Faculty Senate Monthly Packet April 1981

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation
Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet April 1981" (1981). Faculty Senate Monthly Packets. 35.
https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/35

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.
MEMORANDUM

TO Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

FROM Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

The Senate will hold its regular meeting on Monday, April 6, 1981, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the March 2, 1981, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

1. Report on Advisory Council Letter to OSBHE -- Karant-Nunn
2. All-University Committee Chairpersons' Meeting, April 1, 1981, at 11:45 - 1:30 in 225 SMC -- M. Enneking

D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators -- none
2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of the Administration and Committees

*1. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report -- Midson
*2. Committee on Effective Teaching Annual Report -- Peotter
*3. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report -- Yorks
4. Budget Committee Report Update regarding Financial Crises -- Brenner
5. Advisory Council Report Update regarding Financial Crises -- Karant-Nunn
6. Educational Policies Report regarding Financial Crises -- Tuttle
7. AAUP Budget Committee Report regarding Potential Budget Cuts -- Lovell

F. Unfinished Business

*1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Final Reading -- Karant-Nunn

G. New Business

*1. Math Department Motion regarding Math 95 -- E. Enneking
2. Academic Requirements Committee Motions (see E1, numbers 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, and 18) -- Midson
*3 Proposed Constitutional Amendment (Article III, Section 1), First Reading -- Midson
*4 Proposed Constitutional Amendment (Article III, Section 3), First Reading -- Karant-Nunn

H. Adjournment
*The following documents are included in this mailing:

B  Minutes of the March 2, 1981, Senate Meeting
E1  Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report**
E2  Committee on Effective Teaching Annual Report**
E3  General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report**
F1  Proposed Constitutional Amendment**
G1  Math Department Motion re Math 95**
G3  Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 1
G4  Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 3

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only.

Senators unable to attend the meeting should pass this mailing on to their alternates.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 2, 1981
Presiding Officer: Marjorie Enneking
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present: Adams, Alberty, Alexander, Bates, Beeson, Bennett, Bentley, Bierman, Bingham, Breedlove, Brooke, Bruseau, Buell, Bunch, Burden, Chavigny, Chino, Clark, Conroy, Crowley, Dart, Diman, Dressler, Dreyer, Dueker, Dunbar, E. Enneking, M. Enneking, Feldesman, Fiaaca, Giachetti, Gockjian, Gorg, Goslin, Grimes, Hales, Heflin, Heyden, Jenkins, Johnson, Kimbro, Kirrie, Lehman, Manning, Midson, Moor, Morris, Mueller, Muller, L. Nussbaum, R. Nussbaum, Oh, Patton, Rad, Scheans, Sugarman, Swanson, Tuttle, Youngelson, White, Williams, Wurm, Wyers.


Members Absent: Burns.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Blumel, Corn, Forbes, Gard, Gruber, Hardt, Harris Heath, Hoffman, Howard, Leu, Morris, Nicholas, Parker, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Van't Slot.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the February 2, 1981 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

M. Enneking announced that the first meeting of the chairpersons of all-University standing committees had been useful and that the next one would be held on Thursday, April 6, 1981, between 11:45 - 1:30 in 225 SMC. Interested persons are to contact her for details.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

a. Waller responded to the question regarding the suspension of Wr. 120 for the 1980-81 year. In late July the English Department was asked to submit 4%, 8%, and 12% reduction plans. By early September the department was informed that their cut would be 8.9%, and something in the Writing program had to give. The options were to suspend one entire segment of the composition program and the corresponding requirement, or retain the requirement but offer only as many sections as possible. Retaining the Wr. 120 requirement as a prerequisite to 121 but not offering any sections could have kept some 480 students from taking any writing at all this year, passing a large bulge in 120 and 121 on to next year. Or the department could have offered as many
sections of 120, 121, and 323 as the cut of $68,000 would allow, and then turn students away; this would have had a serious impact on students' meeting graduation requirements. Waller, in consultation with Dean Heath, decided that the Wr. 120 requirement should be suspended for 1980-81 but "assumed that Wr. 120 can be reinstated in 1981-82." This decision was made on August 7, just prior to the August 12 advising and registration program for entering students, and Blumel concurred with the decision, a decision that had to be reached over a weekend. No other provisions have been made for students who need Wr. 120 except to undertake a greater sensitivity to students' needs in Wr. 121 as well as maintenance of due standards. Waller pointed out that almost as many writing sections are offered this year as last, mainly by money made available for lectureships through an allocation by the Emergency Board in September. The department cancelled 7 literature courses in the Fall in order to staff more composition sections; for the year, 30 fewer literature sections will have been offered than last year, and nearly every full-time member of the department is teaching Writing every term. He added that it is the department's general view that it should not erode its major, non-major, and graduate course offerings much further than they have been, in order to support a University requirement. The department is willing to explore all alternatives, e.g., finding ways to involve the University as a whole in at least expecting competency in writing of their students, and in finding ways of getting the Writing Center back into operation. Johnson asked if it were possible to turn Wr. 120 over to DCE. Waller replied that that possibility is being explored for next year, but he pointed out that it is questionable to ask students to pay a surcharge for a course that is a University graduation requirement.

b. To the question about which administrators above department head level are being evaluated this year, Blumel replied that he is evaluating James Todd and Kenneth Harris, Gruber is evaluating Stanley Rauch and Bernard Ross, and Forbes is evaluating John Anderson and Mary Cumpston. Johnson wanted to know how faculty could give input and whether that input became part of the public record. Blumel answered that input can be sent to the persons doing the evaluation and that the law requires that materials be available to the persons being evaluated.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

Howard wanted to know about the restructuring of the Library Committee, a recommendation made by the Committee on Committees last year. M. Enneking said that this topic would be discussed at the next meeting.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Before the three scheduled reports concerning the budget began, Kimbrell moved "that the Senate suspend its normal procedure for non-member discussion for twenty minutes to allow questions from any faculty member guest present." The motion was passed unanimously.
What follows is a copy of President Blumel's written comments and of tables displayed on the screen.

"This report is being given to the Faculty Senate in accordance with the provisions of Section 3c of Article 18 of the collective bargaining agreement between the University and AAUP-PSU, and pursuant to my finding communicated to the Faculty in my memorandum of February 17 that the financial condition of the University is such that a declaration of financial exigency or of departmental reduction or elimination may become unavoidable. The matters we will discuss are complex, highly technical in some of their respects, and unfamiliar to many. I shall try to present them in a simplified, non-technical format, with sufficient detail to communicate their significance, but sparing you the technical complexities that add little to the overall picture. Ken Harris is here to answer questions of detail which may be of interest to some of you.

I think it important to begin with a description of the procedural dilemmas with which we are faced. On the one hand, rather specific procedural requirements are contained in the Retrenchment Article of the collective bargaining agreement. We are committed to following the letter and spirit of that article, the intent of which is to provide for extensive discussion and consultation with the faculty and for an effective faculty voice in the decision-making process. These procedures ideally require several months to complete. On the other hand, we are faced with the prospect that final legislative action on budgets may not be completed before late spring or early summer. To delay the initiation of this process until that late date would so shorten the time available for reaching conclusions as to significantly shorten the period for faculty deliberation and consultation. Moreover, in the event that exigency were required, it would permit an unacceptably short period of notice in cases where indefinite layoffs were required in the first year of the biennium. In short, the whole process would have to be completed between the date of final legislative action (say July) and September 15. In addition, this course of action would effectively rule out the option of program reductions to be effective in the second year of the biennium because the required timely notice could not be given.

Thus we have the options of either proceeding through the required steps of the retrenchment process without knowing with certainty the final outcome of the legislative process, or of waiting and taking the consequences I have just described. This is a major question on which I am seeking your counsel.

Let me turn next to a review of the budget reductions imposed upon us this year and a description of those reductions. Action by the Special Session of the Legislature last August resulted in a reduction of $1,900,000. This was lessened by an Emergency Board allocation of $175,000, for a net reduction of $1,725,000. Other budget problems, principally energy and salary improvement underfunding, resulted in an additional reduction of $450,000, for a total cut of $2,175,000, or 6.5 percent of our operating budget. We were directed at that time to treat these reductions as temporary, one-year reductions. Moreover, the cuts had to be implemented in such a short period of time that it was necessary to cut non-personnel items disproportionately and, where personnel cuts were made, to freeze unfilled positions. The effect, of course, was to create distortions in our programs and operations which cannot be permitted to continue. Table
I displays the distribution of the reduction by category of expense and by instructional and non-instructional cuts. I should note that the result of the reductions in instruction was to reduce significantly the number of courses offered during the year and thereby to reduce enrollment below what it otherwise would have been.

In early December, Governor Atiyeh presented his biennial budget proposals to the Legislative Assembly. Table II summarizes the relevant portion of the Higher Education Budget. Please note that these are biennial dollars. The effect on Portland State University, reflecting our share of the changes, is shown on Table III. The totals include all adjustments proposed by the Governor except the dollar totals for salary adjustments for the coming biennium. The cuts ($992,814) represent 2.76 percent of this year's beginning budget, 2.56 percent of the adjusted budget before salary increases and assuming a 6 percent salary increase, a 2.45 percent cut of the 80-81 budget. An issue then becomes whether we could accommodate a reduction of approximately 2.5 percent without implementing program reduction or exigency, assuming the Governor's budget is adopted and fully funded. Of relevance to this issue is a recent analysis which shows that the budget includes fixed term and vacant positions in instruction, research and public service totaling $1,517,000. The Office of Academic Affairs estimates that positions totaling approximately $500,000 could be left vacant. On the other hand, the disproportionate growth in enrollment in certain areas has caused student-teacher ratios in those areas to rise to clearly unacceptable levels. Even with reallocations totaling $500,000 those ratios would remain well above their 1975-76 levels. Other problems such as the shortage of classified staff in the instructional areas and inadequate funds for academic computing cannot be addressed within the Governor's budget.

Two other observations about the Governor's budget. It includes no funds for capital construction for education and general facilities, thus indefinitely postponing our most urgently needed projects. And of critical importance, funding of the budget depends upon the passage of new revenue measures designed to raise $240,000,000 for the biennium. Major elements of this revenue package include reducing the personal exemption to $750, eliminating the indexing provision for personal exemptions authorized by the last session of the Legislature, reducing the maximum allowable deduction for federal income taxes from $7,000 to $5,000 and increases in cigarette and liquor taxes. If enacted by the Legislative Assembly, most of these measures would be subject to referendum which, at the minimum, would delay the implementation of some. Finally, the Governor's budget contemplates the maintenance of property tax relief and basic school support programs.

It is these revenue uncertainties, as well as uncertainty about the general fund revenue projections based upon the existing tax structure, which have led to the recent actions of the Ways and Means Committee calling for the submission of a plan for a further reduction equal to 10 percent of the general fund portion of the budget. It was this action which led to my letter to you of February 17 and which led the Chancellor to propose and the State Board of Higher Education to approve such a plan. That plan will be forwarded to the Ways and Means Committee. An important element in the process beyond this point is the involvement of the Educational Coordinating Commission. Let me read to you the Chancellor's description of that process.
"The Educational Coordinating Commission has been requested by the Chairman of the House Education Committee, Senate Education Committee, and Education Sub-committee of the Joint Ways and Means Committee to undertake two budget reviews.

"First, review the budgets of the Department of Education, Department of Higher Education, and Scholarship Commission, and propose a list of reductions, ranked in priority, totaling 10 percent of the General Fund share of each of these three budgets.

"Second, examine those budgets in aggregate and recommend whether any one should be treated differently -- in achieving the total 10 percent proposed reduction.

"The ECC has determined that it should complete its review process and prepare its recommendations by early April.

"The ECC expects to accomplish its review by examining the proposed budget reduction priorities submitted by each of the agencies and by recommending that they be approved or modified."

The plan approved last Friday by the Board of Higher Education was based on the following assumptions:

"1. The budget approved by Governor Atiyeh is described appropriately as a 'minimum level budget'.

"2. If it becomes necessary to reduce the budget below the level recommended by the Governor, the Department will seek to preserve quality even at the expense of student access.

"3. The timing of the legislative budget review process, possibly resulting in the delay of final budget decisions until mid-summer, will create limitations on our ability to manage, for the 1981-82 year, large numbers of students and faculty -- the two major variables which enable us to effect budget reductions and still preserve an acceptable level of quality.

"4. Examination of the factors related to closing institutions lead to the conclusion that institutional closure is not feasible in preparing the budget for 1981-83. Thus reductions in access should be relatively even-handed across institutions."

Based on those assumptions, the Board approved the following plan -- a list of General Fund reduction "decision packages" for Education and General Services, ranked in priority order. It is not a set of recommendations. It is a response to a directive from the Ways and Means Committee.

Those adopted by the Board are the following: (The estimated impacts on Portland State are shown in Table III)

1. Composed of three parts,
   a. An increase in the application fee from $20 to $25 and in the transcript fee from $3 to $5. Approximately $500,000.
b. An enrollment reduction for both years of the biennium of 1,500 FTE students, primarily Oregon residents, with an accompanying reduction of positions and other costs. This would generate a general fund reduction estimated at $5,307,000. The total budget reduction for this item would be $8,100,000.

c. Elimination of General Fund support for intercollegiate athletics at the three universities - $693,000.

2. A reduction in the General Fund requirement totaling $7,084,651 to be accomplished by reducing in 1981-82 the FTE of all full-time employees to 0.96 with a corresponding reduction for all other employees. The reduction in FTE could be accompanied by a reduction in the length of the 1981-82 academic year or by other appropriate measures.

This was the most controversial item in the set of proposals and was opposed by the Association of Oregon Faculties. Its applicability for institutions with collective bargaining agreements is questionable to say the least. But for those institutions, such as Portland State, the assumption is that in any event an equivalent dollar reduction would be assessed.

The rationale for this proposal is the following:

The first package could be accommodated at most institutions by not filling vacant positions and by not renewing fixed term appointments.

At no institution could the second level of reduction be made without layoffs.

The lateness of final budget decisions would permit very short notice for those persons who would be laid off.

3. The 3rd "decision package" proposes a reduction in the General Fund requirement totaling $5,850,000 consisting of:

a. An enrollment reduction for 1982-83 of approximately 2,265 additional FTE students, primarily Oregon residents, with an accompanying reduction of positions and other costs, including fixed expenses. The General Fund reduction would be $4,594,000. The total budget reduction would be $6,850,000.

b. A 5 percent reduction in the General Fund share of the Education and General Services budget of the Health Sciences Center, amounting to $945,882.

c. A 5 percent reduction for 1982-83 in programs of Centralized Activities, Public Services, Teaching Research Division, and Sea Grant amounting to $510,000.

4. A repeat of #3.
5. A reduction in the General Fund requirement or $5,850,000 consisting of:

a. An increase in tuition rates in 1981-82 and 1982-83 for medical and dental students of 25 percent rather than the 15 percent proposed in the Governor's budget - $582,800.

b. A further increase (in the form of a surcharge) in tuition of $108 per student in 1982-83 amounting to $4,739,600.

You will note from the display that the magnitude of the total cuts is approximately 8 percent for 1982-83. They are massive and would, in my judgment, profoundly alter the scope and character of the University, if indeed that term would any longer be applicable. They would so reduce our base as to set back our development for years or even decades.

One other action by the Board last Friday needs to be mentioned. The institutions were directed by the Board to prepare a list of programs which might be eliminated in order to accommodate the reduction in enrollment and staffing should the implementation of this plan be required.

I cannot conclude this report without mentioning other uncertainties which may affect the fiscal picture. The cuts proposed in the Federal budget could well result in reduced grants and contracts and thus reduce our indirect cost recoveries. The impact of tuition increases on State System revenues is uncertain. The tuition revenue estimates may be too high. There exists the possibility of a continuation of the insidious practice of salary underfunding. I have made no estimates of these effects. I understand the Budget Committee has been considering them, and you will hear from them later.

I believe the foregoing is an accurate description of the circumstances as of the present time. They require that we proceed in an environment of almost bewildering uncertainty.

But while we must be prepared to deal with prospects which are negative, we must not accept them as inevitable. We must maximize our efforts to change those prospects -- and we are doing so. We must bring to public awareness the devastating consequences of cuts in our support and we must mobilize our friends and supporters to exert their efforts and their influence in our behalf. We are doing that. A network of alumni and friends of the University is formed and is being activated to assist us. We are relying in these efforts on the best professional advice that we can find. Your assistance in these efforts is needed and I am confident that it will be forthcoming.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff - 28.9 FTE</td>
<td>$541,000</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff - 16.8 FTE</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Pay</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$443,000</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,175,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction, Rsch., Pub. Svc.</td>
<td>$943,000</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support, Student Svcs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support, Phys. Plant</td>
<td><strong>$1,232,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,175,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table II

Portland State University
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED BUDGET
1981-83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>81-82</th>
<th>82-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASE BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>$36,029,898</td>
<td>$38,811,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80-81 MID-YEAR SALARY ADJ.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE, CREDITS, ETC.</td>
<td>1,276,671</td>
<td>152,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>427,144</td>
<td>304,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Other Dedicated</td>
<td>798,816</td>
<td>264,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>30,973</td>
<td>28,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>173,166</td>
<td>176,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENROLLMENT ADJUSTMENT</strong></td>
<td>74,601</td>
<td>309,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BEFORE REDUCTIONS</strong></td>
<td>$38,811,269</td>
<td>$40,047,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASE ADJUSTMENT - ACADEMIC COMPUTING</strong></td>
<td>( -51,253)</td>
<td>( -51,253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNOR'S REDUCTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session</td>
<td>( -23,888)</td>
<td>( -23,889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>( -16,474)</td>
<td>( -16,663)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Session Continued</td>
<td>( 505,938)</td>
<td>( 505,938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>( -395,261)</td>
<td>( -395,261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AFTER REDUCTIONS</strong></td>
<td>$37,818,455</td>
<td>$39,054,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package #1</td>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>82-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Support</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Reduction</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package #2</th>
<th>81-82</th>
<th>82-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.96 FTE</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package #3</th>
<th>81-82</th>
<th>82-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Reduction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package #4</th>
<th>81-82</th>
<th>82-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Reduction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package #5</th>
<th>81-82</th>
<th>82-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Increase</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>$2,085,000</td>
<td>$3,713,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Reductions</td>
<td>992,814</td>
<td>993,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,077,814</td>
<td>$4,706,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % Cut</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT THE GOVERNOR'S BUDGET DOES

EDUCATION and GENERAL
- Restores 1/2 special session cuts
- Funds cost increases - in energy, books, supplies, equipment - resulting from inflation
- Restores salary underfunding
- Supports 1981-1983 enrollment estimates
- Provides for operation of new buildings
- Cuts 6% from present level:
  - summer session
  - sea grant
  - vet med
  - public services
  - central administration
  - teaching research
- Provides for OPE rate increases
- Reduces teaching staff $3.9 million
- Continues $7.5 million of special session cuts:
  - O/S travel
  - student services
  - administration
  - plant rehabilitation
- Limits salary increases to 6% each year
- Increases student tuition 15% each year
- Increases non-resident graduate tuition 84% biennium
- Eliminates foreign student fee remissions

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION
- No general fund appropriation
- Other fund projects authorized at requested level
Brenner, chairperson of the University Budget Committee, gave the following interim report:

**Our Charge**

The University Budget Committee was asked by President Blumel, on both October 10, 1980 and on December 22, 1980, to develop contingency plans for the 1981-83 biennial budget based on the information available to us. During the latter meeting the President made it clear that our committee (see Exhibit 1) was to prepare its own plan for budget reductions "in parallel" with any plan produced by the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

**Size of the Problem**

As most of us are well aware, the size of the State System of Higher Education's budget for the next biennium is uncertain. Estimates shift and vary daily. The committee, in order to prepare for all possible contingencies, is in the process of developing a set of plans for reductions in PSU's budget which range from $1 million/year to $10 million/year. The rationale for the components of reduction are shown in Exhibit 2. Our primary efforts will focus on the $1 million to $6 million dollar/year reductions.

The uncertainty is very great. It would be incorrect to say that any level of reduction has been assured. The legislature will make the decisions about revenues and expenditures which will determine our own budget. One thing is clear however, the Governor's Budget is the most optimistic plan we have seen and even it results in nearly a $1 million/year reduction in PSU's budget from the 1980-81 Base Budget, as adjusted for inflation.

**Committee Decision Process**

The Budget Committee searched for a process to use to decide how university budgets could be reduced. There were few historical precedents we could find on how Budget Committees should or have done this at PSU or elsewhere.

Numerous techniques were discussed. The method selected is known as "multi-attribute decision analysis." Its goal is to allow the ranking of alternatives when more than one value is important in making a decision. The technique was also selected because it appeared to have a number of important characteristics:

1. It would generate a number of useful outputs at intermediate stages.
2. It was a process which allowed a tailoring of decision criteria to the set of values held by the committee concerning the long-range interests of PSU.
3. It operated in a way which minimized bias in the selection of values, their weighting and in the actual decision making process.
Our ultimate goal was a set of contingency plans which describe in some detail how budget reductions are to be accomplished at PSU for reductions of from $1 million to $10 million/year in $1 million increments (see Exhibit 3). These plans must as best they can, take into account legal, contractual, programmatic and practical constraints on the University.

A few definitions will help explain the nature of the task.

Values - those conditions essential to the long run health of a good University, in general, and PSU, in particular.

Value Weights - a measure of the relative importance of each value; the weights are numerical and total 100.

Utility Functions - a standard of reference used to judge how well each value is adhered to or attained by alternative actions.

Scenarios - a general approach which might be used to reduce PSU's budget.

During the Fall and Winter terms the committee has gone through a number of steps which have produced a ranking of budget reduction scenarios for PSU. These steps are described below:

Step 1 - Value Identification

The early months of our deliberations were concerned with identifying as many possible values relevant to budget matters as we could. The search was divided into three general areas to facilitate the group's thinking about all potential information which could be useful. The three categories were: long run values; goals and missions of PSU; and factors, constraints and data. The committee and its consultants identified 20 long run values, 9 goals and missions components and 14 factors, etc. -- a total of 43 possible values to consider.

Step 2 - Value Consolidation and Selection

The 43 represented just too much to consider all at once. The committee decided to refine and consolidate these into as few values as it could. After a good deal of subcommittee work and general debate over a period of about a month, a set of 10 "Final Budget Goals and Values" were agreed upon (see Exhibit 4).

Step 3 - Value Weighting

Because the committee did not feel that these 10 values were equally important to the long run interests of the University, a system of value weights was developed so that the committee could use the relative importance of each value appropriately in making its decisions.
To reduce potential bias in later decisions, each committee member submitted their set of value weights to the Chairman who computed the committee's average weight for each value. This average weight was withheld from the committee to reduce bias. Each member was asked to save a copy of their set of value weights so that they could confirm the validity of the Chairman's computation at the conclusion of the scenario ranking step. By withholding from the individual committee members the average values weights, the possibility of members attempting to "load" or "unbalance" the results was minimized as they were only sure of their own weights (see Exhibit 4 for the committee's value weights).

Step 4 - Determining More Precisely What Each Value Means

The committee quickly recognized that any attempt to use our values to help us rank budget reduction approaches would be futile unless each committee member had a similar, if not identical, view of what attainment (or non-attainment) of the value meant. To help insure that each of us had such a consistent view of each value, a utility function was developed for each of the values. On it were placed descriptions of various levels of value attainment from "perfect non-attainment" (scored as 0) to "perfect attainment" (scored as 100). Various intermediate points were identified for each of the 10 values. These were generally the 25, 50 and 75 scores. The current attainment of each value at PSU was estimated where possible and dubbed the "status quo." These "status quo" points had values from 25 to 75 depending on how well the committee felt the value was present at PSU today. (See Exhibit 5 for the utility function of Value 1).

Step 5 - Overall Budget Cut Approaches or Scenarios Scored

The development of a set of budgets for various economic conditions requires some decision criteria be used to decide just what resources should be allocated to what areas of the institution. At PSU in the past, a few general approaches have been used when budget reductions were necessary. The committee decided to generate as many different overall approaches as we could and then try to rank these approaches or scenarios based on their ability to attain our set of values as weighted for importance.

Each committee member was given a set of 10 value utility functions and a list of the 8 scenarios we had developed. In the quiet of their own offices or homes they studied each scenario in turn and asked themselves how well each cut approach would attain each value. Their answer came in the form of a score between 0 and 100. This process was repeated for all 80 combinations of scenarios and values. The utility functions helped assure that each committee members scores were consistent in meaning with those of the rest of the group.

Step 6 - Scenarios Ranked

Once each committee member had estimated how well they thought each scenario would attain each value, it was possible to combine the group's responses. The average scores were used with the average weights (from Step 3 above) to obtain
a weighted score for each scenario. An example of this process is shown in Exhibit 6.

The final result of this process is the committee's ranking of the various scenarios (see Exhibit 7). Certain conclusions may be drawn from this process and results:

1. The scenarios at the top of the rankings are preferred to those at the bottom by the members of this Budget Committee.

2. No one approach is clearly the overwhelming favorite of the committee, therefore as budget reduction plans are developed, a number of the 8 scenarios are likely to be used.

3. None of the scenarios state specifically how the marginal decisions about the reductions are to be made. For example, "minimization of impact" does not say "no impact."

Step 7 - The Remainder of the Process

The University Budget Committee has before it some of the more complex parts of its task. First of all, it must decide just how specifically it is going to respond to the request from the President that we provide to him a set of contingency plans about how our committee recommends reducing PSU's budget. Two approaches have been suggested: an active role and a reactive role. The former involves development of a specific plan down to department levels for various amounts of overall budget reduction. The latter would consist of the committee now simply reacting to the budget reduction plans formulated by others who would supposedly "follow our guidelines." The President has asked the committee in writing to follow the active approach.

The process now requires that specific decision criteria be developed. The "active" role requires the committee to actually construct a list of what budgets get reduced and by how much at what level of overall reduction, a rather distasteful task given that current budgets are woefully inadequate as they are.

General Comments

This committee has recognized from the start of its work this past Fall that there was no way for us to develop a universally approved budget reduction plan. Each part of this University is unique and important. Each person employed is striving to serve the community to the best of their abilities. As specific decisions have been made, we have tried to make them in a fair and unbiased manner. The process described above was designed to do this.

We, as a University community, must try to do two things: make decisions which are in the long-run best interests of the entire University and be sure that the message of how devastating any cuts to PSU would be gets to the legislature and general public. The Budget Committee pledges to do the former as it develops its input to the President's final decisions. We hope that the faculty will do the latter to help insure that the ultimate size of the cuts are just as small as they can be.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Levinson</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Longres</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Matschek</td>
<td>Health + Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Timmons</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXHIBIT 2**

**FACTORS IMPACTING PSU'S BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Impact ($/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Governor's Budget</td>
<td>-$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tax Package not Passed</td>
<td>-$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Additional Revenue Shortfall Not in Governor's Budget</td>
<td>-$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tuition Increase, Impact Price Elasticity + Enrollment Declines</td>
<td>-$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salary Increase in Excess of Funding (e.g. 10% x $500,000)</td>
<td>-$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Catchup Salary Package Approved But Not Funded (10% x $250,000)</td>
<td>-$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** = -$10,300,000

**NOTE:** Education + General Budget for PSU = $36,000,000

**EXHIBIT 3**

**BUDGET COMMITTEE GOAL**

10 Plans showing how budget reduction of from $4mil/yr to $0mil/yr could be accomplished

![Diagram of budget plans 1 to 10]
### Value Weights

Final Budget Goals and Values List

1. Provide programs in arts and sciences that are generally recognized as essential to a university.

2. Provide programs in selected professional fields.

3. Offer programs and services which meet the needs of our urban constituency.

4. Strive to maintain and improve the quality of academic programs.

5. Provide graduate and doctoral programs which meet state, regional or national needs.

6. Engage in research and creative activities in all academic areas of the university.

7. Provide cultural and recreational events for both the university and surrounding communities.

8. Attract a diverse group of quality students.

9. Maintain and attract quality faculty and staff by adequate compensation and support services.

10. Continue the progress made toward achieving affirmative action goals.

### Utility Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide programs in arts and sciences that are generally recognized as essential to a university.</td>
<td>- Concentrate cuts in arts and sciences areas.</td>
<td>- Cut many non-essential programs in arts and sciences areas.</td>
<td>- Arts and sciences overall share equally with the rest of the university in the cuts.</td>
<td>- Make no cuts whatever in arts and/or sciences departments or programs.</td>
<td>- Expand funding in these areas as a percentage of the total budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXHIBIT 6**

**SCENARIO SCORING FOR ADHERENCE TO VALUES**

**Example**
- **2 VALUES** → 1 + 2
- **2 Scenarios** → A + B

**Steps**
- **Weighting Values**
  - Value 1: 0.75
  - Value 2: 0.25

**Using Utility Functions**
- To score scenarios for adherence to values
- **Scenario A**: 70% (value 1: 60%)
- **Scenario B**: 50% (value 2: 40%)

**Calculating Weighted Scores for Each Scenario**
- **Scenario A Score**: 61
  - Value 1: 
    - Weight x Value + Weight x Value
    - 0.75 x 70 + 0.25 x 40

- **Scenario B Score**: 53
  - Value 2: 
    - Weight x Value + Weight x Value
    - 0.75 x 50 + 0.25 x 60

**Conclusion**
- Scenario A more fully adheres to the values as weighted

---

**EXHIBIT 7**

**BUDGET REDUCTION SCENARIO SCORES**

**Higher scores indicate the budget committee believes these scenarios best adhere to the set of values it used for evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize impacts on high growth programs</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize impacts on professional schools</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective program elimination</td>
<td>48.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize impacts on arts and sciences</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize impacts on low growth or declining programs</td>
<td>36.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut all employee FTE to .96</td>
<td>36.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the burden—reduce all areas equally</td>
<td>34.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize direct personnel impacts, use &quot;targets of opportunity&quot;</td>
<td>34.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following Brenner's report, Scheans spoke for the Advisory Council which had also discussed the budget situation and possible program cutting. It is the Council's general position that reductions should be programmatic rather than across the board. This would concentrate resources and hopefully maintain some quality in remaining programs and faculty. The Council felt that PSU has always been funded less than adequately, and across the board cuts would only worsen a bad, persistent, situation. Specific recommendations include the following:

A. If at all possible, now and in the future, the Library should be spared.

B. If program reductions become necessary, retain those that

1. constitute a part of the traditional liberal arts curriculum without which the University is not a university,

2. currently respond to sizeable and proven needs of the community,

3. maintain a high quality of instruction,

4. bring PSU national renown, and

5. meet a reasonable standard of cost effectiveness.

Other recommendations were made and will be made but are still under discussion, therefore they were not reported.

R. Nussbaum wanted to know at what point he could present a resolution to the Senate. M. Enneking indicated that it should come under new business. Brenner was asked what could be done during the first year and what during the second, and he replied that program reductions would no doubt be larger in the second year. Sparks was dismayed that the chart of ten values showed affirmative action goals to be the lowest, but Brenner pointed out that the Budget Committee began with 43 goals, thus there were many worthwhile goals which were dropped altogether. He felt that the law will take care of many of the concerns in this area. James asked about the notification period of faculty, whether it would be one year or shorter, and what the probability of termination was. Blumel answered that he didn't believe that the Governor's budget would require termination unless it got to the second level, at which point the probability, according to the best guess, was 50/50. Fiasca wanted to know what inducements are being offered for early retirements. Blumel said that internally this was an easy issue to deal with, but the question is really a legislative one, and it is hard to judge what the prospects are; there seems to be a good deal of support for early retirements. Lovell asked what impact there would be on programs which are offered in the community. Brenner replied that no conclusions have been reached, but certainly how available programs are outside of the University will be considered. Blumel was asked at what point exigency would have to be declared, and he replied that if PSU had to go to level two it would be a virtual certainty. L. Nussbaum suggested that the Budget Committee's suggestions should be pursued and discussed system-wide. M. Enneking urged all present to contact legislators and to inform them of the grave situation, for legislators are making decisions on the basis of
what they hear from their constituents. If the Governor's budget is not passed, we are into the 10 percent cuts, she said. A list of senators and their room numbers was made available to all.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Scheans read the following statement from the Advisory Council regarding the question of the reorganization of the Library and moved its acceptance:

"The Faculty Advisory Council has concluded that the recent administrative reorganization of the Library, although not a violation of the letter of Article III, Sec. 1 of the Faculty Constitution, must be considered a violation of its spirit. Section 1 intends to promote faculty involvement in decision making, so that a meeting of all Readers Services librarians and consultation with the Library Committee (specifically charged with advising the Director in all policy matters involving the Library) prior to implementation of the reorganization would have been appropriate and in keeping with the spirit of collegiality intended by the Constitution."

The report was accepted.

Bunch referred to an October 5, 1979, memo by Ken Butler which serves as a good example of the spirit of collegiality; he asked that the statement be included in the minutes of this meeting. The Presiding Officer ruled that it would be included.

From "REPORT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE FOR THE LIBRARY RETREAT HELD ON JUNE 5, 1979" in the form of a memo, K. Butler, 10-5-79, p. 4

"INTERNAL RELATIONS

There is a need to preserve and continue group process, to keep all staff informed and involved. The help and use of an outside facilitator for assisting with the group process is considered both important and necessary. Group process should continue to be used in reaching future decisions. The general desire was expressed—varying somewhat as to degree—that solving problems by the Library staff as a whole continue. This was seen to require: 1) a climate which respects the consensus method of problem solving; 2) development of the ability to solve problems by consensus through development of knowledge of appropriate mechanisms and processes; and 3) identification and reduction of barriers to consensus.

Barriers already identified include: 1) provincialism and concern solely with one's own area; 2) partisanship (an "us vs. them" attitude); 3) differing expectations; 4) differing success standards; 5) differing individual behavior; 6) long-established interpersonal relationship patterns; 7) communications within the organizational structure; and 8) uncertainty as to the future.
Consensus as to the solution is crucial if space and other problems are to be solved successfully. Consensus can be achieved, it was felt, only if the morale of the Library staff is improved. The improvement of communication is seen as most important for the achievement of this purpose. It is felt that by creating a more open atmosphere better communication can be accomplished. This will require that all staff—professional and classified—are informed of and involved in decisions and changes, and that the structure of the organization permit the process to operate

NEW BUSINESS

1. Bentley read the Committee on Committees' motion for the appointment of an Ad hoc Committee on Instructional Media, to assess the place of audio-visual instructional media in the University. The motion was passed.

2. Moor presented the first reading of a constitutional amendment of Article VIII, paragraph 2. He elaborated that the purpose of this proposed amendment is to clarify the intent of the Constitution as it relates to transmission to the Advisory Council of proposed amendments after their first reading. The reference to an "approved version" in that paragraph has left it uncertain whether it is necessary by vote of the Senate to approve a proposed amendment after its first reading in order that it be submitted for passage at the second reading. Action at the first reading should be limited to debate, clarification, and modification of the proposal. The new wording will ensure that the amendment to be voted upon at the second reading will be the one that the Senate wishes to consider, and it will be understood well enough in advance to allow appropriately deliberate consideration before the decision to adopt or to reject is made. The motion to send the proposed constitutional amendment to the Advisory Council for proper form and numbering was approved.

3. R. Nussbaum presented the following resolution:

The faculty of Portland State University, through its Senate, urges President Blumel to convey to the OSBHE our request to consider

1) adopting a new funding formula for the institutions which reflects the real costs of instruction for a student body with a large fraction of part-time students.

2) in the interim, while this formula is being developed, restoring the amount of $150,000 (each year) to Portland State's allocation from the final Higher Education budget for the next biennium, in recognition of the special burden on this institution in serving a large number of part-time students.

The resolution was unanimously accepted by the Senate

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.
To: The Faculty Senate  
From: The Academic Requirements Committee  
Subject: 1980-81 Report

For the 1980/81 academic year the committee was enlarged from eight to ten members by the addition of two faculty. Meetings take place on a weekly basis during terms including summer.

Matters resolved since the last report were:  
(Dates refer to minutes in which pertinent motions or other actions were recorded).

1. The ARC policy of delegating PE petitions to the chair was reviewed. No changes in present procedure were recommended (4/8/80).

2. In response to a request from Acting V.P. Dobson for a recommendation on the residency status of undergraduate DCE courses, the committee suggested "at this time no change be made in the status ... ineligible to satisfy residency." The committee suggested reconsideration should any significant changes occur, either in academic procedure or in the policy of the Graduate Council, whose lead in this case ARC would follow (4/14/80 see also #18).

3. A request to allow residence status for a M.E.S.C. consortium program taught at Universities of Denver and Utah was not supported by the committee. There was no doubt as to the quality of the courses, but residency was not appropriate for courses taught elsewhere by non-PSU faculty. Students are able to petition individual cases (4/22/80).

4. Procedures were clarified by which Office of Admissions processes transfer evaluations for credit for which official descriptive documentation is claimed to be unavailable. Substitutes may be allowed with certain documentation and routes of appeal were laid out (4/22/80).

5. The Office of Admissions was given guidance on the evaluation of foreign credit. Credit granted solely by Admissions is elective only. Equivalence to specific PSU courses is initially determined by Academic units only. Such units may also choose whether or not to allow specific course credit, and may grant Admissions authority to apply rulings to further cases (5/13/80).

6. A modified motion from the International Student Board was approved to permit liberal interpretation on a case by case basis of applications from students in countries where TOEFL tests are unobtainable. Such students must be tested for placement on arrival (5/27/80).
7. Overload policy was interpreted to include all courses being taken by a student. P.31 of Bulletin to read, "Undergraduate students desiring to take over 21 credits including credits taken concurrently at other institutions ..." (5/27/80).

8. New policies on the use of I and W marks were recommended after consultation with Scholastic Standards Committee and Graduate Council. These were adopted by the Senate with three amendments on October 6, 1980, for implementation Winter 1981.

9. Committee supported a proposal by the Division of Engineering to transfer courses in Engineering and Applied Science only if passed with a grade C or better, to be implemented as soon as published in the Bulletin (10/24/80).

10. A suggestion to disallow Math 95 eligibility for Science distribution was not favored by the committee on first consideration, but returned to the Math Department for further clarification of arguments (10/20/80).

11. ARC approved acceptance of up to 48 credits from the Veteran's Administration program in Nuclear Medicine Technology towards a Baccalaureate at PSU. College of Science to review program every three years (11/3/80).

12. Deadline for overload petitions was moved forward from "prior to beginning of registration" to "last day to add without late fee", this being a more attainable deadline (11/3/80).

13. In order to avoid awarding second degrees to students with inadequate writing ability, committee moved that "Post Baccalaureate students who do not hold a degree from a university where the language of instruction is English, must satisfy the Writing 323 requirement before completion of a certificate program or graduation from PSU" (11/10/80).

14. ARC recommended adoption of new requirements proposed by Engineering for admission to upper division standing -- namely a minimum grade of C in certain courses and a minimum GPA of 2.25 in other designated courses (11/24/80, 1/21/81).

15. ARC recommended adoption of standards proposed by Business Administration as admission requirements for upper division including a minimum of 75 credits at a 2.5 GPA and completion of specified courses. Individual departments may also set specific standards for departmental concentration (12/1/80, 1/7/81).

For both Engineering and Business Administration proposals limitation of enrollment was approved in principle, though satisfactory mechanisms for implementation are still to be resolved.

16. Procedural changes in processing Portland State Credits earned prior to admission was reported by Admissions. They are no longer treated as transfers (12/8/80). No change in their present inclusion for total GPA or for residence was recommended (1/21/81).

17. Changes proposed by Council of Academic Deans in admission requirements for
International U.G. and Postbacc. students were amended and approved. The TOEFL score was raised from 500 to 525, with transfer of English Composition courses allowed as an alternative. Requirements for Postbacc. students admitted as undergraduates were established (1/7/81).

18. Guidelines for treatment of Credit Off-Campus offered by PSU, proposed by the Council of Academic Deans were endorsed with suggestions for modification, specifically definition of "Off Campus". These are to be administered by DCE. All such courses come under review by academic units. Residence is to apply only to courses taken after admission (2/4/81).

Matters pending:

19. Clarification of detailed procedure for Registrar and Admissions to follow in cases of submission of transcripts for evaluation subsequent to admission at PSU (1/14/81).

20. Committee reviewed the procedure and rationale for suspension (1980/81) of the university requirement that Wr 120 be a prerequisite for Wr 121 for certain students. Upon notification of procedural irregularities, V.P. for Academic Affairs requested ARC review the suspension, its extension and its reimplementation (2/4/81, 2/25/81).

Petitions

375 petitions were acted upon between March 1, 1980 and March 1, 1981, with the following results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Granted in part</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by committee action</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by delegation (P.E.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted by: Ann Bennett, M.E.S.C./Anthropology
Glen Gilbert, Health & P.E.
Mike Heneghan, Engineering & App. Sci.
Robert Larson (student)
Tony Midson (chair), A.V. Services
Andrew Nisbet (student)
Philip Rhoades, Admin. Justice
Jay Shimada, Management
Ralph Smith, Education
Christine Thompson, English

3/4/81
The committee continues to work through subcommittees: Grant Requests, Policy, and Program.

Seven proposals were received for funds from the Fund for the Advancement of Teaching, and five were granted as follows:

1. $250.00 to Robert Vogaisang, Department of Speech Communication, for purchase of special equipment for use in "Puppetry in Education and Puppetry in Therapy."

2. $250.00 to Katherine Chavigny, Public Health Studies, for partial support of a workshop in Epidemiology.

3. $1000 to Committee on Effective Teaching to support continued membership in the Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest faculty development program.

4. $180.00 to Committee on Effective Teaching for Development of exhibits for the Conference on Effective Teaching.

5. $95.00 to Glen Fahs, Division of Continuing Education, for registration fee at an annual meeting exploring "Quality Dimensions of Teaching Adults."

Out of $3,745.00 committed to the fund, $1,775.00 so far has been spent on projects relating to innovative course development and to faculty development.

On March 13, 1981, the Committee sponsored a Conference on Effective Teaching titled, "Intellectual Growth and Instructional Developments Toward a New Synthesis."

The Conference was funded by a grant from the P.S.U. Alumni Fund. Dr. William H. Berquist and Dr. David G. Halliburton, both nationally known for their work in faculty development, conducted the half-day conference. Approximately 50 P.S.U. faculty members attended the Conference.

The Committee plans the following workshops for P.S.U. faculty: "Small Group Instructional Diagnosis" (co-sponsored with the School of Business), April 27, 1981; "Classroom Visuals," conducted by Tony Midson and Brent Schauer, May 5, 1981.

Members of the Committee are: Students - David Brownhill, Richard Lyons; Faculty - Harold Adams, Jerome DeGraaf, Glen Fahs, Mary Fox-Spadavecchio, Jerry Lansdowme, Robert Hiller, Pauline E. Peotter (chairperson), June Underwood, Forbes Williams, David Wrench, plus Jim Heath, David Willis and Robert Walker (ex-officio).
March 12, 1981

TO: Faculty Senate Steering Committee

FROM: Sam A. Yorks, Chairperson

I. The most important area engaging the committee's attention this year has been that of PSU Disciplinary Procedures and the Student Conduct Code. During fall term, an allegation that a violation had occurred was brought to our attention by Dean Williams, for the Office of Student Affairs. Dean Williams invoked "probable cause," and the student concerned requested that a hearing be held. As provided in the Student Conduct Code, student and faculty panels for Disciplinary Hearings were reviewed, screened, and selected for representation. A Hearing Board for this case was then chosen by lot by the members of this committee, and at the advice of the President's Legal Advisor, Mr. Mike Corn, further jurisdiction was turned over to the selected group. A date for the hearing having been determined, taking into consideration that the student had since left the school and the state, this individual then withdrew her request. Another case in the meantime having arisen, the committee repeated the original process. Dean Williams pointed out the probability of similar violations and hearings arising; he indicated there was a need for the committee to study the current code and the procedures now in practice, with a view to revision in the light of current academic problems and behavior patterns. The committee agreed to do so in the coming Spring term.

II. The committee again discussed the projected student Who's Who. This has not yet developed sufficient interest and support to make it feasible. Members have suggested that the project be linked to general academic recognition on a departmental basis, to gain additional interest and support. The committee will attempt this by individual action.

III. The committee studied statistics from the Office of Institutional Research, with respect to student enrollment by Ethnic Origin and Sex, Fall 1980. With respect to the implications for Student Affirmative Action, Dean Williams posed these questions: what are the departments doing to further equity in student distribution? Are some departments more fully engaged than others? Is there less overall involvement with graduate students? True, handicapped students have had secured to them better physical access to buildings, in accord with federal guidelines; but in all these matters, current budgetary cuts have an effect. More recent data having been made available in the meantime, members decided to more fully determine what in fact can be done in the light of current needs and resources and in the light of the updated statistics. Faculty members among the committee see the need and light; student members urge realistic application, the chair observed that the current financial situation will actually determine.

For the Committee, S.A. Yorks, Chair
Ann Alexander, Curt Lahti, Bhagirath Lall,
Dan McKitrick, Robert Mork, Kathryn Peterson,
Consultants: William Williams, Major Morris
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Advisory Council, Susan Karant-Nunn, Chairperson
Re: Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Final Reading

Article VIII, Amendments, Paragraph 2

CURRENT WORDING:

The proposed amendment, if then introduced at the meeting, is subject to debate and modification by majority vote. After opportunity for debate and modification, the approved version of the proposed amendment will then be transmitted by the Secretary of the Faculty to the Advisory Council, which shall review the proposed amendment for proper form and numbering. The Advisory Council will return the proposed amendment to the Secretary of the Faculty prior to the next regular meeting of the Senate. At that meeting the presiding officer shall submit the amendment to the Senate for debate and consideration of final passage.

PROPOSED ALTERATION:

Underlined words to be changed to: "resulting version, whether or not modified."
TO: Senate Steering Committee

FROM: Gene Enneking, Mathematics

I propose that the following motion be included under new business at the April 6, 1981 Senate meeting:

Motion: That Math 95 not be approved as part of the 18 credits in Science toward Out-of-Major Distribution Requirements.

Rationale: The Mathematical Association of America has provided minimum standards for the evaluation of mathematics programs for use by departments, college and university administrations, and regional accrediting associations. The following statement is contained in these guidelines:

"College credit granted for work in mathematics must be carefully controlled. It should not be granted for distinctly high school level work. Mathematics courses offered in college should be examined to determine the extent of their overlap with high school mathematics, and where that overlap is substantial the course should not provide credit toward college graduation."

There is disagreement over what is "distinctly high school level work" as the State of Oregon only requires one year of general mathematics for high school graduation, whereas three years are generally recommended for college bound students. These three include algebra, geometry, and advanced algebra, with Math 95 generally identified with advanced algebra.

Removing Math 95 would increase the level of mathematical knowledge for science distribution if mathematics courses are applied for distribution credit.

The above motion was unanimously approved by the Department of Mathematics.
To: Senate Steering Committee
From: Academic Requirements Committee

March 12, 1981

The following amendment to Article III Section 1 of the Constitution is submitted by the Academic Requirements Committee to be inserted after the final paragraph.

University-wide academic requirements shall not be suspended or modified without prior consideration by the Faculty Senate. In an emergency the Academic Requirements Committee or Graduate Council, the Advisory Council, the Senate President, or the appropriate chairperson shall first be consulted. Notification of any change made shall be submitted to the Senate immediately with a request for ratification.

[Signatures]

T. Curt Bennett
C. Schlaan
G. Shoenau
L. Lunde
M. W. Neson
C. Johnson

Tony Mueller
R. K. Milburn
Paul H. Meffan
Lauren Muskan
Larry Brusean
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE III, SECTION 3
OF THE FACULTY CONSTITUTION

The faculty of each department shall by secret ballot of all full-time members (0.5 FTE or more) decide the mode by which its choice of Department Head, both regular and acting, shall be determined. These procedures shall be published and filed with the Office of Academic Affairs. They shall be implemented by April 15 of the Department Head’s third year in office and otherwise upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the Office of Department Head. Any revisions of the procedures must be made and filed at least one month before an election.

The Department shall forward the name of its choice to the Dean of the appropriate College or School, who will promptly review the nomination and forward it with his or her comments to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President in turn shall promptly review the nomination and forward it with his or her comments to the President.

In the circumstance that the President finds substantive reasons to question the willingness and/or ability of the person chosen by the faculty to fulfill the functions of that office as described in the current "Position Description for Department Head," he or she shall, within six weeks of the Department having notified its appropriate administrative officer of its selection, state in writing to the members of the Department his or her reasons for refusing the appointment. Ordinarily, the Department shall then promptly nominate another person. The final responsibility and authority in appointment of Department Heads is that of the President. Grievances arising in connection with appointment of Department Heads will be handled through the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

The Department Head shall serve a stated term of three (3) years but without prejudice to his or her re-election or re-appointment.

[Signatures]