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THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 2, 1995
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Alternates Present: Barnham for Fortmiller, Youngelson-Neal for Potiowsky, Mandaville for Weikel, Steinberger for Williams.

Members Absent: Becker, Daasch, Danielson, Westbrook.


B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 4:05. The Faculty Senate Minutes of June 5, 1995 were approved as circulated.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

LENDARIS, Presiding Officer, opened the 1995-96 session by remarking that, in addition to its customary business, the Senate this year faces four matters of importance: 1) conversion of undergraduate courses to a 4-credit model, 2) implementation of the General Education program, 3) the issue of representation on faculty committees, and 4) the question of reorganizing Oregon's higher education system. LENDARIS called on members of the Committee on Committees to caucus after adjournment to set a meeting for selecting a chair.

Faculty Senate Minutes, October 2, 1995
2. **President’s Report**

a) The University has received its second Title XI (urban university) grant in the amount of $1.8 million over 5 years. Senator Hatfield, who supported PSU’s efforts, attended the 10/2 press conference at which the award was announced. While Bill Becker and Paul Latolais serve as principal investigators, many assisted in writing the grant application and deserve our congratulations and thanks.

b) At its November meeting, the State Board of Higher Education will begin to set a strategy for the 1997 legislative session. The process will bring together Board members, campus presidents, and Oregon legislators and leaders to affirm higher education’s importance and to spotlight the shortfall between the state’s needs and budgetary resources now available. RAMALEY is at work with the Chancellor’s office on a document describing Oregon’s changing educational needs and how the structure and programs of the state system might change to meet them. Separately, the Governor has received the report of his citizen’s commission to rethink Oregon’s educational system, headed by Don Frisbee and Tom Bruggere. While the document has not been circulated, the Governor discussed one of its ideas: a reconfigured higher ed system in which OSSHE institutions would be grouped with either UO or OSU.

Recognizing that Oregon higher ed is entering a propitious time in which its forms and funding will receive serious attention, RAMALEY called on the Senate to assist in developing proposals on how best to strengthen higher education in the Portland metropolitan area.

c) Final details of the budget will be discussed at the 10/19 administrators meeting which will look at the effects of Ballot Measure 5 and at how best to manage the resources available under the 1995-97 budget. RAMALEY invited budget committee members to attend.

KOCAOGLU asked whether and how PSU factored into discussions of a reconfigured OSSHE system. RAMALEY characterized the discussions as brainstorming which included the idea of grouping institutions into two mini-clusters: one, a public Ivy cluster emphasizing arts and sciences; another, an outreach, community-based cluster. These clusters would likely bring changes in name, but not in the missions of separate institutions. RAMALEY’s look at states which initiated reorganization talks showed three outcomes: 1. after recognizing that reorganization would not make a critical difference, to hold back, 2. to create mini-systems, or 3. to have absolute independence.
TEGRIS urged the Senate to take a proactive stance to demonstrate to Oregon’s citizens the prospect of strengthening higher education.

3. **Provost's Report**

a) Following a meeting with the NW accrediting commission in June, PSU received word of its 10-year re-accreditation. REARDON thanked those involved, especially John Cooper, for their work.

b) There was no support in the OSSHE Academic Council for semester conversion and it is unlikely that a plan will emerge during the 1995-97 biennium.

c) REARDON noted that the $6+ million dollar endowment for undergraduate education just announced by UO shows the possibility for external funding for the improvement of undergraduate education. PSU is already well along in this process and has recently received $1,480,000 including $500,000 for faculty development, $178,000 from NEH/NSF for sophomore and junior courses, $260,00 for using technology in large lecture classes, and $80,000 for other faculty support.

4. **Vice-President's Report**

PERNSTEINER expressed gratitude for the warm welcome he received and promised a careful look at current and proposed budgets.

D. **QUESTION PERIOD**

LENDARIS suggested that faculty submit questions in writing to administrators when the answers require gathering or analysis of data.

E. **REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES**

1. **Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Task Force**

MERCER delivered the report in place of P. Wetzel. President Ramaley created the task force in Spring 93, a time of tension in Oregon politics, to assess how and how much the campus environment was accepting, open, and safe for lesbian, gay, and bisexual faculty, staff and students. The task force, made up of faculty, staff, students, and members of the Human Rights Commission, conducted a survey of perceptions of campus climate toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual faculty, students, staff, assessed campus services provided to these groups, and
conducted campus forums. The survey showed that students, staff, and faculty perceived their experience to be like minorities on campus and that faculty and staff perceived PSU to be less inviting than students. The task force had three outcomes: 1. a safe zone committee, 2. a bias reporting line, and 3. lesbian-gay-bisexual advocacy network modelled on the sexual harassment network. A copy of the final report is available from the Office of Affirmative Action.

2. BURNS reported that there was no September meeting of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Election of Steering Committee Members

Katherine Novy was elected by secret ballot to the 95-96 Senate Steering Committee to replace Steve Brenner who had to resign.

2, 3. SBA and LIB reorganization reports

OSHIKA reminded the Senate that the 93-94 Steering Committee completed reports on the SBA and LIB reorganizations (dated September 15, 1994 and circulated for 10/3/94 Senate meeting) and that further review was not required in 1995-96.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. General Education

1a. Chuck White presented a status report on the General Education program as it begins Year II. Over 100 faculty participated in the 7-day training program offered September 6-14. The number of PSU students in Freshman Inquiry is up (685 Fall, 94 vs. 819 Fall, 95). Initiated Fall, 95, Sophomore Inquiry courses enroll 497 students in 18 sections. Fourteen sections are scheduled for winter and 19 for spring.

The Gen Ed program was strengthened by enhanced orientation activities for students, improved training of peer mentors, and the start of a FRINQ (faculty) council to govern Freshman Inquiry. A summer FRINQ program began and a transition module enrolling 80+ transfer students started this fall. With the hiring of capstone coordinator, pilot capstone courses are being readied for Fall, 96. Finally, the Gen Ed program has become a model for other schools.
considering the improvement of undergraduate instruction such as Temple, University of Houston, Linn-Benton, Clackamas, and PCC-Rock Creek.

1b. WHITE distributed copies of the continuing assessment plan for the Gen Ed program.

Responding to MANDAVILLE’s question on retention in Freshman Inquiry, WHITE reported results of a Spring, 95 tally (roughly 70% continuation) and a summer followup of 100 who did not continue (of 75 who responded, most did not re-enroll in successive terms). Responding to A JOHNSON’s question on continuation rates from FRINQ into Sophomore Inquiry, WHITE noted that because students could take SINQ courses any term, it was too early to know continuation rates. Responding to SVOBODA’s question of whether there would be enough sections of junior and capstone courses to accommodate transfer students in the next two years, WHITE said it was still premature to estimate the number of students needing these courses and the number of instructors available to teach them. LENDARIS encouraged the Senate to stay abreast of Gen Ed’s implementation and evaluation. HOLLOWAY noted that the curriculum committee -- when freed from the burden of doing 4 credit conversion -- will review proposed Gen Ed courses. A. JOHNSON called for examination of Gen Ed’s cost as part of its evaluation in view of budgetary pressures and underenrollment in SINQ courses. WHITE responded that differing room sizes partly explain the variation in SINQ course enrollments.

H.  ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 and those present were invited to “K” House.
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 4:05. The Faculty Senate Minutes of October 2, 1995 were approved as circulated.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

LIEBMAN asked senators to provide their current e-mail addresses so he could begin a fast-track communications system and reported that Senate minutes, agendas, and the Governance Guide (including up-to-date lists of committee members) are now available on-line through PSU’s Home Page.
2. **PRESIDENT’S REPORT**
3. **PROVOST’S REPORT**

The combined report concerned the steps toward making higher education’s case for the 1997 legislative session. RAMALEY described four processes:

a. OSSHE is creating three committees to consider how the OSSHE system might be changed to meet the changing social and economic needs of Oregonians. The committees are: a) Access and Technology chaired by Gail McAllister from Eastern Oregon, b) Graduate Education and Research chaired by John Byrne, outgoing OSU President, and c) Economic and Regional Development chaired by Tom Imeson of Pacificorp. Each committee will include one or more institution presidents and, as REARDON noted, each institution will be represented by its Vice Provost/Dean for Graduate Studies on the Graduate Education and Research Committee.

b. OSSHE Board members, institution presidents, and others involved will converge with a separate process initiated by Governor Kitzhaber to rethink Oregon’s educational system. His commission, headed by Don Frisbee and Tom Bruggere, presented a report which has not yet been circulated.

c. The Legislature will make an interim study of what can be done to strengthen higher education. Tom Hartung, chair of the Senate education committee, will take a leading role and it is not yet known if a House committee chair will take part.

d. Business leaders will assess options for strengthening OSSHE. They realized that during the 1995 session, they focused on protecting core elements of education reform without equal attention to higher education which suffered further cuts. AOI, OBC, and the Portland Chamber of Commerce will mount a joint effort.

RAMALEY noted that knowing these processes creates a different context for understanding the map of choices facing higher education. Restructuring is but one path in a portfolio of possibilities.

Responding to SVOBODA’S question of whether the last and most public process would be limited to large business lobbies, RAMALEY said she favored including small business and groups concerned with public services, safety, transportation, and community issues. RAMALEY expressed concern that many of those most
affected are not organized to exercise voice in the proceedings. REARDON noted that OSSHE asked for recommendations of community members for its committees.

4. Vice-President’s Report

PERNSTEINER reported that he is at work with the Budget Committee to prepare the guidelines for 1996-97 and future budgets and to assess a) possible revenue enhancements from increased enrollments and external fundraising and b) anticipated reductions in the budget. OSHIKA reported that the next Budget Committee meeting will be November 15 at 9 am.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

LENDARIS urged faculty to access the PSU Home Page and to click on News and Events (which includes communications from Chancellor Cox and Letters to the Editor and editorials regarding OSSHE’s possible reorganization) and Faculty and Staff Information.

KOCH reported that the evaluation of graduate education continues with the appointment of several faculty and the Deans of CLAS and UPA to a university-wide committee which began its work by considering the draft plan for graduate studies distributed at the Spring Convocation. A list of committee members is available from the Office of Graduate Studies.

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Fall Term Registration Report

FAHEY reported for Tufts. A year-to-year comparison of the 4th week official headcount shows PSU was down .5% in headcount, down .5% in credit hours, and down .4 % in FTE because of a slight shift toward graduate enrollment.

E2. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

OSHIKA supplemented BURNS report circulated with the agenda.

a. Peter Kohler, OHSU president, spoke about the advantages accompanying OHSU’s new status as a public corporation. OSHIKA noted that OSSHE continues to oversee OHSU’s academic programs and its Provost sits on the OSSHE Academic Council
b. Richard Markwood, Director, described the Central Oregon Education Center, set up with a legislative appropriation of $300,000 to serve the state’s fastest-growing area. The Center actively collaborates with Central Oregon Community College and, with other universities, offers higher degrees.

c. Tim Griffin, new vice chancellor for public and corporate affairs, spoke of building links between OSSHE and the business community.

d. Robert Nosse, outgoing Executive Director of the Oregon Student Lobby, discussed OSL’s efforts in the legislature.

e. OSSHE continues to advance its diversity initiative as seen in PSU’s push to recruit diverse faculty

f. OSU faculty are circulating a letter calling for the return of their “kicker” tax rebate to public education.

g. The next meeting of IFS will be December 1-2 at PSU.

3. Committee on Committees

WATNE, newly elected chair, reported that all committee nominees recommended at the October meeting have accepted. This year, the Committee will encourage retired faculty to serve on committees.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Curriculum Committee Holloway

G2. Graduate Council - Goslin

The committee chairs presented progress reports on 4-credit conversion and prepared the Senate for its review of their recommendations at the December 4 meeting. A summary of presentations and discussion follows:

1. The business of the committees: In 1995, the Curriculum Committee oversaw three matters: the customary flow of course changes, new General Education courses, and a flood of changes occasioned by conversion from a 3-credit to 4-credit model for Fall, 1996. Conversion became the major task. HOLLOWAY
noted that the Committee sought to manage the process by creating a set of protocols (approved by the Senate) and a schedule for submitting paperwork. Few departments completed their course proposals by the June deadline. GOSLIN noted that the Graduate Council issued three guidelines: a rationale for proposed changes, justification for net gain or loss, and a check of crosslisted courses. Many proposals arrived after the deadline. Both chairs doubted that their committees would be able to review late submissions in time for the 12/4 meeting and noted that some departments chose to delay conversion until Fall, 1997. LIEBMAN noted that the Curriculum Committee tried to accommodate late submissions through a fast-track process: it split into subarea workgroups to review proposed changes for possible duplication or overlap and to assure that prerequisites remain in place. The workgroups then communicated directly with departments to request justifications or make changes as quickly as possible.

2. The Senate’s mandate for conversion: HOLLOWAY noted that in 1994, the Senate approved a pilot project of 4-credit conversion in English, and in 1995, authorized 4-credit conversion for the undergraduate curriculum. Responding to WEINBERG’S question, GOSLIN and A JOHNSON reported that, on recommendation of the Graduate Council, the Senate decided to make optional the conversion from 3 to 4 credits for graduate courses. Responding to WEINBERG’S question of how many departments changed, WETZEL noted that all but three CLAS departments submitted curricular proposals and only one of them did not change from 3 to 4 credits. SVOBODA expressed misgivings that so many departments chose to convert their grad courses when issues such as the scheduling of night classes were yet unresolved and worried that, for departments still considering it, the conversion would become a fait accompli. Speaking to the intent of the Senate’s mandate, OSHIKA reported that, in their reports, both the Curriculum and University Planning Committees recommended that the decision be left to the discretion of departments and that, while the Graduate Council’s report did not instruct departments to go forward, it did not prohibit them. To explain what had happened, OSHIKA noted that in CLAS, a large number -- perhaps 80% -- of graduate courses have 400/500 standing and departments undertaking 4-credit conversion of their undergraduate courses felt obliged to change for the sake of consistency. KOCAOGLU noted that the School of Business had earlier converted its courses from 3 to 4 credits. REARDON noted that the option for changing course credit had always existed.

3. Senate review of the Committees’ recommendations for course approval:

There were two related topics: (a) whether to summarize or profile the multitude of course changes and (b) the best way for the Senate to review the committees’ recommendations.
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Regarding the first (a), to save paper and time, the Secretary of the Faculty decided to make a dozen copies of OAA’s 55 page summary available at central places around the University. Recognizing that curriculum is the most important business of the Senate, BRENNER requested distribution of course profiles to all Senators so they could review overlaps or duplication. CONSTANS asked how senators can give consideration if they lack a detailed list. A. JOHNSON, LENDARIS, and CABELLY discussed the possibility of and need for security for a list of proposed course changes available through PSU’s Home Page.

Regarding the second (b), OSHIKA called attention to the charge to committees and to the appropriate level of review by the full Senate. LENDARIS noted that each senator must cast a vote and we need a careful review because the changes will become part of PSU’s catalogue. GOSLIN discouraged the thought that the Senate would repeat the detailed review undertaken by the committees and pointed out that what he had in hand came from a two-hour meeting. BRENNER responded that he was not seeking to redo committee work but to have sufficient information. WETZEL recalled that semester deconversion involved block approval of department proposals rather than consideration of individual courses. HOLLOWAY suggested that we proceed using a summary by departments of recommended course changes rather than a listing of every course. HARDT noted that 60 course changes/year was normal in the past 15 years and the best way to handle the hundreds of changes this year was to continue the practice of a summary sheet which included changes and new courses. WEINBERG requested a statement from each department regarding the impact of 4-credit conversion on the number of courses required for the major, night courses, and whether course credit is comparable at community colleges. GOSLIN reminded that the conversion protocols required departments to provide a statement of what was new.

In closing, GOSLIN recommended that the decision of how and how much information to circulate be left to the judgement of the Secretary of the Faculty. HOLLOWAY reminded faculty in departments with cognate courses in other departments to check the changes in these departments. LENDARIS warned the Senate of the large workload for the December 4 meeting and noted that HARDT would preside in his absence.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 4, 1995
Presiding Officer Pro Tem: Ulrich Hardt
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Alternates Present: Wetzel for Mercer, Christensen for Watne, Holloway for Westbrook.


B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:07. The Faculty Senate Minutes of November 6, 1995 were approved with two corrections: Ketcheson not Fahey gave the Fall Term Registration Report for the Registrar and the meeting was called to order at 3:05 not 4:05.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A workshop, “Managing the Overlap: School, Work, and Family,” sponsored by the PSU Committee for Women Faculty Development and the Office of Affirmative Action, will be held Tuesday, December 5, 1-4 pm. (For Suwako Watanabe)

The AS-PSU Book Exchange will be open during finals week in SMC 290 and
will reopen during first week of classes. The Book Exchange offers students a higher return for books sold and a lower price for books purchased. (For Anna Dinh, ASPSU)

2. President’s Report
3. Provost’s Report

Ramaley was in Maine. In place of the Provost’s report, Reardon requested S. BRENNER (chair) to report for the Intercollegiate Athletics Board regarding a November 19, 1995 Oregonian article which included purported comments on religion and athletics by a PSU coach. At a meeting with the Athletic Director and other administrators, President Ramaley charged IAB to develop a policy on religion and athletics for PSU. Brenner asked Bob Lockwood, our NCAA representative and a lawyer, to examine relevant law and court decisions and to review policies from public institutions. There is a possibility that policies will be adopted by the Big Sky Conference and the PAC-10. The Attorney General reported that there are no applicable Oregon laws, that the matter would be discussed, and that its staff would review proposals produced by PSU. IAB will develop a set of principles and guidelines consistent with law. The draft policy will be shared with coaches and outside observers from interdenominational organizations. The revised draft will be reviewed by the AG’s staff before being presented to the President for adoption as an administrative policy. On December 6, Janis Nichols of Public Relations will hold a media training for coaches and assistant coaches.

4. Vice-President’s Report

PERNSTEINER reported that a) he and President Ramaley will be meeting in Washington with HUD Secretary Cisneros regarding the Urban Center Building for which funding is being sought from federal, state, local, and private sources, and b) is at work with the Budget Committee and CADs to prepare budget guidelines.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

A. JOHNSON asked whether PSU application forms are available on the Internet. TAGGART reported that the Information Technology group is at work on the project and expects to install it soon.
E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Annual Report, Graduate Council

GOSLIN presented the report. There were no questions. HARDT accepted the report for the Senate.

E2. Annual Report, Curriculum Committee (postponed)

E3. Annual Report, Library Committee

GRECO called attention to #3 regarding the need for teaching faculty to take part in forums on the Vision Plan for restructuring library faculty and support staff and #4 regarding faculty partnerships with the Friends of Library to encourage donations in support of teaching and research needs.

E4. Annual Report, Scholastic Standards Committee

CONSTANS presented the report. There were no questions. HARDT accepted the report for the Senate.

E5. Semi-Annual Report - Faculty Development Committee

LAFFERRIERE reported that 54 proposals totalling $370,000 were submitted by the November deadline, representing a 50% increase in submissions over 1994. About $100,000 is available for faculty development awards this year.

E6. Quarterly Report - University Planning Council

CABELLY reported there were no Fall term meetings.

E7. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

BURNS reported on the December 1-2 meeting at PSU.

1. The Chancellor reported that he and the Board are preparing for the 1997-99 "prison" biennium which will bring increases for corrections, a shortfall in Oregon Health Plan funds, and declining lottery revenues. He identified three objectives: a) stop the disinvestment in higher education, b) address salary improvements, and c) broaden support for higher education. Four strategies are underway: a) an assessment of future needs as begun in the 2010 document, b) a critical review of the mission statements of all institutions, c) consideration of funding opportunities
for each institution, and d) examination of the structure and governance of OSSHE. The Board is creating four committees (undergraduate education, graduation education, lifelong education and professional development, and community and regional development) which will look at resources and funding, modes of delivery, access, accountability, and governance. IFS requested faculty representation on all these committees and the steering committee.

2. OSU’s Faculty Senate is considering ROTC’s representation in the Senate in view of ROTC’s policy on preferences for sexual orientation.

3. Faculty representatives played significant parts in president searches at OSU and WOSC.

4. New officers: Martha Sergeant (WOSC), President, Bea Oshika (PSU) will join advisory committee. Craig Wollner will succeed Scott Burns.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council - Holloway/Goslin

Introducing the 4-credit conversion, HARDT noted that the 1036 course changes to be considered were the largest number in PSU’s history and expressed thanks for the hard work of the Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, and Linda Devereaux (OAA). LIEBMAN provided a legislative history of the conversion organized around 3 questions:

1. What and why Senate mandated conversion. In March 1994, Provost Reardon encouraged the Senate to consider conversion as a way to improve productivity and academic quality and recommended implementation in Fall, 1995. In April 1994, the Senate voted to authorize a 4-credit pilot project by English department beginning Fall, 1994. Consideration of conversion by the GC, UCC, and UPC culminated in reports to the December, 1994 Senate meeting recommending delay and reconsideration. Reexamined in January, conversion was moved in February, 1995 and approved by unanimous vote less one:

“The Senate recommends the University adopt a four-credit course model for undergraduate curriculum, to take effect Fall 1996, with the following provisions: 1) Academic departments will undertake course/program revisions, where accreditation requirements permit, with the objective of pedagogic improvements; 2) Academic Requirements Committee will establish recommendations for policies applying to the baccalaureate degree, transfer credit, and enrollment; and 3)
University Planning Council and Curriculum Committee will establish protocols for implementation and approval to proceed during 1995-96.

2. How? LIEBMAN referred to UCC Guidelines approved by the Senate in June, 1995 and Grad Council’s Guidelines (both circulated) and asked chairs to report.

3. Finally, what have we learned. PSU tried to do in less than a year what took 2 years at UO. The 1036 course changes show the determination of departments and the committees. We have learned much about how to better articulate the processes of changing the curriculum and reviewing the changes. More important, the effort brought many departments to rethink their mode of instruction and the way they organize course offerings for the major, for general education, and as service to other academic units. What we hope for are pedagogic improvements that will come from a reduction in the number of courses for students and of preparations for faculty.

HARDT called for reports from UCC and GC chairs. HOLLOWAY (UCC) described the process (subcommittees that communicated with chairs) and acknowledged two problems: a) compliance with/enforcement of deadlines, and b) lack of time to review courses that overlap or are required among 2+ departments. More than 50% of programs/departments accomplished conversion.

GOSLIN (GC) set the context for Senate action by recalling that Senate approved restructuring of School of Business Administration on a 4-credit model 2 years earlier. In 1995, GC reviewed 517 course proposals. GOSLIN noted three matters for GC’s attention in 1996: a) extended learning, b) how to handle joint grad/undergrad courses (400/500’s), and c) addressing rationalization of duplicated/complementary courses. Only one program -- Public Administration - did not convert, believing that 3 credit model best fit the late afternoon/evening schedule of its students.

A JOHNSON/LIMBAUGH moved to approve GC’s recommendations for course and program proposals as circulated in the Supplement for the 12/4 meeting and the addendum (distributed). WEINBERG asked how the UCC and GC protocols for conversion were approved and how GC judged whether courses met its standard for conversion. LIEBMAN noted the UCC protocols were approved at the 6/95 Senate meeting. (Secretary’s note: The Senate’s motion did not mandate conversion of graduate courses and programs and did not require approval of GC’s protocols.) GOSLIN described the standard for 3 to 4 credit conversion as broader coverage and more work. Many departments welcomed conversion as a way, long overdue, to bring graduate workloads and credit hours into correspondence. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.
A JOHNSON/LIMBAUGH moved to approve UCC’s recommendations for course and program proposals as circulated in the Supplement for the 12/4 meeting and the addendum sheet (distributed). HOLLOWAY offered a friendly amendment to add a missing course: Writing 200 Writing about Literature. J BRENNER requested clarification of whether the vote would approve recommendations to defer consideration for a few courses. A JOHNSON interpreted his motion to include all recommendations and asked whether approvals now in process would come before the 1/8/96 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

In response to CONSTANS’ request for a school-by-school review of recommendations, HARDT said that this was subsumed by the motions to accept, now approved. HARDT called on Senators to examine changes for their programs and schools.

H. ADJOURNMENT

With HARDT’s recognition of a record for swift completion of a large agenda, the meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 8, 1996
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Alternates Present: Shireman for Adams, Wyers for Anderson, Meredith for Cumpston, Burns for A Johnson, Bender for Nunn, Holloway for Westbrook.

Members Absent: Bluestone, Danielson, Feeney, Fokine, Friesen, Goslin, Greenfield, Kenny, Limbaugh, Miller, Tinnin, Weikel


B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:07. The Faculty Senate Minutes of December 4, 1995 were approved as circulated.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The AS-PSU Book Exchange will be open during first week of classes in SMC 290. Faculty are encouraged to announce the Book Exchange in classes. (For Anna Dinh, AS-PSU).

2. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Unable to attend, Ramaley arranged two reports.

JOHN FOWLER, Director of Campus Security, reported that, during the break, a student residing in the Ondine was found with ammonia nitrate and other
bombmaking materials. Security and police removed the materials and, after obtaining a warrant, searched the room. The student was evicted and has been suspended from the university. The student was involved in 7 chargeable criminal offenses at another university, but was not charged or referred in any of these cases.

LENDARIS reported for Ramaley that OSSHE has formed four task forces: Graduate Education and Research, Community and Economic Development, Lifelong Education and Professional Development, and Undergraduate Education. A PSU staff or faculty member sits as member or consultant to each task force. They are: Roy Koch (consultant, Graduate Education and Research), President Ramaley and Morgan Pope (Community and Economic Development), Sherwin Davidson and Marge Enneking (Lifelong Education and Professional Development), Chuck White and Bea Oshika (Undergraduate Education). The task forces will begin meeting in January. The Chancellor asked Presidents to assure involvement on their campuses and Ramaley formed a campus advisory body that will include PSU's representatives to the task forces, the Provost, the Vice-President (FADM), the Faculty Senate president, a student representative, and other members of the University community who are invited to express their interest.

3. PROVOST'S REPORT

4. Vice-Provost's Report (OAA)

5. Vice-Provost's Report (OGS)

REARDON deferred to the reports by the Vice-Provosts. DIMAN reported on the revised time schedules to accommodate four-credit conversion in Fall, 1996. The new schedules will follow the MWF/TTh format used for 3 credit courses by adding minutes to the current time slots. In place of the current 50-minute session, MWF classes will meet for 65 minutes/day for a total of 195 minutes. Classes will start at 7:45 am with a ten-minute break between time slots. In place of the current 75-minute session, TTh classes will meet for 100 minutes/day for a total of 200 minutes. Classes will start at 8 am, 10, 12, and 2. The revision will maximize classroom usage and allows flexible scheduling of 3-credit and other course packages. In answer to KOCAGOLU's question about evening classes, DIMAN reported that normally 4-credit courses will meet twice at week beginning at either 5:40 pm or 7 pm. In answer to GRECO's question, the possibility exists for a single 4-hour bloc and its scheduling should attend to bus schedules to accommodate students.
KOCH reported that the committee on graduate education (including faculty representatives from all schools, three from CLAS and Deans Toulan and Kaiser) has met 3 times and targeted three areas: traditional research-based graduate training, professional master's degrees, and post-baccalaureate/continuing education. Members the committee initiated data-gathering, attended conferences on graduate education, and visited UC, Davis which implemented a graduate-group model. KOCH will present the committee’s prospective goals at Winter Convocation, January 22, 3 pm.

6. Vice-President's Report (FADM)

PERNSTEINER did not offer a report.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no written questions or questions from the floor.

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Committee on Committees - Watne

WATNE reported that CoC completed calendar-year appointments to standing committees. When several chair nominees raised the question of how long they would be expected to serve (and, in some cases, declined), CoC deliberated the question and decided by vote that there should be no presumption of renewal and that chairs would generally serve for one year, though special circumstances may warrant reappointment. To assure a successful transfer of leadership, the committee proposed a model used in other organizations: selecting a vice-chair (as future chair) and asking the past chair to stay on as a mentor to the current chair. S. BRENNER raised two questions: whether the policy would further burden CoC by increasing turnover when one-year terms expire and whether it would require more learning-the-ropes as chairs turn over more often. He approved of CoC’s decision to allow for reappointment under special circumstances. Responding to the first question, WATNE said one-year terms made recruitment easier. LENDARIS responded that seeing burnout discourages sitting members from becoming chair. In answer to WINEBERG’s question of how CoC makes nominations for chair, WATNE responded that CoC tries to find a sitting member who is familiar with the committee’s current concerns and membership. As the current practice of phoning members for names of chair nominees is time-consuming and often unsure, WATNE hopes that CoC and the committees can develop an end-of-year reporting system to speed reappointments and select chairs. Describing the changeover of UCC’s chair as awkward, HOLLOWAY called for better communication between UCC and standing committees during implementation of the new one-year-term policy.
E2. Annual Report, Curriculum Committee - Holloway

HOLLOWAY summarized the report (attached), calling attention to the effectiveness of the subcommittee structure, pending 4-credit conversions and program changes, and the lack of time to consider General Education courses.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council - Holloway/Pratt - Goslin/Ellis

HARDT/KOCAGOLU moved to accept UCC's recommendations for course and program proposals as circulated with the agenda. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

HARDT/SVOBODA moved to accept GC’s recommendations for course and program proposals as circulated with the agenda. In the chairs’ absence, KOCAGOLU agreed to take questions for the Graduate Council. S. BRENNER asked whether changes in the Engineering Management Program (9 new courses by his count) would require additional FTE. KOCAGOLU responded that the nine are existing courses being converted from 510’s to permanent standing. In response to WINEBERG’s question of how often they would be taught, KOCAGOLU said some would be annual offerings, others biannual. Responding to suggestions from HOLLOWAY, LENDARIS, & S. BRENNER, KOCAGOLU will revise catalogue copy to indicate which are annual or biannual courses and to correct typos and omissions. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 5, 1996
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Alternates Present: Shireman for Adams, Wyers for Anderson, Moor for Bowlden, Guetti for Fokine, Beeson for Johnson A, Andersen for Kocaoglu, Holloway for Westbrook

Members Absent: Barton, Becker, Etessami, Fortmiller, Friesen, Goldberg, Greenfield, Harrison, Johnson, D, Kenny, Potiowsky, Weikel, Wilson-Figueroa

Ex-officio Members Present: Brenner, Cabelly, Constans, Davidson, Ellis, Holloway, Kaiser, Kirrie, Lafferriere, Liebman, Pernsteiner, Reardon, Rosengrant, Ward.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:08. The Faculty Senate Minutes of January 8, 1996 were accepted with three corrections: Fokine present, Paradis attended for Cumpston, and (per Watne) the phrase “selecting a vice-chair (as future chair)” should be omitted from the Committee on Committees report.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

February 16 is the deadline for the Visions of Society essay contest which provides a generous stipend to the winning graduate student (Susan Danielson)

2. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER

LENDARIS offered a midyear report summarizing the Senate’s work and suggesting themes for coming months. The text follows these minutes.
3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

RAMALEY reported that

a) the OSSHE task forces are meeting regularly. The task force on which she serves (Community and Economic Development) sent out a questionnaire to understand the priorities institutions assign to community and economic development and how they direct resources, build partnerships, and evaluate the effectiveness of their efforts. With the information, the task force will move into agenda-setting and planning in order to merge with the Governor's budget-making process in May or June.

b) as a member of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of Higher Education, she is aware of national soulsearching on questions which have seized our attention at PSU: the changing nature of graduate and professional education, the university's commitment to community service, and the role of research universities in creating new capacities for the development of society and economy.

c) Marc Weiss, an advisor to HUD Secretary Cisneros, recently joined others at PSU to discuss the ways that universities can energize and enrich metropolitan communities and their surrounding regions.

d) she is drafting a prospectus for a book on universities and change that draws on PSU's experience in articulating values for learning and teaching, in broadening the definition of scholarship, and in building knowledge-based partnerships for change in the region and the nation.

e) she is considering the appointment of an interim vice-president for university relations, to help define the responsibilities of an administrative officer for institutional advancement.

f) she is grateful to faculty for nominating the first cohort of PSU Student Ambassadors, an impressive bunch.

4. **PROVOST'S REPORT**

REARDON reported that

a) PSU is under consideration by the Kellogg Foundation to become part of its Comprehensive Models Project. Grants officers are interested in the general education program, in community-based learning, in revised guidelines for faculty roles and rewards, and in the enhancement of
teaching through the faculty development program. A site visit is scheduled for March 6-8.

b) PSU has submitted documentation in response to an inquiry from the Pew Foundation regarding membership in a similar consortium.

5. **VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

PERNSTEINER discussed the University's investments in education.

a) In fiscal 95/6, these total $5.9 million, including expenditures for technology (about $1.7 million), added faculty, the first faculty salary increases, CAE, and the general education curriculum. In future years, the amount will grow. In fiscal 95/6, investment in general education will be $1.335 million of which $585,000 carried over from last year's base (for University Studies' staff, peer mentors, S&S) and $750,00 was added for faculty pay, teaching assistants, additional peer mentors, etc. PSU asked the Chancellor's Office for interim funding to cover the added $750,000, which represents the extra cost of maintaining two general education programs during the 4-year phase-in of University Studies.

b) PSU received over $3 million in grants for activities associated with University Studies (innovative technology, community partnerships, assessment, etc).

c) Regarding the overall budget, 95/6 brings the last round of Measure 5 cuts, amounting to an $800,000 cut for PSU. Phased in two steps (July, 1995 & January 1997), the full cost of faculty salary increases ($3.6 million) will not impact the budget until fiscal 96/7. Rolling in the costs of educational investments and salary enhancements with Measure 5 reductions will produce a "worst-case" gap between sustainable revenue at current levels and expenditure of about $5.8 million in 1998/9. Four budget balancing strategies are to be implemented: 1) seek interim general ed funding from OSSHE, 2) carry over unspent portions of the current biennial budget, 3) reduce current expenses by $1.4 million annually, and 4) add 7% in enrollment (5-600 FTE) in 97-99. The last (4) will require an accounting change by OSSHE so PSU receives additional funds for its increased enrollment in the current year.

D. **QUESTION PERIOD**

Responding to MOOR's question on whether OSSHE would provide continuing support
for the General Ed phase-in, PERNSTEINER said that PSU had requested 5 years to which OSSH replied that it would decide one year at a time. Responding to BEESON’s question of how Gen Ed when fully phased in would operate at lower cost, PERNSTEINER said that savings will be realized from Harrison Hall by reducing number of sections taught.

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

ENNEKING reported on the Feb 2-3 IFS meeting at WOSC

a) Shirley Clark, vice-chancellor for academic affairs, and Les Swanson, OSSH Board president, described the budget planning process.

b) The program proposal process will change from one to two steps in which the Board and Academic Council will first review a preliminary statement before the final proposal is completed.

c) OSSH is finalizing an early/phased retirement plan that provides more attractive health coverage.

d) OSU's Faculty Senate passed a resolution excluding units not adhering to a policy of non-discrimination which will end ROTC's representation in Fall, 96.

e) Craig Wollner will continue Scott Burns' work in presenting salary comparisons for OSSH institutions from AAUP's annual survey.

f) IFS members will sit on all OSSH task forces including Bea Oshika (Undergraduate Education), Bob Zimmerman (Graduate Education and Research), Marge Enneking (Lifelong Education/Professional Development), and Martha Sargent (Community and Economic Development)

g) Bea Oshika will serve as IFS representative to the Academic Council

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council - Pratt

PRATT presented UCC's recommendations for approval of changes in Art, Geology, and Women's Studies. Regarding the decision to change some Art courses from 4 to 3 credits, CONSTANS discussed scheduling of labs and studios. BEESON/ GOSLIN moved to accept UCC's recommendation for course and program proposals in Art and Geology as circulated with the agenda and Women's Studies (distributed and attached to minutes). The three motions were approved unanimously on a voice vote.

G2. Motions

LIEBMAN read the three motions (circulated). BEESON/NOVY moved motion #1 (Review Requirements for New and Experimental Courses). J BRENNER, SVOBODA, TINNIN, REARDON, ELLIS raised questions about implementation (Whether it would affect existing 410/510 courses? Would review by head be satisfactory or must there be a committee that makes recommendations to approve/not approve to department head?). LENDARIS clarified, saying the motion calls for review of all courses, but does not specify how review would take place. However, intent of peer review would not be consistent with sole approval by head. WINEBERG offered a friendly amendment for a Fall, 96 starting date. REARDON expressed concern that the motion would give UCC oversight of 410/510 courses. HOLLOWAY suggested that the principle was sound, but its application difficult given the number of 410/510 courses (about 200 in Fall 95). MOOR raised questions about review of University Studies courses. GOSLIN moved to table which was unanimously approved by voice vote.

Motions #2 & 3 were discussed by ELLIS, DIMAN, REARDON as to whether 507 seminars would be excluded. It was decided to continue discussion at the following meeting.

G3. Ad hoc Committee on Procedures for Curricular Change

LIEBMAN read a draft motion (as required under Article 4 Section 4) “to form an ad hoc committee on procedures for curricular change” for the purpose of reviewing our current procedures and to learn what’s done at other universities in order to know what changes (if any) should be made in keeping with OSSHE’s endorsement of decentralized decision-making and with representation by one member from each instructional unit and by the chairs of ARC, UCC, and GC. The committee will make a report at the June meeting (or earlier) of what it has learned and recommends. HOLLOWAY/KRUG moved the motion. HOLLOWAY suggested that the committee consider how to coordinate policy-setting and administrative parts of the process. WINEBERG offered a friendly amendment to replace the terms “instructional
units" with "schools and colleges." Discussion produced the recommendation that the committee make a preliminary report at the June meeting if need arose to continue its work into the 96-97 academic year. The motion, modified by these suggestions, passed unanimously on a voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 4, 1996
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:07. The Faculty Senate Minutes of February 5, 1996 were accepted as circulated.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

On behalf of Debbie Murdoch, Government Relations, LENDARIS communicated a request for PSU faculty participants in OSSHE-sponsored box-lunch briefings for top administrative officers on issues of importance to the State. Murdoch noted that faculty have taken part in information teams briefing interim legislative committees. In February, David Swanson and Howard Wineberg spoke to the interim committee on growth management. Administration of Justice faculty will testify in March before the interim judiciary committee.

2. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
2. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

3. PROVOST'S REPORT

5. VICE-PROVOST’S REPORT (OGS)

LENDARIS reported that RAMALEY was in a meeting and could not attend. REARDON did not offer a report. KOCH will report at the April meeting.

4. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT (FADM)

PERNSTEINER reported that implementation of the four strategies for budget reduction have kept the University on target. These are: additional funds from the Chancellor, increased enrollment, savings in the current budget, and year-ahead reductions in the base. Winter Term 96 enrollment is above the target. FADM has identified its one-time and permanent cuts and the Provost is soon to meet with the Deans to suggest academic budget cuts that will be brought before the Budget Committee.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

LENDARIS clarified the review process for University Studies. UCC discussed procedures to review FRINQ and SINQ courses with Professors Toth and Biolsi. The authorizing motion does not call for a decision on the program’s continuance, but obliges ongoing assessment and regular reports to the Senate.

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

OSHIKA added to ENNEKING’s report on the Feb 2-3 IFS meeting (Minutes, 2/5/96, page 27)

a) Les Swanson, OSSHE Board president, noted growing interest and potential support for higher education and suggested that any increased funding would be targeted, for example, to engineering/high tech in the Portland metro area, distance education, and/or satellite programs as in Bend.

b) Articulation was another key theme. Swanson discussed a possible 7-year high school/bachelor's degree track and the need for industry, community colleges, and OSSHE schools to collaborate in support of the CAM.
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c) Programs supporting important gubernatorial initiatives such as at-risk youth, corrections, and vulnerable populations may be targeted for more funding.

d) IFS is attending to the location, composition, and agenda of the focus groups convened for the four OSSHE task forces by the Davis and Hibbetts research firm.

e) At the April Senate meeting, OSHIKA will summarize the working drafts of the four task forces.

E2. Committee on Committees

WATNE made three points

1. Toward the goal of wider participation on committees, CoC will implement new strategies to increase faculty involvement in the 1996 committee preference survey.

2. In cooperation with Retired-Emeriti Professors of PSU, CoC will circulate the committee preference survey to emeritus faculty, many of whom have expressed interest in continuing their service to the University. It is planned that they will be consulting or ex officio (non-voting) members.

3. Toward the goal of a successful renewal of academic-year committees, CoC will improve communication with members of standing committees regarding their recommendations for chairs and for the continuation of members.

E3. Ad hoc committee on Procedures for Curricular Change

LIEBMAN reported that he expected to have a final list of members by the April meeting.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F1. Motions, 2/5/96

LENDARIS reported that the Steering Committee decided to refer the three curricular motions discussed at the February meeting to the Ad hoc committee on Procedures for Curricular Change. LENDARIS offered two clarifications/modifications: 1) The initiation of a new course involves first, a judgement about usefulness and quality through peer review, and second, after successful peer review, further administrative decisions regarding scheduling and cost. Motion #1 refers solely to judgements exercised through peer review -- not administrative decisions. Motion 2 should be reworded to consider only x01 and x07 courses. Motion by HARDT/WATNE to refer
to the Ad hoc committee was approved unanimously by voice vote.

G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution

LENDARIS introduced three amendments regarding the enlarged definition of the faculty voted 11/94. Secretary’s note: Full text of the amendments and sections of the Faculty Constitution to be changed were circulated with the agenda. The first amendment would create the labels: designated and certified. The second amendment would create distinct representation for designated and certified faculty in the All Other category. The third amendment would specify representation on eight standing committees. LENDARIS reviewed procedures for amendments and opened discussion. SVOBODA called attention to the impact of adding additional members on four committees. LIEBMAN interpreted the motions regarding committee representation as making easier the selection of faculty qualified to serve among a roster that includes many whose work is not primarily instructional (eg campus safety, public relations, athletics). RICKS corrected Liebman’s misreading of management service employees who are not unclassified and therefore do not fall within the enlarged definition. LENDARIS suggested that the Provost provide with discussion of how unclassified employees are certified for participation in the Senate. RICKS noted that OIRP provides OAA with a list of unclassified employees holding faculty appointments, including many research assistant or research associate appointments which are not designated. CABELLY noted that, in 1994, one argument for expanding the faculty was the difficulty faced by Committee on Committees to find representatives from AO category (then 15-20) and suggested that an unintended consequence of new amendment would be leave committees unfilled. HARDT raised the concern of whether separate seating would set a precedent for other units such as SBA or UPA to seek separate representation for their designated and certified faculty. Referring to the legislative history, OSHIKA noted that a) there were unranked faculty who contributed to instruction (eg XS), but were unrepresented in Senate, and b) designated faculty do not form a natural class in All Other.

In his job as academic adviser, MERCER has broad exposure to instruction across campus and thought it unwise to disqualify people like him from serving on instructional committees. HOLLOWAY suggested there was wisdom in having athletic staff learn about curriculum and said the implication of the amendments was to create a 2 tiered faculty. S BRENNER asked whether this body was a university senate or a faculty senate and if we take ourselves to be a university senate will find it useful to have wide representation. J BRENNER asked for clarification on why an amendment was preferable to relying on the good judgement of the Committee on Committees to choose appropriate members of instructional committees.
LENDARIS replied that the amendment would offer guidance.

In response to ROBERTSON’s question as to why voting only applies to All Other, LENDORIS suggested that the 5 senators added after enlargement have a different perspective. SVOBODA, J BRENNER, HOLLOWAY sought a rationale for determining eligibility for committees as proposed. RICKS suggested that restricting eligibility is unwise if people who do academic advising or deal with the Grad Council are unrepresented. In response to KOCAGOLU’s question about the meaning of designated and certified, HARDT interpreted designated in terms of hiring prior to the 1994 amendment. WINEBERG asked whether certification was permanent.

OSHIKA suggested that in lieu of amendments, what has been happening de facto could be formalized by adopting a set of guidelines to assure the qualifications of those who serve on faculty committees.

LENDARIS reminded that separate Senate representation of All Other was an additional consideration. Recognizing that AO was a heterogeneous group, J BRENNER had heard no special claims or grievances by a subgroup and therefore could see no rationale for splitting the category. OSHIKA described the process of certification and assignment that occurred during the first year after enlargement. HARDT said a look at Senate history shows AO was always heterogeneous (as it included all who did not report to a Dean) and that enlarging the category will not narrow representation any more than happens in SBA and CLAS where senators come from both big and small departments. Opposed to a split, RICKS argued altering representation in this way would dictate a structure that no other unit has. LENDORIS pointed to the new category for extended studies as a case for separate representation. LENDORIS suggested compromises including removing the amendment regarding representation on instructional committees. HOLLOWAY suggested the steering committee should review the discussion and revise the amendments before the next mailing.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m.
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 1, 1996
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Members Absent: Cumpston, Elteto, Fokine, Goldberg, Goslin, Greenfield, Johnson D, Johnson A, Novy, O'Toole, Robertson, Weikel.


B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:06. The Faculty Senate Minutes of March 4, 1996 were accepted as circulated.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

2. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

a) PSU is one of six finalists for a Pew Leadership Award to recognize institutions that provide models for restructuring higher education. Nominated by WICHE and AASCU, PSU was selected from a pool of 46 schools by a lay board of CEOs and former university trustees. Three schools will receive awards. RAMALEY distributed and discussed background materials and the agenda for Pew's site visit on April 2-3.

b) The Kellogg Foundation invited PSU to submit materials for a grant
program on institutional change.

c) RAMALEY asked the Advisory Council to consider how best to inform
the faculty and encourage participation in these initiatives.

3. PROVOST’S REPORT

REARDON was unable to attend. In answer to a question from the Senate
Steering Committee regarding certification of unranked faculty, DIMAN reported
that OAA uses the requirement for an Instructor (a minimum of a master’s degree)
and has grandfathered unranked faculty previously eligible.

4. VICE-PRESIDENT’S REPORT (FADM)

5. VICE-PROVOST’S REPORT (OGS)

PERNSTEINER deferred his report. KOCH reported that the Task Committee on
Graduate Education is meeting regularly and formed three subcommittees:
Principles and Approaches, Organization and Administration, and Operations.
These committees are paying special attention to: how judge program quality,
interdisciplinary degrees, sufficient faculty staffing, possible PhD programs, the
designation of a graduate faculty, the role of research in the PhD, financial and
administrative support, and the use of new technologies. A working document will
be made available on the Web and open meetings are planned. A summary final
report is planned for the June meeting.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

OSHIKA reported that there have been no meetings since February. As member of an
OSSHE task force, she noted that they will report at the April 19 Board meeting.
RAMALEY summarized a recent conversation with Chancellor that identified three
phases for the task forces: In Phase I, each will make a series of conclusions from its
working documents and the results of focus groups (roughly 15 public plus others by the
Oregon Business Council). In Phase II, each will create list of options for OSSHE. Phase
II will produce a list of 5-6 long-term issues bearing investments and legislation. Phase
III will move toward an implementation strategy such as partnerships, realignments with
community colleges, etc. One prospect is the creation of a single catalogue of offerings in
engineering among all Portland schools. Materials will be available at and after April 19
on the Web.

E2. University Planning Council

CABELLY reported that the committee had 1) Overseen the 4-credit conversion process 2) Reviewed the new P&T Guidelines for their consistency with PSU’s vision statement, and 3) Reviewed the Library Vision plan.

E3. General Student Affairs Committee (postponed to May)

E4. Faculty Development Committee

HIERINKX reported that 54 proposals requesting $356,000 were received. Each was reviewed by 4 committee members and one additional reviewer who had expertise in the field. FDC recommended funding 30 proposals. FDC also reviewed 13 Institutional Career Support proposals. In response to LENDARIS’ question of types of requests, she estimated 25% were instructional, the others research.

E5. Academic Requirements Committee (circulated, discussion deferred to May)

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F1. Constitutional Amendments (3/4/96)

After reviewing the sense of the meeting and considering procedural requirements, the Steering Committee has withdrawn the amendments regarding certified faculty.

G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Writing Intensive Courses

D CARTER, director of Writing Intensive Courses, provided background for three motions: 1) to change its status from pilot to ongoing program, 2) to limit ideally to 20 students per section and end the ceiling on the number of WIC courses offered annually, and 3) to substitute a WIC course for Writing 323. (Note: These motions were circulated with the agenda) Authorized in 1993 as a two-year pilot, WIC is now in its third year and provides up to 20 sections in regular departmental courses taught by trained faculty. A WIC course substitutes for WR 323 if passed with C- or above. A year’s extension was approved in Spring 95 to allow for completion of a program evaluation. The evaluation which paired 170 papers from Wr 323 and WIC at beginning and end found no statistically significant difference. In addition, evaluators interviewed WIC
students and faculty. CARTER suggested that WIC adds something not provided by University Studies program; for transfer students, it boosts writing skills and for faculty, it strengthens skills by stimulating discussion of how best to teach writing and by offering workshops on how to do it. HARDT/BOWLDEN moved the three motions. Discussion followed: DANIELSON asked whether requiring more than one WIC course was considered. For example, Hawaii requires 5 WIC courses beyond its regular writing requirement; OSU requires 2, other schools 2-5. When Wr 323 disappears under the new Ged Ed requirements, will WIC be emphasized? CARTER reflected on difficulty of staffing a large number of WIC courses. HARDT asked whether the 20 student ceiling was kept. CARTER said occasionally exceeded, though WR 323 at 25 is larger. S BRENNER wondered about implications for staffing and cost and asked, in the case of a required course, whether departments will accommodate >20 students.

Speaking in favor, BOWLDEN doubted that UNST courses can substitute for Writing courses because with 40-45 students, they are too big and urged an increase in the number of WIC courses. CARTER seconded this noting that writing in UNST courses is not discipline specific as are WIC. ROSENGRANT suggested beginning discussions to formalize the relationship between UNST and WIC. CABELLY suggested recruitment might depend on giving stipends to faculty. CARTER offers an annual workshop to 4-5 faculty who are starting WIC plus others interested. WINEBERG asked what will replace WR requirement after UNST replaces Gen Ed. J BRENNER urged continuing evaluation and a move to formalize integration with upper-division UNST cluster and capstone courses. At the suggestion of LIEBMAN, these were added as friendly amendments: 4) there will be ongoing evaluation (form unspecified) of WIC, and 5) the Senate encourages consideration of how to integrate WIC with upper-division UNST cluster and capstone courses. WESTBROOK noted that universities which abolished the general Writing requirement usually allow departmental requirements (as in technical writing). PRATT called attention to the Curriculum Committee’s support for the motions (part of G2 in the mailing).

The 3 motions plus the 2 friendly amendments were passed unanimously on a voice vote.

G2. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

a). PhD in Math Education (see description and GC’s recommendation in G2 of the mailing) ADAJIAN discussed the proposed degree. The program is unique in its balance between Mathematics and Math Education requirements (MA in Math required plus 18 additional hours each in Math, Education, and an elective such as ed policy or psychology). It fits with PSU’s urban mission. Though NSF Teacher Enhancement grants, the Math Learning Center, and a nationally-known eight course program for middle-school math teachers, Math faculty have worked with local educators for more
The program will impel research on the effectiveness of teaching innovations (such as visual math) which will benefit PSU and the profession. Demand for math teachers is high. The program will provide coursework for Ed.D. candidates. Answering POTOWSKY's question of why the program will be in Math rather than SOE, ADAJIAN noted the emphasis on Mathematics coursework and the number of committed faculty were important. Speaking in favor, EVERHART explained that the program's target is Math educators for higher education (note: like ADAJIAN) and SOE lacks staff to teach the required mathematics courses. Speaking in favor, BODEGOM raised concern about necessary budgetary reallocations. WETZEL estimated the cost at $100,000 and expected the program to become self-supporting. ADAJIAN noted grants are available. FRANKS/J BRENNER moved and the GC's recommendation was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

b) PRATT discussed the UCC's recommendation to approve a Certificate in Chicano/Latino Studies. (Note: A missing second page with descriptions of courses was distributed) Most courses are being taught. No additional faculty are required. The certificate is a way to organize coursework and mobilize staff time. Speaking in favor, WESTBOOK noted the growing numbers of Chicano/Latino PSU students and the prospect of building links to a growing PDX Chicano/Latino community. HOLLOWAY noted benefits to all students. HARDT asked why the number credits required (40) was higher than other certificates. PRATT and J BRENNER noted that 3rd year Spanish adds 8 hours on top of 32 for required courses. ROSENGRANT noted Certificate in East European Studies required 39 credits. NUNN noted that the best programs require advanced language study. DANIELSON/J BRENNER moved to accept UCC's recommendation which was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

c) PRATT introduced UCC's recommendations for 4-credit conversion for Math 211/212/213. WINEBERG/FRANKS moved to accept which was approved unanimously on a voice vote

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 p.m.
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 6, 1996
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Alternates Present: Moor for Bowlden, Paradis for Cumpston, Beeson for Johnson A, Anderson for Kocaoglu, Youngelson-Neal for Potiowsky, Tapang for Ricks, Hickey for Rosengrant, Mandaville for Weikel.


Ex-officio Members Present: Everhart, Kirrie, Koch, Liebman, Mercer, Oshika, Pernsteiner, Pfingsten, Pratt, Ramaley, Reardon, Vieira, Ward, Young.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:04. The Faculty Senate Minutes of April 4, 1996 were accepted as circulated.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

2. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY discussed the need for Phase II of the Strategic Plan begun in 1990-91. Phase I defined PSU's mission and objectives and identified institution-wide goals and strategies, but did not specify specific actions or target resources to achieve them. That is the objective of Phase II which will first take stock of the programs that serve our mission, then link them to a strategic budget. Taking stock includes evaluation of PSU's progress in four
areas: 1) the nature of faculty scholarship (revised P & T Guidelines), 2) the character of curriculum (University Studies, the undergraduate major and graduate education), 3) campus operations (student services), and 4) cooperation with the community (partnerships and University District). Taking stock also includes attention to a changed environment (K-12 reform, OSSHE’s reorganization, regional concerns like growth management). KOÇAGÖLU will review our progress and update our planning assumptions and progress to give direction to Phase II. PSU has retained the services of NCHEMS (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems) to provide support for developing an institutional strategic budget and to link institutional resources to the achievement of PSU’s Mission. Phase II will address the next generation of challenges facing PSU: how to expand graduate education to other sites (schools and community colleges), how to link general education to the undergraduate major, how to assess our contributions to the community and the benefits of collaborations to the university, and how to provide lifelong learning. The future will require us to ask anew how the community will access education and how it will support us.

3. PROVOST’S REPORT
4. VICE-PRESIDENT’S REPORT (FADM)
5. VICE-PROVOST’S REPORT (OGS)

REARDON and PERNSTEINER deferred their reports. KOCH reported that the Task Committee on Graduate Education determined that it cannot complete its work before year-end. It will summarize its activities in a working paper available on the Web. Faculty are invited to discuss the working paper at hourlong meetings held May 20-23. These discussions will inform a draft report to be written in summer and early fall. In winter-spring 1997, the committee will complete its final report including recommendations. In response to S BRENNER, KOCH reviewed the questions addressed by the three subcommittees (documented in a draft circulated at the meeting).

D. QUESTION PERIOD

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

OSHIKA reported that the IFS meeting April 12-13 in Corvallis focused on OSSHE's strategic planning. Phase I yielded the report, "Creating Tomorrow: Implementing the 2010 Vision." Phase II begins with invited community meetings. IFS expressed
concern that faculty participation has been an afterthought in Phase II and in other steps in the planning process.

E2. Budget Committee

OSHIKA reviewed the report which expressed appreciation for good work by Pernsteiner, Stock, and Harris. To cope with the expected shortfall between expenditures and income under the BAS model, the University must intensify recruitment, retention, and credit hour production. It is not yet clear how units that help to meet these goals will benefit.

E3. Teacher Education Committee

YOUNG reviewed the report which was accepted without questions.

E4. General Student Affairs Committee (postponed from April)

LI did not attend.

E5. Academic Requirements Committee (circulated in April, discussion postponed)

MERCER reviewed the report. ARC met with UCC, IASC, the Gen Ed committee, and FRINQ council to resolve confusion over general education requirements and to set policies. ARC’s chair will sit on Gen Ed committee and next year, Gen Ed’s chair will sit on ARC.

E6. PSU Foundation - L Theisen/Development Office - D Schaeffer (postponed)

E7. Report of the Library Vision Committee

SETTLE introduced the report (circulated with the mailing) which has been reviewed by the President’s Administrative Council, the Council of Academic Deans, UPC, Library Committee, and at campus hearings. MICHAEL BOWMAN, team leader, covered its recommendations and the proposed layout. Two concerns emerged from the hearings: security and separation of journals. Staff will walk the unstaffed floors after 9 pm. Regarding separation, a survey showed 69% for, 19% against, and 12% no opinion. GOSLIN/CONSTANS moved for Senate approval. Responding to GOSLIN’s question about budgetary impact, LENDARIS reported that President asked her administrative council to identify outside funding sources. Answering MANDAVILLE, PFINGSTEN noted that AV will not be affected. Answering
HOLLOWAY, PFINGSTEN noted that a single reference float would make it easier to serve handicapped. The motion passed unanimously on a show of hands.

E8. Intercollegiate Athletics Board

S. BRENNER reviewed the IAB report with special attention to a draft set of "Religion and Intercollegiate Athletics Guidelines" (circulated with the mailing). The draft has been read by five outside reviewers and is under review by the Oregon Attorney General. DANIELSON asked what consequences might come from violation. BECKER suggested that "place of worship" might be substituted for "church." TINNIN called for greater balance in providing examples. GURTOV asked how the Guidelines might guide thinking about the place of religious expression in the classroom. S. BRENNER requested submitting written comments to IAB for its final review.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

LENDARIS noted that the revised Steering Committee motions (circulated) were referred to the Ad Hoc Committee on Procedures for Curricular Change.

G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

ARICK (SPED chair) reviewed the proposal for the addition of a fourth specialization in Special and Counselor Education to the Ed.D. GOSLIN/HARDT moved to accept GC’s recommendation which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

PRATT (ESR chair) reviewed the summary of proposed changes in ESR’s graduate program and noted that ESR added four faculty in the last 3 years. S BRENNER asked whether students in non-science departments might participate in MEM courses. J BRENNER/SVOBODA moved to accept GC’s recommendation which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 3, 1996
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Members Absent: Barton, Constans, Feeney, Friesen, Goldberg, Kenny, Novy, Nunn, Potiowsky, Robertson, Taggart, Watne.

Ex-officio Members Present: Davidson, Kaiser, Kirrie, Koch, Lafferriere, Liebman, Oshika, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Ramaley, Reardon, Toulan, Ward.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:06. The Faculty Senate Minutes of May 6, 1996, were accepted with two corrections: 1) "and progress" to be deleted from p 40 line 6 and 2) in E7. Report of the Library Vision Committee "President asked her administrative council to identify outside funding sources" should be changed to "President will seek outside funding for the library."

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

2. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY reported that investments in instruction such as Harrison Hall, FRINQ and SINQ classrooms, and new technologies for teaching are beginning to pay off in enrollments and in funding enhancements from the Chancellor. The first wave of Fall applications is strong (up roughly 45% for graduate study), and there is greater interest among traditional-age students and more sophomore transfers showing the effect of the General Education program. Regarding OSSHE’s Strategic Plan,
RAMALEY also reported that Phase I culminated in April with a list of roughly 70 items that has been pared to about 20 which have been offered as strategic objectives to caucuses around the state. She expects a smaller list of objectives in the final phase. The Council of Academic Deans, Advisory Council, Senate Steering Committee, and students will review drafts of PSU’s response to the report from OSSHE’s task forces as part of the objective-setting process. On June 13, the Council of Presidents will meet with the Chancellor in anticipation of the Board meeting scheduled for June 20-21 in Ashland. There are many rumors, but it is believed that restructuring is off the table. The Secretary to the Faculty will ask senators when they will be available during the summer in the event that we need to call a meeting to make our case. As the academic year ends, PSU should take pride in the award of $3 million in grants to support instructional programs and in our standing as a finalist for awards from the Pew Charitable Trust and the Kellogg Foundation.

3. **PROVOST’S REPORT**

REARDON has received the report on the reorganization of the School of Urban and Public Affairs and comments from the Dean of CLAS, the Department of Political Science, and the International Studies Program. He will review them and make a recommendation to the President for her review. The reorganization will require Senate approval and the concurrence of OSSHE’s Academic Council. When complete, the recommendations will come before the Senate Steering Committee which may need to schedule a summer meeting.

4. **VICE-PRESIDENT’S REPORT (FADM)**

5. **VICE-PROVOST’S REPORT (OGS)**

PERNSTEINER did not report. KOCH offered the annual report for the Task Committee on Graduate Education. The Committee was formed after the September 1995 colloquium on graduate education to address growth in the completion of graduate degrees. [In 1995-96, nearly 1000 will be awarded -- as many or more than other OSSHE institutions. The MA/MS is becoming more of an entry-level credential, and a growing number plan to earn the doctorate to enter education, government, or industry.] Its three sub-committees focused on: 1. understanding the role played by graduate education in order to evaluate existing and proposed programs at PSU (called Principles and Approaches); 2. the responsibilities of faculty and administrators in graduate education (Organization and Administration); & 3. the administration of programs (Operations).

The first two subcommittees produced a working document available on the Web. At meetings to discuss the document, faculty raised questions regarding: 1. the creation of a graduate school and designation of graduate faculty, especially
procedures for departmental decisions; 2. the idea of community and contributions of graduate education to the community; 3. balancing interdisciplinary efforts with general principles of graduate education; and 4. program quality. A final draft will be completed in the Fall, including recommendations to the President, Provost, and Senate. KOCH expressed appreciation for the committee’s hard work.

***ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER FOR 1996-97

LENDARIS explained that only continuing and new members can vote. LIEBMAN read the names of newly elected senators and distributed ballots. LENDARIS read the slate of nominations offered by the Steering Committee and invited additional nominations. GOSLIN/TINNIN moved to close nominations and to elect by unanimous ballot. On a voice vote, Hardt was elected Presiding Officer.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO TEM

LENDARIS presented the Steering Committee’s nomination for Leslie McBride. Kokaoglu/Beeson moved to close nominations and elect by unanimous ballot. On a voice vote, McBride was elected Presiding Officer Pro Tem.

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

OSHIKA followed up her earlier report regarding the lack of faculty representation at caucuses for OSSHE reorganization. Joan Shireman attended one of the four, but faculty involvement was minimal. No IFS meeting took place since the last Senate meeting. The next will be June 7-8 in Ashland.

2. Committee on Committees

TINNIN for WATNE summarized the report. CoC met Fall to do calendar-year appointments and voted to 1) invite retired and emeritus faculty to become nonvoting members, 2) limit terms for chairs of standing committees to one year and ask outgoing chairs for recommendations for successors, and 3) modify procedures for the faculty preference survey to increase participation. In Winter, CoC met to fill vacancies and, in Spring, do new appointments. In answer to WESTBOOK, LIEBMAN said that retired and emeritus faculty will be sent a committee preference form during the summer. CABELLY asked if the one-year chair policy was voted by the Senate. LENDARIS recollected that it was.
3. Advisory Council

CABELLY reviewed its role as advisor to the President, announced that Johanna Brenner would chair in 96-97, and thanked members who served 95-96.

4. University Planning Council

CABELLY called attention to its report and added that UPC would review the document from the OSSHE task forces.

5. Ad hoc Committee on Procedures for Curricular Change

PRATT reviewed the committee's charge and composition and reported that it met twice and agreed to focus on 1) streamlining the curricular change process (toward fewer steps and less time), & 2) enabling departments to share proposed changes to ensure cooperation and strengthen the overall curriculum. The committee will survey procedures for curriculum change at other universities in order to make a report to the Senate this Fall.

***ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE

LENDARIS presented the Steering Committee's slate of nominees. There were no nominators from the floor. CONSTANS/MANDAVILLE moved to close nominations and elect by unanimous ballot. On a voice vote, Eric Bodegom, Lewis Goslin, Robert Mercer, and Mary Ricks were elected. LENDARIS noted that the Chair of the Committee on Committees would be added when elected.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Redesigned Teacher Licensure Pilot Program

KRUG for YOUNG called attention to the report (G1). Anticipating new licensing requirements, the School of Education plans to launch a pilot program. In 1999, licensure -- which now exists solely for elementary and secondary -- will be offered for 4 levels: early childhood (age 3 - grade 4), elementary (grades 3 - 8), middle school (grades 5 - 10), and secondary (grades 7 - 12). HARDT, Associate Dean, noted the pilot would not bring change to required coursework, curriculum, faculty, or library. CABELLY/GOSLIN moved to accept the report. Answering J BRENNER's question as to what motivated the change for early childhood, KRUG said federal laws for special education. HARDT answered ENNEKING's request for clarification of middle school teacher training, noting that the pilot program will explore whether they are better served. KRUG noted that any program changes
that might result from new licensing requirements would come back to the Senate for its consideration.

Answering WINEBERG’s question about the intent of the motion, LENDARIS responded that the question involved review of the report and assent to start a pilot which would generate program changes for future Senate approval. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

2. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

PRATT offered WCC’s recommendation for 4 curriculum changes:

a. Rename the minor in Urban Studies as the minor in Community Development (same 27 credit total)

b. For SPFA, change Music 120 to 320 and approve 4-credit conversion for the BA/BS in Architecture (see Attachment 1)

c. Create a new course, Linguistics 481 (World Englishes)
d. Approve 4-credit conversion for Speech and Speech and Hearing (see Attachments 2, 3). SP 427 is not recommended for approval. Two new courses SP 470 and SP 452 are recommended.

BLUESTONE asked to defer consideration of the change for Music 120 until he could consult with colleagues. TINNIN/SVOBODA made a motion to approve all changes except Music 120 which passed unanimously on a voice vote. Finally, PRATT offered a followup to the matter of review of University Studies courses: to streamline the process of course evaluation, UCC recommends adding one of its members as ex-officio representative to the University Studies Committee.

3. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

LENDARIS made note of the letters from AAUP, the Advisory Council, and UPC included with the G3 documents (circulated). R JOHNSON and ELLEN SKINNER, P & T committee co-chairs, summarized its work. Members were appointed by the Provost on the basis of recommendations by Deans and Chairs and 2 AAUP reps were added. The committee had three goals: 1. to broaden the definition of scholarship (research, teaching and mentoring, community outreach); 2. to set standards of quality respectful of the mosaic of talents and mindful that faculty are not equally accomplished in all these areas; 3. to enable faculty through an evolving scholarly agenda to take on different roles in the course of a career or in the development of a department or program.

Procedures included a Fall 94 retreat, review of P&T Guidelines at other universities, 20-25 small group discussions, and discussions with AAUP regarding procedure, especially for the scholarly agenda. The scholarly agenda is new. In place of existing practices that emphasize evaluation over career planning, the intent of the scholarly agenda is formative and developmental. To implement the scholarly agenda, departments must develop processes for originating, evaluating, and resolving conflicts and must periodically discuss their overall "agendae."

"Discussion focused on whether the scholarly agenda would be obligatory or optional for P&T review. CABELLY, chair of the Advisory Council, called attention to its letter and raised the concern that if the scholarly agenda was not mandatory, there would be a lack of protection for both faculty members and the administration. FORBES said that the agenda could, by offering an additional layer of review, provide protection for a faculty member. S BRENNER, speaking on behalf of the AAUP executive council, acknowledged that scholarly agenda could work for or against the faculty member, but changes might occur which would render it inappropriate at some later time. Disputes might arise over what was originally written and what actually occurred. SVOBODA asked whether agenda could be modified each year. S BRENNER raised the possibility that at times in some departments conflict might lead to unwillingness to redo a scholarly agenda. Unless obligatory, J BRENNER prophesied a deadlock as with the customary
model of individual entrepreneurship where a faculty member refuses to cooperate in the mosaic of talents. The remedy would be to require an ongoing process of review in which scholarly agendas were modified with agreement all around. However, the question of who would decide if head and faculty disagree over scholarly agenda is a sticking point. There must be procedural rules which, when they are violated, make it possible for a faculty member to grieve. O’TOOLE emphasized the need for departmental processes. LENDARIS concurred that departments must have procedures. R JOHNSON replied that the guidelines don’t specify procedures but aim to create a collaborative culture that’s developmental/formative for evaluation at the department level. Also, BEESON raised concern that the scholarly agenda would leave faculty vulnerable in the event of changing expectations on the part of the department or the administration. HOWE responded that the current system gives no measure of where one stands nor a recourse when a dean makes a request. Having something in writing allows for negotiation and provides protection when one goes up for review.

Other questions addressed the proposed timetable. WINEBERG sought clarity about the date at which the guidelines take effect and how they affect faculty now in place versus those hired after their implementation. SKINNER answered that University guidelines would be approved one year before departments’ and no one will be considered until department guidelines are approved. Departments would have a year to go through all steps for approval of their guidelines. Fall 97 would be the first time faculty could come up under the changed guidelines. Old guidelines would remain in effect for 5 years. R JOHNSON noted that missing from the timetable is Fall, 2001 which is the last time that existing faculty could come up under current guidelines.

Further questions concerned evaluation. GURTOV suggested, though the guidelines would be included, the scholarly agenda might confuse an outside evaluator. SKINNER replied that other institutions with scholarly agenda use outside evaluators, and evaluators ought to understand that not everyone should do same thing. R JOHNSON said the explicit statement of criteria for quality and significance would be adequate for outside reviewers.

CABELLY/HARRISON moved "to accept in principle and to direct members of administration and AAUP leaders to negotiate provisions requiring use of scholarly agenda as part of the evaluation process for P&T for all those covered." ELLIS doubted the motion fit Oregon collective bargaining law and suggested cutting the directive to members of the administration and AAUP leaders. Seeking to interpret the motion, J BRENNER said, unless required, departments will not act in earnest and that AAUP’s concerns could be addressed. S BRENNER suggested a "sense of senate" motion affirming the importance of negotiating scholarly agendas. HOLLOWAY called Cabelly’s motion complicated. MOOR suggested a substitute motion to accept as submitted. TINNIN suggested delaying the vote until
September 97 when all guidelines -- including department guidelines -- are decided. LENDARIS called the question. CABELLY reread the motion and the subsequent roll-call produced 30 votes -- short of the 34 required for a quorum. LENDARIS announced the need for a future meeting.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.