculty
rights have been trammelled upon. As SBA Faculty Council Chair, he was told by the University Planning Council not to speak with them unless he had something negative to say. DeCARRICO responded by saying that the concern was about the overall process, and the precedent that it sets. GILLPATRICK wondered what the concern was; the process was unclear since committees had disbanded for the summer. In response to MOOR's comment that the Provost asked the SBA to go through appropriate steps, GILLPATRICK noted that no vehicle existed at the time, and, in order to save money, immediate planning was necessary.

The question was called; the motion PASSED.

NEW BUSINESS

1. MOOR moved motion G1: "Block transfer students have WR 323 waived on admission to PSU." MILLNER described the block transfer system for students graduating with an Oregon Transfer Degree (a two year degree). We are the only institution with an upper division writing requirement for these students. MOOR asked whether this would be the beginning of a "slippery slope," whereby our requirements would be diluted. TANG responded by noting that this would be in effect only for those students receiving the Oregon Transfer Degree, and that these students would still receive nine credits of English Composition.

DAILY asked for the English Department reaction to this. REECE noted that this affects only a small number of students, and that they are still getting a broad level of writing experiences, especially with the concept of writing across the curriculum. CAIN noted that our own PSU students would less versatility, and J. BRENNER was concerned that this might cause inequities. FORBES hoped that students would not turn around and ask for upper division credit for this. We should make sure that the community colleges are aware of this.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

2. GOEKJIAN presented and moved motion G4:

Explanation:

"The Portland State University Faculty Senate congratulates the staff, editors, and adviser of the Daily Vanguard on their receipt of 12 awards from the Oregon Newspaper Publisher's Association in April."

The Vanguard competes against the Emerald, the Daily Barometer, and the PCC Bridge in 15 categories. This year the Vanguard took first place in 4 categories: Best News Story,
Best News Series, Best News Photo, and Best Cartooning. Merit awards were earned in best design, best section, best series, best feature story, best news photo, best headline writing (two awards), and best columnist. The motion PASSED unanimously.

3. REECE introduced CARTER, who described the Writing Across the Curriculum concept. He noted that the English department is not wedded to WR 323, but is wedded to good writing. The concern is that students learn to write early in their programs, but lose these skills later. We need literate graduates. For the last year, a committee made up of Duncan Carter (Chair), Kim Brown (Applied Linguistics), Candace Goucher (Black Studies), Hugo Maynard (Psychology), Bob Tinnan (Biology), David Johnson (History), Nona Glazer (Sociology). The mission is to investigate the models available for writing across the curriculum, to design a program, to decide the relationship of the program to WR 323, to shepherd such changes through the ARC, to set the program in motion, and to monitor that program and evaluate it. A. JOHNSON noted that this was for informational purposes only.

4. A. JOHNSON noted that the President had already given the update on the Budget Allocation Criteria, and hoped that faculty would attend the meetings and give their input.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:55.
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Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 3, 1992
Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
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Members Absent: Ashbaugh, Bjork, Brannan, Brennan, S. Brenner, Casperson, Cumpston, Daily, Dunnette, Ellis, Finley, Goekjian, Kocaoglu, Midson, Reece, Schaumann, Tama, Terry, Tuttle, Wurm.
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APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the May 4, 1992, meeting were amended as follows: S. Sivage attended for Desrochers. Page 39, paragraph 3, last sentence should read "...the new Provost (not Chancellor) would be selected by the end of the week." Page 44, first sentence: DECARRICO insisted that "no such statement was ever made; this must have been a case of extreme miscommunication. This comment was not in response to the previous sentence, as it appears here. It was in response to previous remarks by Gillpatrick (and possibly others) regarding why SBA was being singled out for this action, and whether or not all other units in the University were receiving similar scrutiny." DECARRICO said: "Further, my response as reported here is also incomplete, and therefore confusing. My response was as follows: 'It would be most unfortunate if UPC actions were to be perceived as punitive ones aimed at any given unit. The concern has been about the overall process involved, and the precedent that it sets'."

With these corrections, the minutes were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. A. JOHNSON thanked Rick Hardt for his 13 years of service as Secretary to the Faculty and presented him with a handsome pen and pencil set. Hardt was charged to let the minutes reflect the enthusiastic applause by the Senate. So there you have it.

2. Newly elected ASPSU president Dean DAWKINS circulated a memo recommending that all university boards which acted on expenditures of students' incidental fees be composed of at least 50% students. He also pledged his support of the University in these difficult times and hoped that all would work together closely.

3. JOHNSON announced that this Senate meeting would continue on Wednesday, should that be necessary.
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY made the formal announcement that she was invoking Article 22, Section 2b, of the collective bargaining agreement, in order to initiate the program reduction process. A letter had been sent to AAUP, and a "Dear Colleague" letter to all faculty and staff two weeks ago. An 80% budget is being planned by the Budget Reduction Team. Criteria for that process will be voted on later on today's agenda. REARDON, who chairs the team, described the process and timeline. General recommendations will be sent in time for the June board meeting. Stage II will be more detailed and will not be until fall.

KOCH noted that the chancellor seems to focus on SCH as a degree of productivity, and not on much else. RAMALEY agreed and emphasized that at PSU much community-based scholarship and the hands-on experiences of students should also be considered. REARDON said that CADS had been instructed to look at productivity broadly. He also said that representatives will be called to a University-wide meeting to define how to meet the remaining cuts in administrative services which have been given to PSU: 73 by June, 1993.

RAMALEY announced faculty and staff seminars for open discussions of budget cuts. Summaries from these meetings will be available to the team and for review by all in OAA. She emphasized that no decisions have been made yet, contrary to some rumors.

BRENNAN asked if proposals for add-backs would only be made at the university-wide level. Not necessarily, even though a strong case will be made for accessibility at OSSHE institutions to minority students; attentiveness to the PSU mission will also be closely monitored. DESROCHERS preferred not calling them add-backs; she feared giving the impression that cut programs would be put back. BEESON, however, said that decision packages could well propose that cut faculty be put back on, staffing programs which have been newly constituted into different formats or new emphases. WEIKEL asked when notices would be issued to affected faculty. In September/October, according to the President. Notices will be given to faculty even though the programs may eventually not be cut. How will we live through the next months together, she asked. MOOR wanted to know what date the lay-off notices would take effect. One year after the notice, assuming we will have to lay off anyone, replied RAMALEY. MOOR thought that in order to meet AAUP standards, the notices would take effect one year from the end of the academic year in which the notices were given. RAMALEY said she could not issue anything until after the July board meeting and wanted to postpone notices until the last moment, even after the possible September 12 vote, should the legislative special session recommend that. KOSOKOFF noted that the E-word was being avoided. That was so, RAMALEY said, because of instructions from the chancellor.
What would happen if the budget were frozen at 80%? We'd have to live with the proposed program cuts and hope that decision packages would get us additional funds with which we could be creative. Several tuition proposals are being considered. Oregon now charged 39% of the costs; the national average is 30%. RAMALEY wants to keep tuition as low as possible, given the metro area population, but there are consequences. GILLPATRICK wanted to know if the semester system was being discussed as a money-saving issue. RAMALEY recalled the painful politics behind that topic which send shudders of fear. No one is discussing it seriously.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. PFINGSTEN said that the library reorganization had taken place in response to a committee's recommendation. Regarding promotion and tenure review of faculty, he said that that took place at three levels:

   a) the Library-wide committee made up of a member from the previous year (who chairs the committee), two faculty from the public services area, two from the technical and media area, and one non-voting student.

   b) the joint administration/faculty committee, and

   c) the Director of the Library

PFINGSTEN saw obvious advantages to the administration/faculty mix.

Regarding the faculty involvement with the operation of the Library, nothing has changed. Some classified people in the Library (technicians and para-professionals) should also become involved subsequent to the reorganization. What still is needed is a system of annual review of administrators. He vowed that would be an open process.

WEIKEL asked what provisions have been made for open discussions. Is there a faculty council such as SBA has? PFINGSTEN had no objection to forming a council, so long as everyone was clear what the council would do, and so long as para-professionals would be represented on it. TERDAL asked if the faculty had voted for these changes. They had not, but the reorganization grew out of the work of a faculty committee with two subcommittees which had written two reports. Discussion was then held with the provost, and the decision was made. It was just the way to go. OSHIKA wanted to know if the faculty elects anybody. Only the faculty on the promotion and tenure committees. Faculty also wrote the P&T guidelines.
2. REARDON answered the question about the one-year approval process for new courses and program changes. The longer time is needed by the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council for its review work. JACKSON, who chairs Curriculum, said she had inquired about release time for herself. A. JOHNSON contended, however, that often these committees have done the work much more quickly. Is it a question of can't or won't? He asked if chairs in the past agree with Rerardon's answer, noting that the committees frequently do not work on proposals until fall, even though proposals are due to OAA in March. Who is really requiring this long lead-time, asked JOHNSON.

ELECTION RESULTS

Throughout the meeting, elections for 1992-93 were held with the following results:

Presiding Officer: Ansel Johnson
Pro tem: Beatrice Oshika
Steering Committee: Susan Karant-Nunn
Don Moor
Oren Ogle
Shelley Reece
Secretary to the Faculty, Alan Cabelly, also serves.

Committee on Committees members (two-year terms)

All Others: Tony Midson
SBA: Janice Jackson
CLAS: Patricia Wetzel
Craig Wollner
ED: Loyde Hales
SW: Harold Briggs
UPA: Annette Jolin

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. MOOR presented the annual report of the Advisory Council.

2. TERRY gave the Committee on Committee's annual report.

3. McMAHON, presenting the final annual report of the Research and Publications Committee, thanked her committee members for their work. REARDON also thanked the group for getting the new process of faculty development started.

4. DECARRICO issued the annual report of the UPC; the new faculty charter of SBA has just been received and will be reported on in the fall, she said.
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

MILLNER reviewed the ARC deliberations regarding the diversity requirement. 159 courses from 16 departments were received by the May 6 deadline. An additional 80 came late. Hearings were held on May 27. A total of 101 courses were accepted. (Of the 41 reviewed in appeal, 18 were accepted).

He emphasized that the ARC had long discussions about the issue of cultural courses vs cultural diversity courses. The committee was as inclusive as possible in the decisions, but looked for critical insights a course would give to diversity, what the specific intent of the course was, and how it dealt with diversity. Unfortunately most proposals that were not approved suffered from incomplete paper work.

It was moved "that the Senate approve the ARC list of recommended courses dealing with cultural diversity."

KARANT-NUNN agreed that cultural vs cultural diversity was the heart of the issue. By adding the third criterion, the Senate desired that cultural courses be included, and not just those classes that dealt with the downtrodden. KRISTOF testified that the Art Department submitted its courses dealing with Ancient, Oriental, Egyptian, Greek, Roman, and Islamic Art, and all were turned down in the first review, and all but one again after the appeal. WALTON was incensed that most Asia history courses were rejected. She is a strong supporter of diversity in the curriculum and disagreed with the ARC decision. She was particularly confused why Modern Japan would have been accepted and not Modern China. And why Steve Kosokoff's China and not hers? All of these courses require historical understanding of profoundly different cultures.

MILLNER assured the Senate that the committee had no political orientation or agenda; it tried to distance itself from the courses and assess them strictly by the criteria given to it. Looking at the list would make that obvious, he said. The write-ups of the proposals were the problem most often. He added that this is an ongoing process, and proposals can be submitted again next year and courses added. In two years, the entire thing should be reviewed.

WEIKEL said she strongly supported this requirement, but the ARC decisions were supporting the worst fears she had about it. How could courses dealing with the Far East be turned down? KRISTOF felt the same about Oriental Art. MILLNER argued that the list shows inclusiveness. BRENAN could not find any courses focusing on differently-abled persons. J. BRENAN pointed out that there also were no courses dealing with gay and lesbian issues.

DODDS read the following statement by NUNN, who had to leave for another meeting:
At a truly critical time in PSU's existence an atmosphere swirls around the issue of diversity and curricular improvement. A committee of colleagues has become judge and jury of which of our courses are acceptable and which are not—in terms of diversity. By itself decisions the Academic Requirements Committee has itself sown the seeds of disunity; I sincerely hope the harvest is not a bitter one.

The deliberations of the Academic Requirements Committee have resulted in a number of surprises, shocks and disappointments. More than one of us has been told, in effect, that he or she has been found wanting. Some of us are not yet sure why.

In my own case the ARC designated two of the three courses I submitted for diversity course requirement eligibility as acceptable. HST 433/533, Latin American Social History, was approved; HST 430/530, Twentieth Century Latin America, was approved upon resubmittal; but HST 417/517, Latin American Cultural History, was disapproved twice. One might conclude that Latin American culture is not worthy of consideration for the diversity requirement. But I do not think that is the reason for disapproval.

Significantly, HST 414/514, 415/515, and 416/516 (U.S. Cultural History) were accepted. One might conclude that the Committee believes that U.S. cultural history is more diverse in essence than Latin American cultural history. I hope that is not the case.

Needless to say I am one of those who is puzzled as to why one of my courses was rejected. Especially is this true after receiving a written indication from a member of the Committee that the course in question probably would be accepted. I hope someone was not pulling my leg. And I hope HST 417/517 was not rejected because I raised strong objections—in my resubmittals—to the Committee's initial actions last month, comparing those actions to intellectual inquisitions carried out under authoritarian regimes—in Latin America and elsewhere. And I further hope that the course was not turned down because colleagues with no expertise in Latin American history made their choices based on quotas, agendas, personalities, politics, and the like. I do not think my colleagues would do this, but I do not know.

Having defended, so to speak, my methodology, course content, aims, and text choices to an extent greater than is required to enter a course into the PSU Bulletin, I find that my courses are .667 diverse. That's a very good field goal percentage, but it is less than perfect. Being two-thirds diverse-eligible is like being a little pregnant: impossible. Either diversity applies to Latin America and society and culture or it does not. Therefore, I respectfully request
that if the three Latin American history courses mentioned are not all acceptable to the ARC, then the two that are, be also deleted from the list of approved courses. Thank you. Frederick M. Nunn, Professor of History and International Studies.

KRISTOF was equally puzzled why Oriental Art was not acceptable. COOPER observed that people clearly wanted answers why courses were turned down. MILLNER said that very specific reasons were given on the checklists; the committee had such complex reactions to the proposals that he could not recall details to any one of them. He urged the Senate to separate the two issues which have arisen, the list and the committee process. He promised to make modifications to the process as the committee moves along, but he asked for a positive vote on the initial list of courses for implementation in the fall.

KARANT-NUNN moved a four-part substitute motion

1. "that the Senate reaffirm its support of the diversity requirement;

2. that the Senate approve the list of courses submitted by the ARC as a partial list only;

3. that the Senate instruct the ARC that it does not necessarily accept its interpretation of criterion C as permitting a distinction between cultural courses and cultural diversity courses; and

4. that it ask the ARC to review all the rejected courses, bearing in mind the Senate's understanding under (3) just above."

J. BRENNER moved "to table the substitute motion."

The motion was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:52, to be resumed on Wednesday, June 3.

The Senate reconvened on Wednesday, June 3, at 3:00 p.m. in 271 CH

NEW BUSINESS

PATTON presented the Resource Allocation Criteria prepared by a subcommittee of the UPC and Budget Committee, and it was moved "to adopt the Resource Allocation criteria as presented."
WOLLNER/WEIKEL amended the motion "to delete item 8 of Appendix B, page 7."

The amendment was passed.

KARANT-NUNN declared that she would vote for the criteria in full recognition that no definition can protect against interpretation. These criteria do not preclude interpretation. MOOR wished he could amend the criteria in some way so that programs which were essential to the existence of the University would not be cut, even if they were low quality—that should only point toward the need for improvement of the program rather than elimination. He said he would be satisfied without an amendment if he could be sure that the Budget Reduction Team had heard him. PARSHALL agreed and said one doesn't cut off the left foot if it is weak.

JACKSON and KARANT-NUNN shifted the discussion to the definition of programs, observing that definitions could be used in various ways. MOOR and WEIKEL added that elimination of a program would not necessarily justify the elimination of faculty, if their expertise could be used elsewhere.

MCKENZIE/HAAKEN moved to amend the motion by adding a new point f to item 1 on page 4: "target programs philosophically, not individuals punitively."

LANSOWNE felt that was already understood, and LENDARIS thought that putting it in would almost invite that kind of criticism. WEIKEL favored adding that protection, but MOOR explained that the contract provides as much protection as possible to guard against that.

The amendment failed.

BOWLDEN moved "that the following statement be added to the last paragraph under 'Statement of Principles' on page 1:

Since the 1991 reductions in academic programs were made without benefit of the more careful program reviews that are part of the current process, the Budget Reduction Team will in making its recommendations assess the cumulative effects of the earlier reductions and those to be made during this round."

The motion was passed unanimously.

R. JOHNSON and DESROCHERS questioned the purpose of item #3 on page 4, saying it went beyond the scope of what the Budget Reduction Team at PSU could deal with. DESROCHERS thought it could be read as a challenge of the highest level of advocacy. OSHIKA, however, insisted that the management structure of the OSSHE did have a bearing of what happens at PSU. LENDARIS agreed; one should ask if
the chancellor's office is necessary. It's important to see the sentiment of the faculty, he said.

R. JOHNSON moved "to remove item #3 on page 4."

The motion failed.

The original motion "to adopt the Budget Allocation Criteria as presented" was changed to "to adopt the Budget Allocation Criteria as amended."

The motion was passed unanimously.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Before continuing with new business, the Senate returned to the topic of diversity and removed the KARANT-NUNN substitute motion from the table.

Howard WINEBERG, ARC member, was given the privilege of the floor and read the following statement:

I would like to comment on some of the concerns expressed in the Faculty Senate regarding the courses for PSU's diversity requirement. I am a member of the ARC and have spent the last two years working on the diversity requirement. These are my views—they may or may not represent the views of other members of the ARC.

I urge you to accept the courses recommended by the ARC. That is, the first motion brought to the floor regarding courses appropriate to meet the diversity requirement. I resent many of the comments directed at the ARC by some faculty. As a member of the ARC I can assure you that our decisions were not, as someone stated, "capricious." The committee took its task of deciding whether or not a course was appropriate for the diversity requirement quite seriously and did its job in a professional manner. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues do not exhibit the same professionalism. In particular, it seems inappropriate for faculty to be complaining to the Faculty Senate that not all of their courses were approved for the diversity requirement. A committee would not be doing its job if it accepted every course submitted. If one looks at the list of approved courses one will notice the wide range of courses and disciplines covered. The committee did not have its own agenda regarding what courses to approve. Each course was judged on its own merits. No course had a free ride. Courses were not approved based on their title. It seems inappropriate for Faculty Senators to be second guessing the committee based on the title of some courses that the committee did not approve. After all, you did not see any of the justifications for why particular courses should be approved.
I can tell you that many of the faculty did not take this process seriously as many wrote "it is obvious why my course is appropriate for the diversity requirement" while others checked off all the categories and criteria while giving little justification for how their course met the diversity requirement.

An important part of the committee's deliberations involved whether a course devoted a substantial portion of its course to culture/diversity. I thought Professor Nunn's comments were not only uncalled for, but petty and in some instances quite juvenile, especially his comment that if all three of his courses are not approved then he prefers that none of his courses be approved. For this requirement to work, some courses have to be turned down. If the Faculty Senate wants any courses dealing with culture to be included regardless of whether very little is devoted to culture (such as only one session), then I could easily see 400 courses being included in the list of approved courses—the effect of this would be to make the requirement meaningless. Some tough choices will have to be made regarding which courses are deemed inappropriate. If the Faculty Senate is serious about its commitment to the diversity requirement then it should let the ARC do its job. If the Faculty Senate is unwilling to have a diversity requirement that has some "teeth" to it then I suggest that it eliminate the requirement entirely.

LANSDOWNE asked what the effect of passing the substitute motion would be. A. JOHNSON explained that only rejected courses would be reviewed. J. BRENNER added that ARC will again send out requests for proposals for adding courses to the diversity list for the following year. FARR didn't understand the reason for the substitute motion. Why include courses that deal with culture when the requirement is cultural diversity? KARANT-NUNN insisted that that discussion was held earlier when criterion "c" was added to the guidelines, making a much broader range of courses acceptable. The ARC chose to work with a different interpretation of the criteria than the Senate had.

ANDRUS said she was asked by the ARC why a course on Egyptian art should be on the list of approved courses when that art was in museums everywhere. WALTON had profound disagreements with the chairperson of the ARC and his interpretation of the criteria and the committee's arbitrary rulings. PARSHALL said many teachers were bewildered by being turned down by the ARC and that a reporter from The Oregonian had called her to investigate rumors that all anthropology and foreign language courses had been turned down. She feared that PSU would be embarrassed if we didn't come to a resolution soon.

J. BRENNER insisted that criterion "c" had been used by the ARC, hence the anthropology, geography, history, and speech courses on
the list. Is it a bad, small, initial list? No. It's not perfect, but it's a decent list. Did the ARC make misjudgments? Probably. But don't pass the substitute motion for that reason, she urged. Give the ARC a chance to perfect its selection and interpretation of the criteria. She admitted to some arbitrariness because of the pressure of time this year but denied that the list was biased in any way.

MOOR said that the only inevitable effect of the substitute motion was to re-examine the turned down courses. It was in no way to be used for reproaching the committee. The mistakes made by the committee were simple mistakes, not punitive. Several other Senators carried on the debate for some time, until BUNCH proposed that it might be easier to have a list of courses that aren't culturally diverse.

A motion to "stop debate" was passed unanimously.

The substitute motion failed, but not unanimously.

The original motion "that the Senate approve the ARC list of recommended courses dealing with cultural diversity." was passed, but not unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

It was moved "to accept the proposed Master's in Public Health (MPH)."

The motion was passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Presiding Officer JOHNSON announced that there would be special meetings this summer. All Senators were asked to leave summer addresses with Rick Hardt.

The meeting was adjourned at 16:20.