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To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

From: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on March 3, 1986, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the February 3, 1986, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of the Administration and Committees -- none

F. Unfinished Business -- none

G. New Business

   *1. Resolution regarding Faculty Excellence Awards -- Cabelly

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

   B Minutes of the February 3, 1986, Meeting**
   G1 Resolution regarding Faculty Excellence Awards**

** Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 3, 1986
Presiding Officer: Robert Jones
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Members Absent: Hakanson, Kempner, Newberry, Olson, Peterson, Scheans, Steward.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Bogue, Corn, Edgington, Erzurumlu, Hardt, Harris, Leu, Miller, Paudler, Pfingsten, Reardon, Ross, Schendel, Toulan, Trudeau, Williams.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the January 13, 1986, meeting were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

JONES reminded Senators of the standing invitation by the K-House for liquid refreshments following the meeting.

QUESTION PERIOD

REARDON, speaking for Vice President Dobson, said that the catalog deadline for publication of the list of approved courses for general distribution requirements was April 10, 1986.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. DRESSLER reported that the Academic Requirements Committee is continuing with the review of the lists of courses which may be used to meet the distribution requirements.

Because the time for development of the lists by the departments was so short, there has been some confusion about the meaning of the guidelines prepared by the ARC and accepted by the Senate in November. The committee is trying to resolve these different perceptions so that the lists as presented to the Senate for approval will be based on common assumptions.
Some problems have arisen which are of a housekeeping nature. Course titles, descriptions, and prerequisites in the catalog do not always seem to be consistent with the current practices and expectations of the departments. When such differences have been noted, the ARC has brought them to the attention of the department.

DRESSLER pointed out that there was one matter which the Committee wished to bring to the attention of the Senate this month so that senators would have an opportunity to think about it before the final recommendations are brought to the Senate for a vote.

The requirements adopted last spring specify that no more than 12 credits in a department may be used to meet the distribution requirements. The ARC has asked that departments with strict prerequisites omit any course from the list which has a prerequisite of twelve or more credits.

The Committee recognizes and shares with these departments a concern that no well prepared student be penalized or discouraged by omission of more advanced courses from the list, particularly in view of the expectations that the more rigorous admissions requirements now in effect will mean that more students will arrive on campus prepared to take advanced courses in subjects such as foreign language, mathematics and science.

ARC will bring to the Senate a recommendation that a simple procedure be developed which allows the department head to certify that the student may substitute an advanced course for the lower division prerequisite which is on the list. The catalog and time schedule will clearly state the availability of this option.

An example of this might be a student with four years of excellent high school Russian who might be prepared to a 300-level course in literature or composition and conversation or a student with a strong calculus preparation who might be ready for differential equations or advanced calculus.

DRESSLER reminded the Senate that at the October meeting the upper-division requirement was reworded so that students could take the 18 credits of upper-division work in the 54 credits of general distribution or in addition to the 54 credits of general distribution. A student who wishes to use an advanced course in any of the affected departments as a part of the 18 credit requirement would not be injured by this suggested procedure.

2. TUFTS reported that Winter term registration was up 3% over one year ago.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS -- none.

NEW BUSINESS

BJORK, distributing the following resolution, stated that it followed the widely accepted AAUP policy statement in giving faculty a primary role in
the search for a university president, and he asked for unanimous Faculty Senate support. The resolution was moved and seconded.

"The Faculty Senate urges the State Board to adopt a selection process for Portland State University's new president that is consistent with those national AAUP standards which are expressed in the 1981 red book policy statement Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators."

BJORK's written memo also contained pertinent portions of a four-page "Draft: The Search and Selection Process," issued by the Chancellor's office on January 15, 1986, which proposed that the search committee be composed of five board members and one representative from each of the following: faculty, students, administrative staff, and community.

The attached AAUP policy statement, on the other hand, emphasized "the primary role of the faculty and board in the search for a president."

WRENCH spoke in general support of the resolution but thought that the Senate should hammer out an effective statement that did not only refer to PSU but would be appropriate for all OSSHE schools. In addition to mentioning AAUP policy, that statement should also refer to long-standing traditions in Oregon. The following substitute motion was moved and seconded:

"The Faculty Senate notes that faculty members in the institutions of the Oregon State System of Higher Education have traditionally played a much larger role in the selection of their presidents than is envisioned in the Chancellor's proposed procedure dated 1/15/86. We respectfully request that the Board review traditional practice before changing it, and that they adopt procedures consistent with the national standards of the American Association of University Professors. Those standards are incorporated in their 1981 policy statement, Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators. A copy of that statement is to be found in the enclosed book of AAUP policy statements."

At this point R. JOHNSON presented his substitute resolution, agreeing that PSU should not be the only institution mentioned. However, he wanted to emphasize the collegial process in the selection and ensure the proper role of the faculty in the process.

"We have reviewed the draft proposal for 'The Search and Selection Process' which changes the process by which a presidential search committee is appointed. Under this proposal members of the State Board of Higher Education will represent a majority of the committee and only one faculty member will be appointed to the committee.

We believe that such a proposal allows for only nominal faculty representation! The success of presidential leadership is directly related to the collegial atmosphere at a university or college, and the 'chemistry' that exists between administration and faculty significantly impacts the effectiveness of an institution."
We are primarily concerned that under the current proposal faculty will have only a nominal voice in the presidential search process. We unanimously recommend that, when any institution is in the process of presidential search, the institution's faculty be given a significant voice on the presidential search committee. As you consider a change in the method of presidential search, we encourage you to adopt a policy that recognizes the importance of significant faculty representation and that provides for a more even distribution of board members, faculty, and other interested parties."

JONES ruled that the Senate should dispose of the Wrench substitute motion first, but A. JOHNSON suggested that the R. Johnson substitute could be added to the end of the Wrench motion. MANDAVILLE asked if Wrench had considered simply amending Bjork's motion, rather than substituting it entirely. WRENCH responded that, because of the several changes made, it was easier to substitute, and BJORK agreed to support the Wrench motion, withdrawing his own original resolution.

A motion to substitute the Wrench motion for Bjork's resolution was passed.

A. and R. JOHNSON moved and seconded that the R. Johnson resolution be added to the Wrench motion; they continued to argue that it was important to communicate to the Board that we were concerned about all OSSHE institutions and wanted to establish a collegial relationship with a new president right from the start. BRENNER concurred. BJORK and GOEKJIAN did not; they agreed with KIMBRELL that brevity is the soul of wit and that a lengthy statement would communicate indecisiveness.

MANDAVILLE asked what policies had been followed in the OSU search. JONES replied that the initial proposal had been the same as PSU's, but because of faculty and senate protest the committee ended up with three faculty members. He also recalled that the 1973 PSU presidential search committee had seven faculty members on the committee of sixteen. TANG predicted that the Chancellor would be receiving pressure from other constituencies as well; for instance, The Oregonian had asked for an increase in community representation.

She was also concerned about sending a copy of the AAUP book along with the motion, saying that the Board was well enough aware of AAUP policy; she proposed taking out the reference to AAUP altogether. HENEGHAN agreed, arguing that a reference to AAUP would be looked at in a different light at this moment, since the Chancellor and AAUP are currently at loggerheads. WRENCH warned that we should not overestimate the Board's familiarity with AAUP. He recalled that the Coordinating Commission last year had never seen the AAUP policy book. He also pointed out that the Board should know that AAUP is not just a faculty union at PSU. WEIKEL added that that was precisely why the reference to AAUP must remain; AAUP is a national organization and its policies are adhered to by many bodies. BENNETT thought that a slight change in wording might prevent raising the ire of the Chancellor, and she suggested substituting "comparable to AAUP" for "consistent with the standards of AAUP." However, KIMBRELL said he was not upset with the reference to AAUP -- after all, AAUP was here long before PSU. HAMMOND wanted to allay people's fears by stating that the State Board could make the distinction between collective bargaining and AAUP standards and policies.
At this point several small editorial changes were made in the motion until the final version read as follows:

"The Portland State University Faculty Senate notes that faculty members in the institutions of the Oregon State System of Higher Education have traditionally played a much larger role in the selection of their presidents than is envisioned in the Chancellor's proposed procedure dated 1/15/86. We respectfully request that the Board review traditional practice before changing it, and adopt procedures consistent with the national standards of the American Association of University Professors. Those standards are incorporated in their 1981 policy statement, Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators. A copy of that statement is to be found in the enclosed book of AAUP policy statements."

The motion was passed unanimously.

JONES was directed to send the motion to the chairperson of the Board of Higher Education, with copies to the Chancellor, the presidents of the other universities and colleges, and to AOF.

R. NUSSBAUM was granted the privilege of the floor. He stated that the Chancellor's drafted proposal was an insult to the PSU faculty and suggested that an additional statement needed to be sent along with the motion. He read the following:

"The Faculty Senate of PSU opposes any form of token participation by a member of the Portland State University faculty on the presidential search committee, as proposed by Chancellor Davis in his 1/15/86 draft to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education."

CONSTANS proposed the statement as a motion, and it was seconded.

President BLUMEL asked if the statement could be interpreted that PSU would not participate in the presidential search process if it did not get more than one faculty representative. CABELLY felt that the Senate had just passed a good motion and urged that they not make a bad relationship worse by acting on the Nussbaum motion. A. JOHNSON agreed and suggested the Senate adopt a wait-and-see stance; he moved to table the motion.

The motion to table was passed.

BLUMEL pointed out that the executive committee of the Board had drawn up the January 15 draft, not the Chancellor, and MOOR suggested that the Wrench motion be corrected before being mailed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:07.
RESOLUTION

The PSU Faculty Senate congratulates Carl Abbott, Urban Studies and Planning, and Lee Casperson, Electrical Engineering, for receiving Faculty Excellence Awards this year.

We believe that faculty excellence should be rewarded and urge the Presiding Officer of the PSU Senate, the President of PSU, the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, and the Chancellor to work with the Legislature to increase the number of awards available statewide.