MEMORANDUM

TO Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

FROM Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on June 7, 1982, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 3 and 17, 1982, Meetings

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE SENATE, 1982-83

D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators -- None
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   *1. Advisory Council, Annual Report -- Beeson
      ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO TEM
   *2. Committee on Committees, Annual Report -- Rad
      ELECTION OF FOUR MEMBERS OF SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE
   *3. Educational Policies Committee, Annual Report -- Moseley
   *4. Research and Publications Committee, Annual Report--Anderson

F. Unfinished Business--none
   DIVISIONAL CAUCUS TO ELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBERS as
   follows:
   for 2-year term:  AO, BA, DCE, ED, SW, UA
   for 1-year term:  AL

G. New Business
   *1. Eligibility Requirements for Admission to Computer Science
       Program--Enneking
   *2. Time Limitation and Academic Standards Motions from Graduate
       Council--Bolton

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
   B Minutes of the May 3 and 17, 1982, Senate Meetings
   E1 Advisory Council, Annual Report**
   E2 Committee on Committees, Annual Report**
   E3 Educational Policies Committee, Annual Report**
   E4 Research and Publications Committee, Annual Report**
   G1 Eligibility Requirements for Admission to Computer Science Program**
   G2 Time Limitation and Academic Standards Motions**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members Only
Minutes:

Faculty Senate Meeting, May 3, 1982

Presiding Officer: Mary Cumpston
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Fahs for Beattie, Gihring for Chapman, Casteel for McMahon, Parshall for L. Nussbaum (part of the meeting).

Members Absent: Bjork, Buell, Holloway, Jenkins, Simpson.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Corn, Dobson, Forbes, Gruber, Hardt, Harris, Hoffmann, Howard, Leu, Morris, Nicholas, Parker, Pfingsten, Ross, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Vant Slot, Williams.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the April 5, 1982, Senate meeting were approved as circulated.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

Dobson reported on the activities of the Task Force on Emergency Services whose goal it has been to identify the needs and problems of the faculty laid off because of budget cuts. Resources within and without the University have been determined, individualized assessments of needs have been conducted, plans for assisting faculty members have been formulated, and funds for supporting these plans have been sought. The Task Force has worked hard to improve morale and has obtained several extended privileges for those affected:

-- Active faculty identification card
-- Faculty rates for University facilities and services
-- Staff tuition rates
-- Use of office space if available, with extension of telephone, secretarial and other support services
-- Opportunity for faculty to pay own health benefits for six months after termination

In addition, all Task Force members have extended their personal services. Dick Halley has coordinated the efforts and has met on several occasions with each individual.
The Office of Affirmative Action has set up a job identification and referral network with local and regional higher education institutions.

To date the following results have been achieved:
1 individual has accepted a new internal position which will extend temporary employment through June 30, 1983
2 individuals have had lay-off notices rescinded, possible through rotation of academic leaves among departmental faculty
2 individuals have a high potential of obtaining positions external to the University
2 new full-time fixed term appointment opportunities have been created; one of these new positions will be advertised in next Monday's Bulletin
1 individual declined University services and is seeking employment opportunities in another state
1 fixed-term individual has been extended an appointment due to a recent faculty resignation
2 fixed term and 1 or 2 tenure-track individuals have the potential of employment through self-support courses.

External funding is being sought to continue parts of or all of some programs eliminated by the recent budget reductions. Dobson spoke highly of the degree of cooperation she has received and strongly encouraged affected individuals to seek assistance from the Task Force whose members are Coordinator Dick Halley, Carl Abbott, Ron Anderson, Mary Cumpston, Jack Finley, Don Leu, Major Morris, William Paudler, Fred Waller, with Margaret Dobson, chairing.

2. Questions from the Floor to the Chair
Kimbrell asked whether the University could get involved in distributing "propaganda" on whom to elect for the Senate and House during the up-coming May primary.

Blumel saw nothing wrong with having the material available at the University; however, it would not be appropriate for faculty to pass these out in their classes.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Fiasca presented the Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee, and it was accepted.

2. Grimes presented the Annual Report of the University Athletics Board, and the Senate accepted it.
3. Brenner introduced the Budget Committee's Annual Report and elaborated on the two items that dealt with short-term solutions to the financial crisis. He reported that the committee in general was opposed to such stop-gap solutions and urged that a long-term plan dealing with Oregon's higher education budgeting problems be developed. Brenner said that the recommendations the committee made to the President for program elimination were rejected. Blumel clarified that the recommendations were considered by him, not rejected. R. Nussbaum inquired of Brenner which programs the committee had identified for reductions and wondered if it was appropriate for a committee which reported to the Senate to have a secret list. Brenner felt that it was and refused to name the programs. Bates argued that the Budget Committee was established as a constitutional committee and should therefore make an open report to the Senate, even on this delicate issue. Moor also wanted to know which four programs had been put on the list for possible elimination. Brenner, recalling how the Senate had castigated him last year when he had identified programs, said he would not give the information. Goekjian moved "that the Senate reject the report for incomplete information, return it to the Committee and ask for specific information regarding the judgments made." The motion failed, and the report was accepted as distributed.

4. Limbaugh presented the Annual Report of the University Scholars' Board and commented that the Board was pleased with the fourteen different proposals it had received for next year's Visiting Scholars' Colloquia. The report was accepted.

5. Peotter offered the Annual Report of the Committee on Effective Teaching. She pointed out that the Committee has tried to fill the function of a faculty development program but said that a much larger budget was needed if they are to continue this service to the faculty community. The report was accepted, and Peotter announced Friday's workshop featuring Jack Ramsay.

NEW BUSINESS

Moseley spoke about the Educational Policies Committee's proposal for the reorganization of the University. The document had been circulated separately to Senators and ex-officio members. The discussion of reorganization at PSU is not a new issue nor is the EPC proposal a hasty one. He pointed out that faculty had been invited to participate in this long-term study. While the issue discussed is an academic one and is not financially motivated, Moseley pointed out that if reorganization was to take place, this would be the best time to do, hence the September 1982 date in the proposal. Emphasizing that EPC's motive was to create a strong, unified Arts and Sciences core for this University, with the Professional Schools surrounding it, he read the five-part motion at the end of the Committee's proposal. Waller raised a point of order and moved instead "that the Senate meet on May 17, 1982, at 3:00 p.m., to consider the EPC motion." The motion was passed.

Swanson asked what the action of Senate would do. Cumpston explained that it would only be advisory to the President. Hales suggested that the
components of the motion should be voted on one by one, in reverse order; he saw
the creation of the School of Engineering as a totally separate issue. Beeson
felt that implementation of the plan would be difficult to accomplish by fall-
term and wondered if other options had been taken into consideration or if only
those things achievable this year had been proposed. Waller answered in the
affirmative.

Moor inquired about the budgetary implications. The new School of Performing
Arts will cost money, and was that considered? Moseley responded that the
long-term benefits of such a School had been the important consideration. He
admitted that there would be some new costs, but money was a secondary
consideration for the EPC. The net savings in the proposed plan still
essentially amount to one deanship. He reiterated that the EPC was not
advocating change for the sake of change, neither is there virtue in keeping the
status quo for the sake of the status quo. However, the benefits accruing from
the creation of the School in increased visibility for the performing arts on
campus are compelling. Waller added that there is the potential of grant and
gift monies for a new School for projects like remodeling and acquiring musical
instruments.

Feldesman and Enneking felt that some of the advantages given for reorganization
did not really require reorganization to be achieved. As an example Enneking
pointed out that the role of departments and department heads could be given a
wider span of control now. Moseley said that more delegation of responsibility
to department heads would have that effect. Erdman wondered why each School had
its own dean while the proposed large College would also have only one dean.
Moseley responded that each professional School had its own directions,
curriculum and goals and had to deal with its several different accrediting
agencies, hence their problems of administration are unique. Karant-Nunn gave
a detailed account of the dollar amounts it would cost to administer one faculty
FTE in the College and each of the professional Schools, saying that someone
should look at the implications of this.

Bates and Erdman raised several questions not addressed in the proposal:
representation on faculty committees and the Senate, distribution requirements,
and actual financial savings of the plan. Bates urged that the Senate should
discuss the principles and academic merits and not be influenced by
personalities, but he was also puzzled by the absence of a discussion of the
role of deans and assistant deans. Since deans and their assistants are tenured
faculty members, removing individuals from their positions would not realize
much savings. Moseley agreed that these topics had not been addressed by the
EPC at this time and repeated that the proposal is not complete in that sense;
much more faculty discussion must be forthcoming.

Richen, Art, commented that this proposal was conceived by deans, hence it did
not eliminate any dean positions. The proposal then was given to a faculty
committee which does not have fair representation. Moseley countered that the
proposal had not come from the body of the deans; Vice
President Gruber merely pulled together several proposals that had been made over many years and passed that summary on to the EPC, a committee made up of divisional representation from across the University. The EPC proposal is significantly different from early proposals.

Chino was bothered by the tentativeness of the EPC language in the description of the College of LAS: "It hopes that administrative appointments...will reflect...and it assumes that all administrative officers will...." He felt these crucial matters needed to be addressed and had not been by the EPC.

Moseley replied that his Committee did not want to determine the new College's and School's administrative positions, allowing them to determine their own destiny, hence the chosen wording. Blumel agreed that it was too early to talk about those matters. Youngelson thought it was important that faculty be consulted before they leave for the summer.

Goekjian raised the question of what demand there is for the new School of Performing Arts. Do we know that graduates of that program will be in demand? He saw a contradiction in creating this administrative superstructure after just having eliminated the journalism department. Moseley pointed out that Dance was already very active in conjunction with other community groups. While it is true that the community is not necessarily looking for actors and musicians, a School of Performing Arts is different from departments granting B.A. degrees. Since the three departments have many things in common, there is strength in that unity. Journalism, being a small department and alone, did not have that strength. Scheans wanted to know if this would be an applied School. Moseley responded that it was not a professional School. Tate, Theatre Arts, commented that his department now serves three types of students: the liberal arts students, the theatre arts education majors, and the students looking toward careers in theatre. The new School would not change that.

Bennett asked about the need for common facilities for the three departments. Tate replied that Music and Theatre Arts are in the same space now but that Dance could not be accommodated there. He did not see physical closeness as a necessity. L. Nussbaum wondered if the performing arts could not be a part of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Moseley responded that much higher visibility would result from a separate School. Such a School would have similar interests to those of the greater Portland area, the center of the performing arts in Oregon.

Kimbrell observed that the Senate's arguments were going in circles and needed to be focused on one thing at a time. He therefore moved "that the Senate receive the EPC report with thanks and adjourn until May 17." The motion was passed by acclamation.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 4:28 p.m.
Moseley gave some background information about the development of the EPC proposal for University reorganization, and he said that the EPC recommended strongly that the proposal be passed, since the pros outweighed the cons.

Moseley reported having talked to deans of eight of PSU's twelve peer institutions (such as University of California at Hayward, Cal State at Los Angeles, San Francisco State University, University of Colorado at Boulder, University of Denver, University of Louisville, University of Nebraska, and Wichita University); eight have similar structures as the one being proposed for PSU, and the deans report that the unified college of arts and sciences has strengthened the liberal arts core of their curriculum because cooperative efforts have been facilitated. Deans of Arts and Sciences have had equal or more clout on those campuses, and in times of budget cuts they have had smaller cuts than the professional schools.

The deans also reported that their accessibility to the faculty had not been a problem, a bit of information that delighted the PSU Senate. None of the peer institutions had associate or assistant deans according to disciplines. They also reported that delegating additional responsibilities to department heads had strengthened the departments. The University of Texas at Austin told of having saved $750,000 when they reunified the arts and sciences after separation.
Waller formally placed the EPC motion on the floor. Cumpston explained that parts two and three would be reversed and that Senators would proceed through each sub-part at a time; deletions, additions, and other alterations would be in order so long as they did not substantively change the intentions of the proposal for reorganization.

Waller spoke for the motion. He recounted that the EPC had received many comments from faculty and had carefully considered all suggestions before accepting or dropping any of them. Admitting that on consequential issues money and academic merit cannot be separated, he nonetheless emphasized that neither costs nor personnel changes had been primary issues. One element of the proposal will produce significant savings, and that is important, given the current financial situation; however, the sideways changes will not mean additional costs. Waller agreed with Moseley that the common purposes of the three colleges would be enhanced by the formation of a single college and that the strength and autonomy of departments would increase.

Bates saw no basis to assume that there would be any savings, except for the salary of Dean Hoffmann who is retiring. If the dean of arts and sciences needed at least part-time assistant deans and secretarial help for them, chances are that there would be no savings at all. He thought it important to know what the plans were for the administrative structure of the new College.

Hoffmann gave an account of how the academic organization at Portland State came about. In the 1950s President Cramer called four faculty members (among them Hoffmann) together and announced that they would head the divisions of Arts and Letters, Science, Social Science, and Education. No faculty discussion was ever held on this academic organization which endured for years. In the 1960s departments were created, schools were added, and the first proposals of a College of Arts, Letters and Sciences were made. Faculty generally opposed all early proposals of merger. In July 1978 Vice President Richelle sent a memo to President Blumel suggesting a consolidation of the three Colleges into one. The President appointed a committee, chaired by James Hart, to study the suggestion. The committee agreed with the proposal, yet no action resulted. During 1980-81 an ad hoc committee of deans, chaired by Hoffmann, again studied the issue and also recommended consolidation.

The last of a series of proposals for merger is now being made by the EPC, and Hoffmann supported the recommendation. He felt that in this day of reduced emphasis on the liberal arts a combined College would strengthen that core in the University curriculum. Putting all of the liberal arts under one dean would also eliminate the scuffling between the deans that sometimes occurs under the present arrangement. He also minimized the problem of accessibility to the dean, saying that accessibility is in the eye of the beholder. Further, the span of control of departments would be expanded, because it is largely controlled by the departments and their leadership.
Shimada and Bates wanted Ken Harris to comment specifically on the financial savings of the proposal. Harris replied that it would roughly amount to $50,000 plus OPE and the savings in administrative costs of the eliminated dean's office. Gruber added that it was clear that there would be savings, but it depended on which plan would be adopted, and he urged the Senate to discuss the central issue, namely placing the liberal arts at the center of the University.

Leu said he supported the plan. Education has a vested interest, since 80% of education students' work is done in Arts and Letters, Science and Social Science. He did not see power and divisiveness as issues. R. Nussbaum said that arguments he had heard for protecting the liberal arts and sciences would only be convincing if the President would commit himself publicly that reorganization has a deeper meaning, i.e., that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences become the center of this institution. Karant-Nunn echoed that. She was afraid that something else was lurking behind this proposal; it is not just strictly an academic issue, because financial aspects have been introduced. She said that reassurances must be forthcoming and that liberal arts is not convinced that the President is a champion of liberal arts.

Blumel said he was reluctant to speak in situations like this, because he did not want to be seen as impacting the decision. However, he wanted to assure the Senate that there were no hidden agendas, nor did he see anything inconsistent in the EPC proposal in regards to PSU's mission and future. PSU is not a land grant university but a liberal arts University. He emphatically stated that had he not been a protector of the liberal arts, and had economic factors only been considered in recent budget matters, cuts in the liberal arts would have been much greater.

F. Williams, speaking on behalf of the undergraduate students, also supported the proposal for reorganization, because he saw it as strengthening the liberal arts program. Moseley reassured the Senate that the proposal carried no hidden agendas.

Waller addressed the question of the weight of the voice of one dean speaking for all of the liberal arts in CADS. First of all he thought that a dean could surely carry appropriate weight. Further, Waller pointed out that CADS is only advisory to the President and does not make rules of its own. The imbalance of costs among larger and small departments and schools cannot be solved nor should it be viewed as a problem. As an example he pointed out that the English Department had a larger faculty than several of the Schools at PSU. As regards the administrative structure of the new college, EPC left that to the new dean and the affected departments. He stated that no new dean would be appointed without consultation of departments.

Sheridan, Music, now turned the discussion toward the third part of the motion, the creation of the School of Performing Arts. She read a statement formulated jointly by the music and dance faculty in support of the School. The status of a School would bring visibility to the program, community support, and would attract students; benefits would be realized much sooner than if the departments were separate. Combining these departments into a School would not mean that they would be separated from the liberal arts; the new organization would still meet the stated goals of the University.
Schendel spoke of the need for cohesiveness of the arts in Portland and the leadership Portland State could provide. Even though it meant HPE would lose FTE, he supported the move of Dance, because Dance saw their future with the Performing Arts, and he felt it was in the best interest of Portland State and the community.

Tate said the Theatre Arts faculty generally supported the statement of the Music and Dance faculty and also the establishment of the Performing Arts School, if financial support could be assured. He also agreed that the ties with the liberal arts must remain strong.

Goekjian’s concern was with the economy. He noted that more deficits in the state had just been announced, and there was no doubt that the School, the new Dance Department and all the administrative structures will cost money. It was the wrong time to create a new School and let the problems work themselves out later. He moved “that the possibility of a School of Performing Arts be studied by a committee appointed by the Senate and that the committee report the real costs and benefits of the formation of such a school to the Senate for its consideration.”

A. Wilson spoke in favor of the motion. He said the overriding problem was space; however, the need for new faculty was another problem if PSU was going to train professionals in theatre. He said that the three departments had not gotten together to talk, and he agreed with earlier statements that Dance should be a part of the liberal arts rather than HPE. Buell stated that he was generally in favor of the School, but he was still trying to reconcile spending money on this and just having eliminated Journalism.

Shold, speaking as an EPC member, opposed the motion. He said that the creation of the School points in a direction that is important for PSU and especially for the students. Approving the establishment of the School now would mean that remodeling and/or building could be begun now rather than waiting a year. Moseley wondered what this special committee would do differently from what the EPC has already done. Leu also opposed the motion, urging the Senate to decide on the motion presented by the EPC. However, Moor spoke in favor of the motion. It would be better to use the money to rescue programs and faculty we have cut.

The Goekjian amendment to delete the Performing Arts School from the EPC proposal failed. There was no further discussion on constituting the present program in dance as a department.

Kimbrell moved “that the words and the pre-architecture courses be deleted from the section reading ‘that the Center for Population Research and Census, the Public Administration Program, and the pre-Architecture courses be transferred to the School for Urban Affairs’.”
Scott Newman, architecture, explained that the part-time faculty had met regularly during fall and winter and had carefully examined all aspects of the program and discussed its potential. In the process they consulted with many audiences, including students, the professionals in the community, and with the University of Oregon. Their findings were that PSU had a definite role to play in Oregon, and it is their recommendation that the two-year program be expanded to four years. At the basis of their proposal, however, is the requirement that the program must be based in the liberal arts and that is best served by leaving it in the Art Department. Architects need a thorough education in the liberal arts rather than training in urban planning.

Abbott regretted not having seen that study. He spoke of architecture being a part of urban design, in physical and social contexts. He also cited the cooperation with University of Oregon. Since their students have come to PSU for a term to study urban design, it shows that they respect the work done in Urban Affairs. Abbott added that he was an historian and was still interested in the liberal arts, even though he is teaching in a professional School. Toulan recounted the long history of this discussion and noted that the Art Department had not been much concerned with this issue until now.

Kimbrell noted that a letter circulated by Urban Affairs suggested that there was no support for architecture on Art. He pointed out that Urban Affairs did not offer any of the following courses: Art History, Engineering, Physics, Aesthetics. Gil Davis had worked on an urban design proposal; the Art Department turned it down because they believe that architecture is an art-centered program, not design. Kimbrell said it was clear to him that UA wanted the pre-architecture program in order to boost their FTE. Dueker felt, however, that Kimbrell’s figures needed to be reinterpreted; the program has not prospered in Art.

D. Richen countered that the Art Department had built unanimity of support and developed excellent rapport with the over 100 students in the program. He said they felt that UA had animosity toward the 6-7 teachers in the program. Zegretti replied that there was no animosity, but he did want the Senators to know that UA had seven faculty trained in architecture who could offer a wide variety of courses. A. Piper warned, however, that the program would lose large numbers of students if it were transferred to UA.

R. Nussbaum reported that lobbying prior to the Senate meeting had been heavy on this issue; he was speaking against the amendment, because he felt that the Art Department had no strong commitment toward architecture. He felt that in times past students had wanted more support. PSU has wanted to find an identity of its own; an urban university must provide a special focus, the urban environment, and students in architecture should see that discipline in an urban environment. Youngelson agreed that the needs of students and the community must be considered and students should be taught urban design, but PSU’s is a pre-architecture program and as such must be basic design and art design.
Swanson moved the previous question. The vote on the Kimbrell amendment passed 29 to 23.

Pinamonti moved to amend the name of the School of Urban Affairs to include "School of Urban and Public Affairs." He suggested that the move of the Public Administration program to UA made the name change necessary. Brenner warned that the designation of "public affairs" could be confusing, because many businesses had public affairs departments which suggested something quite different. He mentioned that "Public Administration" could be used in the title. A roll call vote showed that the Pinamonti amendment was passed 20 to 17.

Cumpston invited discussion of the final part of the EPC motion to designate the Division of Engineering and Applied Science as a School. There was none. It was pointed out that the School should be known as the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.

R. Nussbaum proposed and moved the following addition to the EPC motion: "and that the Advisory Council be requested to nominate and the President to appoint before the end of spring term 1982 a special committee to review and to prepare proposals for revision of the Faculty Constitution, especially concerning unit representation proportional to faculty FTE on policy-shaping committees." The amendment was passed.

White moved that the EPC motion be amended to change all unders to with. The motion passed.

The roll call vote on the EPC motion, as amended, was 45 Yes and 10 No.

ADJOURNMENT
The special Senate meeting was adjourned at 5:32 p.m.
REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE FACULTY SENATE
JUNE 7, 1982

This year's members are: Marvin Beeson, Earth Sciences (Chairman); M. Ann Bennett, Anthropology; Gordon Dodds, History; Don Moor, Philosophy; Rudi Nussbaum, Physics; and Dan Scheans, Anthropology (Secretary).

A great deal of time was spent this year on matters resulting from the current budget crisis as well as on "everyday" problems having to do with faculty welfare. Some of the items that consumed more than average amounts of time included the following:

A. Proposed Constitutional Amendments
   1. Eligibility for election to the Advisory Council [Article VI, Section 3 - vacancies]. Passed by the Senate 1-11-82.
   2. Eligibility for Reelection of Department Heads [Article III, Section 4 - Faculty authority]. Passed by the Senate 2-1-82.

B. Motions to the Senate
   1. Urging the President to accept plans from departments for cuts by orderly reduction.
   2. Urging the Administration to reconsider early retirement plans and involved incentives.
   3. To recommend temporary closure of PSU if further cuts are called for.

C. Recommendations to the President:
   1. That a policy be formulated on departmental tenure and salary for administrators,
   2. To establish a DCE/PSU review committee,
   3. To establish a committee to review problems with the bookstore,
   4. To support a program of compulsory leaves as preferable to faculty layoffs,
   5. Nominations for members of the Dean of Business Administration Search Committee,
   6. Nominations for two members for the Graduation Programs Board,
   7. Nominations for the membership pool of the Disciplinary Hearing Panel.

D. Discussions with the President:
   1. Representation balance on University committees,
   2. Numerous questions pertaining to faculty morale,
   3. Problems relating to the welfare of laid off faculty,
   4. The imperative need for long range planning at our level focusing on program development and faculty well-being and welfare,
   5. Need to reevaluate our Ph.D. programs in terms of focus and quality,
   6. Kinds and dimensions of budget cuts which, if exceeded, would force us to give up the pretense of being a "university”.

The advisory council was also active this year in a series of meetings with "influentials" and colleagues. These included the following:

1. Members of the OSBHE,
2. T.K. Olson, Chairman ECC,
3. Chancellor candidates,
4. Legislators [Jim Gardner, Hardey Meyers, Shirley Gold, Vera Katz etc.]
5. Advisory councils from the U of O, OSU, and the OHSU.
The faculty constitution charges the Committee on Committees with recommending to the President membership and chairpersons of all Constitutional and Administrative Committees, and to insure adequate divisional representation. Below is a summary of the Committee activity during 1981-82.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
During 1981-82 academic year, the Committee was requested to make approximately 110 recommendations on 31 university-wide committees.

COMMITTEE PREFERENCE SURVEY
The Annual Faculty Survey of Committee Preference was distributed in March, 1982. Three hundred faculty responses yielded about 600 indications of preference. The process of organizing and tabulating the results was computerized, utilizing PSU’s Honeywell system. Results were consulted in making recommendations for appointment to the 1982-83 committees. Concern has been expressed about some longstanding procedures which the Committee has used in making its recommendations to the President. Despite the statement on the Preference Survey sent to the faculty that "not responding indicates your willingness to serve on any Committee", the practice of the Committee in making its recommendations has been to consider predominantly those faculty who have returned the Survey questionnaires. Since a significant percentage of eligible faculty do not respond to the questionnaire, in the past many faculty members have not been considered for committee work. The Committee on Committees examined these procedures and decided not to restrict itself to the faculty preference list, to seek advice from sources other than the survey results, and to adhere to the interpretation that non-response actually means "willing to serve on any Committee".

REPRESENTATION ON ALL COMMITTEES
The Committee studied the anatomy of the composition of all university committees as existed in the Fall of 1981. Out of a total faculty of over 600 there were about 250 different faculty members serving on the 42 all-University standing committees. A small number of these served on more than one committee.

Five committees require membership from each unit and five others have some specific membership requirements. As charged by the PSU constitution, the Committee on Committees has normally tried to "insure adequate divisional representation" by recommending faculty from various units of the University. Because of the wide variation in the size of the units as well as the interest exhibited by the Faculty in the Preference Survey, faculty representation on committees is not proportional to the faculty size in each unit. For example, the data revealed that about one-third of the faculty in the three academic colleges (A&L, SS, SC) served on committees, while this ratio was over one-half for faculty in the six professional schools (BA, ED, EAS, HPE, SW, UA). The ratio of faculty from an individual unit serving on committees varied from below one-third for one unit to above three-quarters for another unit.

Another factor that may partially explain the apparent non-proportionality in committee service is the fact that preference responses from the faculty are also non-proportional to unit size. For example, this year (April 82) over two-thirds of the professional schools faculties responded to the survey, while for the three colleges this ratio was less than half. After considering the question of balance on committees, the Committee recommends that relatively more faculty from the three colleges should be encouraged and appointed to serve on University Committees in order to distribute the work of the committees more uniformly among the entire faculty.
REPRESENTATION ON FIVE SPECIFIC COMMITTEES

There are 5 university committees, namely: Budget, Committee on Committees, Educational Policies, Effective Teaching, and Library, that require representation from each unit. Whether the currently required unit representation on these committees should be changed was raised in the Senate last year.

After consultation with the Advisory Council, the Committee made the observation that these five committees, by virtue of the charges to them, require a steady flow of information from all units within the university. It is considered to be important for all units to have their operational data, along with their points of view presented on these committees. Committee reports, that are commonly arrived at by consensus are then passed through the Faculty Senate, thereby giving the Senate an opportunity to modify or pass judgment on them.

The Committee recommends a continuation of unit representation on these committees.

NUMBER AND SIZES OF COMMITTEES

After some discussion, the Committee concluded that in view of the current economic picture, declining enrollment and decreasing research and contract funds, more faculty efforts should be focussed on instruction, research and scholarly activities, and professional advancement. One means by which more time may be devoted to such activities is by decreasing the level of faculty effort expended on committee work.

The previous Committees on Committees have studied different aspects of this issue in some detail and made recommendations. There appear to be committees which can be either eliminated, combined with other committees, or simply reduced in size. We recommend that a concerted and systematic effort by made to consolidate, eliminate, or reduce the size or the scope of committees judiciously, to reduce the overall effort involved in committee work.

RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL PERFORMANCE OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The question of determining proper means of recognizing meritorious performance of committee members has been discussed several times in recent years within this committee, as well as in the Faculty Senate. After a lengthy discussion, the Committee decided to address the "recognition issue" by a memorandum to all chairpersons of university committees as follows:

The voluntary service of faculty members on the various university committees is a vital but largely unrecognized activity. Often the effectiveness of a committee is due to the special efforts and commitment of one or two individuals. Such significant contributions of time and energy "above and beyond the call of duty" should be specifically recognized.

The Committee on Committees thinks that part of a committee chairperson's responsibility is to evaluate and draw attention to the meritorious committee performance of faculty members. This need be nothing more than a simple memo to the appropriate academic unit chair, dean, and university administration. The Committee believes that any form of formal rating procedure would not be as meaningful or potent as a sincere and spontaneous expression by a committee chairperson.

This is not meant to impose additional burdens on the chairpersons but to encourage what we think is a necessary courtesy. No one recognizes and appreciates more than committee chairpersons that handful of individuals whose contribution to committees has been indispensable.
The Educational Policies Committee met at least once a week during the 1981/82 academic year. The major activities and accomplishments are as follows:

1. The current committee has heeded the advice contained in its predecessor's Annual Report to the Senate to fulfill its responsibilities more effectively through stronger and closer cooperation with other committees and by establishing a more productive relationship with the administration, especially the Office of Academic Affairs. The Educational Policies Committee is now regularly exchanging minutes with the Budget Committee and has established one joint sub-committee with that committee. The EPC has met with the President on several occasions, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs joins it weekly, on a continuing basis.

2. The committee carefully studied the issues relevant to the name changes of the Mathematics Department and of the Division of Engineering and proposed to the Faculty Senate that it approve the following motions:

   a. "The Faculty Senate approves the change of the name of the Department of Mathematics to the Department of Mathematical Sciences. This approval does not imply approval of the addition of any course offerings or the transfer of courses currently offered, or intended to be offered by any other department of the University to the Department of Mathematics or the Department of Mathematical Sciences."

   b. "The Faculty Senate approves the change of the name of 'Section' in the Division of Engineering and Applied Science to 'Department' and the concomitant change of the title of Section Head to Department Head. Approval of the change of the name Division to any other designation is not implied by this approval."

   Both proposals were approved by the Faculty Senate at its meeting of November 17, 1981.

3. The committee carefully reviewed the budgetary situation and

   a. on October 14 recommended to the President that he continue with the basic strategy of reducing diversity and range among programs while supporting those activities which will remain, and that he continue to use the Guidelines as a basis for budgetary decisions. The committee also recommended that the President exert a vigorous effort toward system-wide review of funding and that more information be shared with the faculty in the matter of budget reductions.
b. On November 2, 1981, reported to the Faculty Senate on the matter of budgeting reductions in which it urged long-term solutions based on the Guidelines and a sound planning process. In addition it urged that efforts be made to bring about system-wide review of allocation.

4. The Educational Policies Committee participated in a joint ad hoc committee study with the Budget Committee to review the Kreinin plan. The committee, chaired by John Walker (Budget), and Ken Butler (Budget), Guido Pinamonti (EPC), and Bill Savery (EPC), concluded the following:

   a. "...that PSU has adopted most of those parts of Kreinin's Buy-Out that fit our institutional restraints. We have come to MSU's answer independently, which tends to confirm the wisdom of both places."

   b. "...that the 'social contract' plan advocated by Professor Kreinin is inappropriate for PSU because of the reoccurring adoption of several of its elements already in the absence of an agreement. Furthermore, its key element of mandatory sabbaticals is a dangerous threat to the fragile and eroding faculty benefits."

5. Reported to the Senate at its March meeting on the state of the Cooperative Education Grant proposal and agreed to oversee the development of the proposal to insure the academic integrity of the program. Two EPC members are participating with an ad hoc committee to develop the proposal and internal guidelines. The committee will review and make final recommendations to the President.

6. Recommended to the Senate at its meeting of May 3 that it adopt a plan for reorganizing significant elements of the University, through the following motion:

   a. "The Faculty Senate recommends that Portland State University effect the following academic reorganization, to be effective no later than September 16, 1982:

      --That the present academic Colleges of Arts and Letters, Science, and Social Science be merged into a single College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, under a single Dean;

      --that the present program in dance be constituted as a Department of Dance under its own department head;

      --that a School of the Performing Arts, comprising the Departments of Dance, Music, and Theatre Arts, be constituted, under a Dean;

      --that the Center for Population Research and Census, the Public Administration Program, and the pre-Architecture courses be transferred to the School for Urban Affairs; and

      --that the present Division of Engineering and Applied Science be designated the School of Engineering, under a Dean."
7. The committee intends to strengthen its role further during the coming year. The committee anticipates recommending a constitutional revision to clarify its relationship with the Office of Academic Affairs and reviewing the function and performance of the Doctoral Programs and of Computing Services. It intends to support the President's commitment to long-range planning and to participate in University planning in ways appropriate to its charge.

Chairperson: Roger Moseley

Members: Oma Blankenship
Michael Carl
Daphne Hoffman
Morton Paglin
Guido Pinamonti
Bill Savery
Walter Shold
Charles Tracy
Robert Van Atta
Fred Waller
Bill Williams

Consultant: John Gruber
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Faculty Senate

FROM: Sandra C. Anderson, Chair, Research and Publications Committee

SUBJECT: Annual Committee Report

The Research and Publications Committee is charged with soliciting proposals from the faculty in order to distribute funds designated each year for faculty development in the areas of research and scholarship. The Committee met in the Fall and made minor revisions in the existing guidelines. These were then distributed to each department office, and a summary sheet was sent to each member of the faculty. The deadline for proposals was February 26, 1982. A total of 50 proposals was received requesting funds amounting to $77,496.

The Committee has evaluated all proposals; the following criteria were applied:

a. Faculty salaries and out-of-state travel expenses are not supported. Travel is funded only in so far as it is an essential part of a research study.

b. Services that are provided to faculty by the University, such as routine computer use, are not supported. Special needs that cannot be met by the Computer Center are, however, considered.

c. Projects that are basically thesis research of students are not supported. Student wages can be included where the role of the student is clearly outlined and a necessary part of the study. Student wages were figured at $4.25 per hour this year.

After deliberation, we have recommended that 34 of the proposals be funded in total or in part, amounting to $32,000. These recommendations have been forwarded to the Office of Graduate Studies and Research for implementation.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra C. Anderson, Chairperson

Don Heilison
James Heneghan
Daniel Johnson
Joseph Kaplan
Robert Lockerby
Abdul Qayum
Pavel Smejtek
Richard Crittenden
Ivan Curcin
Rod Diman
Richard Forbes
Don Gibbons
Robert Harmon
Eligibility Requirements for Admission to the Computer Science Program

Students may declare a major in Computer Science at any time after enrolling at Portland State University. Effective Fall term, 1982, formal admission to the Degree program in Computer Science is required of all students pursuing a degree in Computer Science. Students not formally admitted may not be allowed to enroll in some Computer Science courses. To be eligible for admission, the student should meet the following requirements:

1. Admission to Portland State University.
2. A minimum of 90 credit hours to include the following courses or their equivalents:
   a) WR 121
   b) MTH 200, 201, 202, 203
   c) CS 250, 251, 252
3. A cumulative grade point average of 2.50 or higher on all course work taken at Portland State University, including courses transferred to Portland State University.
4. A grade of C or better in each of the Mathematics and Computer Science courses listed in (2) above.

Candidates who do not meet all criteria may, upon petition, be granted eligibility when an evaluation of the student's total record justifies such action and the student is recommended by the Computer Science Committee.

The Selection Process

Ordinarily, those students who meet the above eligibility requirements will be selected for admission to the Computer Science Program.

If the number of eligible applicants for admission to any degree program exceeds the number for which resources are available, then acceptance will be competitive.

Details concerning procedures and deadlines can be obtained from the Department of Mathematical Sciences.

Continuation Criteria

Students admitted to the Computer Science Program must obtain a grade of C or better in each course required for the Computer Science Degree. Students who receive a grade below C twice in the same required course will be dropped from the program.
TIME LIMITATION

All course work submitted for the master's degree program approved by the department must be completed within the seven years prior to awarding of the degree. The formal application for the degree must be filed with the Degree Requirements Office the term prior to the term of graduation.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP FOR ALL STUDENTS ADMITTED TO GRADUATE STUDIES

All students admitted to graduate studies (regular, conditional, graduate certificate, and non-degree) at Portland State University must maintain at least a GPA of 3.0 for all graduate credit earned after admission to graduate studies. The graduate regulations for academic probation and academic disqualification apply to all students admitted to graduate studies at Portland State University.